SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

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

O God over all, blessed for evermore: amid the seething strife which mars the earth and builds its walls of separation, whate'er problems we face in this volcanic day, this white altar reared at the gates of the morning speaks to us ever of our final reliance on those supreme spiritual forces, faith and hope, and love, which alone abide and on which our salvation in the end depends. As the toil of a new day opens before us, we lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts; may they be acceptable in Thy sight.

Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day. May we follow the gleam of the highest and best we know, as it leads o'er moor and fen and crag and torrent till the evening comes and the fever of life is over, and our work is done.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PROXMIRE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 23, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 15)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the President's budget message. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

A Federal budget lays out a two-part plan of action:

It proposes particular programs, military and civilian, designed to promote national security, international cooperation, and domestic progress.

It proposes total expenditures and revenues designed to help maintain stable economic prosperity and growth.

This budget for fiscal year 1968 reflects three basic considerations:

In Vietnam, as throughout the world, we seek peace but will provide all the resources needed to combat aggression.

In our urgent domestic programs we will continue to press ahead, at a controlled and reasoned pace.

In our domestic economy we seek to achieve a seventh year of uninterrupted growth, adopting the fiscal measures needed to finance our expenditures responsibly, permit lower interest rates, and achieve a more balanced economy.

In recent years, the American economy has performed superbly. Since 1963, our Nation's output has risen at an average rate of 5.5 percent a year; 5.3 million more people are employed and 1.2 million fewer unemployed. Industrial capacity has grown by 18 percent, and far less of it is idle than was the case 3 years ago.

During this past calendar year alone:

Our Nation's gross national product—apart from price changes—has grown by nearly 5.4 percent.

The unemployment rate has remained at or below 4 percent for the first time in 13 years.

More than 3 million additional jobs were found in nonagricultural employment, the largest yearly gain experienced since 1942.

Corporate profits and personal income have each grown about 8 percent to record levels.

We have at the same time become engaged in a major effort to deter aggression in southeast Asia. Some $19.9 billion of the Nation's resources will go to support that effort in the current fiscal year and $22.4 billion in 1968. This past year our economy met these requirements with minimum strain and disruption.

We have also embarked upon a series of new programs to lift the quality of American life in the fields of health, education, urban development, pollution control, and the war on poverty. Yet the productivity and vitality of our economy is such that the total Federal budget in 1968, including the full costs of the Vietnam conflict, the new programs, and all of the various Federal trust funds, will account for only 1½ percent more of our gross national product than it did 3 years ago. Since the gross national product rose sharply over these 3 years, we have been able to meet our increased commitments abroad, move forward with urgent social programs at home, and still provide a massive expansion in goods and services available for private consumption and investment.

During the year and a half since the decision to send troops to Vietnam, consumer prices have risen 4.5 percent in spite of efforts to hold them down. We have, nevertheless, had considerably better success than in similar periods during World War II and the Korean conflict. Then, prices rose 13.5 percent and 11 percent, respectively, even with the imposition of price and wage controls which we have avoided.

The economic performance of the past 3 years did not just happen. It grew out of the ingenuity, hard work, and imagination of all parts of American society. But the one element which provided a catalyst for all the rest was the imaginative and flexible use of Federal fiscal policy.

In 1964, and again in 1965, tax reductions were enacted which gave a strong stimulus to the economy. Idle capacity came into operation, new capacity was built, and both the numbers and productivity of the Nation's workforce rose sharply.

In late 1965 and early 1966, however, as the economy rapidly approached full capacity operation, inflationary pressures began to develop.

On two occasions, I proposed, and the Congress promptly enacted, tax changes aimed at dampening those pressures. At the same time I made every effort to postpone, stretch out, or eliminate all but the most essential Federal expenditures. Cutbacks totaling over $5 billion in program levels and $3 billion in expenditures are being undertaken by Federal agencies during the current year. These actions contributed to a welcome moderation of inflationary pressures in the latter part of 1966.

FISCAL PROGRAM FOR 1968

In the budget for 1968, I am again proposing a fiscal program tailored to meet responsibly the needs of an expanding economy. This program will require a measure of sacrifice as well as continued work and resourcefulness.

In the year ahead, defense expenditures will continue to rise as we carry out our obligations in Vietnam. After a rigorous review of civilian programs and a sharp paring of spending requests, a modest increase in domestic expenditures will be required as we press forward to meet our obligations at home. Equity also demands that we increase substantially social security benefits for our older citizens so that they share in the Nation's growing income which their own past work and investment helped to bring about. And finally, during the coming year, we must take every reasonable step to permit a continuation of the move toward easier monetary conditions and lower interest rates which is now clearly underway.

Under these circumstances, I am proposing a temporary 6-percent surcharge on both corporate and individual income taxes. I also ask that individuals in the lower income brackets be exempt from the surcharge. The tax should remain in effect for 2 years, or for such period as may be warranted by our unusual expenditures in Vietnam. I will not hesitate to recommend an earlier expiration date, however, if the fiscal requirements of our commitments in Vietnam permit such action. In addition, I recommend legislation to provide a further acceleration of certain corporate tax payments.

With these new measures, and the ex-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

penditures I am proposing, the Federal budget deficit as measured in the national income accounts will be $2.1 billion in fiscal year 1968, compared to $3.8 billion in fiscal year 1967.

The national income accounts budget is the measure developed and used for over three decades by economists and fiscal experts to judge the impact of the Federal budget on the flow of income and production in the economy. Its measures of total Federal receipts and expenditures are the same as those used in recording the receipts and expenditures of business firms and individuals. Together with data on business and individuals, the national income accounts budget is used to build up official statistics on gross national product and national income.

Unlike the more traditional administrative budget, the national income budget: Includes the large expenditures and receipts of the Federal Government's trust funds, but excludes Federal loans and receipts from the sale of loans, since these are not recorded as income or expenditures in the accounts of business firms or individuals.

I am emphasizing the national income accounts as a measure of Federal fiscal activity because the traditional administrative budget is becoming an increasingly less complete and less reliable measure of the Government's activities and their economic impact. For example, trust fund-financed activities not reflected in the administrative budget now approximate one-third of that budget. More specifically, the fiscal year 1968 administrative budget excludes $48.1 billion of trust fund receipts and $44.5 billion of trust fund expenditures.

In addition, the treatment of lending as equivalent to spending in both the administrative and cash budgets is not suitable for an analysis of the budget's impact on the flow of national production and income.

To permit a higher 1968 budget deficit than the $2.1 billion involved in my fiscal recommendations would, I believe, be unacceptable. We would run substantial risks of choking off the much-desired move toward lower interest rates by placing too much of our stabilization effort on the shoulders of monetary policy, and renewing inflationary pressures, particularly in the latter half of this year.

On the other hand, to seek a lower deficit or a surplus through a more restrictive fiscal program would be unwarranted and self-defeating under present economic conditions. Such a fiscal policy could depress economic activity, reduce the incomes of individuals and corporations, and thereby fail to secure the revenues it was designed to achieve.

Summary of Federal receipts and payments

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
FEDERAL RECEIPTS			
National income accounts receipts—Federal sector	$132.6	$149.8	$167.1
Deduct: Timing adjustment (cash versus accrual)	−1.2	−3.9	.4
Add: Loans repaid, differences in coverage, and other adjustments	.7	1.0	1.4
Total cash receipts from the public	134.5	154.7	168.1
Deduct: Trust fund receipts	34.9	44.9	48.1
Add: Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments	5.1	7.2	7.0
Administrative budget receipts	104.7	117.0	126.9
FEDERAL PAYMENTS			
National income accounts expenditures—Federal sector	132.3	153.6	169.2
Deduct: Timing adjustment (cash versus accrual)	−.3	.2	.4
Add: Loans, differences in coverage, and other adjustments	5.2	7.5	3.6
Total cash payments to the public	137.8	160.9	172.4
Deduct: Trust fund expenditures	34.9	40.9	44.5
Add: Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments	4.0	6.8	7.1
Administrative budget expenditures	107.0	126.7	135.0
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS (+) OR PAYMENTS (−)			
National income accounts—Federal sector	+.3	−3.8	−2.1
Receipts from and payments to the public	−3.3	−6.2	−4.3
Administrative budget	−2.3	−9.7	−8.1

The economy, the budget, and the aims of our society would be jeopardized by either a larger tax increase or by large slashes in military or civilian programs. I have reviewed these programs carefully. Waste and nonessentials have been cut out. Reductions or postponements have been made wherever possible. The increases that are proposed have been carefully selected on the basis of urgent national requirements.

The Congress through the appropriations process, will, of course, subject these programs to a searching examination. I welcome that examination. But it is my judgment that major cuts cannot be made without serious impairment to vital national objectives—in defense, in education, in health, in the rebuilding of our cities, and in the attack on poverty.

This Nation is healthy and growing. It can—and, I believe, must—continue to move forward: In the defense of freedom against aggression; in the search for international peace and cooperation; and in the effort to improve the quality of American life. At this juncture in our history we have two choices: To stand still and mark time; or to press ahead responsibly and confidently.

For my part, I have chosen the latter course. That choice is reflected in my budgetary and fiscal proposals.

BUDGET SUMMARY

Federal expenditures, as measured in the national income accounts will rise from $153.6 billion in fiscal year 1967 to $169.2 billion in 1968. That increase is composed of four major elements: $5.8 billion for Vietnam and other national defense outlays; $6.2 billion in benefits under the Federal Government's social security and other trust funds, two-thirds of which results from the new social security legislation I am proposing; $1 billion for the cost of military and civilian pay increases, to keep abreast of rising salaries in private industry; and $2.6 billion for all other programs of the Federal Government.

Federal revenues will increase more rapidly than expenditures, from $149.8 billion in fiscal year 1967 to $167.1 billion in 1968, reflecting both the growth in the economy and the effect of the tax legislation I am recommending. The Federal deficit, as measured in the national income accounts will, therefore, decline between 1967 and 1968 from $3.8 billion to $2.1 billion.

While the national income accounts budget is the most appropriate measure of the overall economic impact of the Federal budget, a discussion of individual Federal programs is best carried out in terms of the more conventional administrative budget and the various Federal trust funds.

Administrative budget expenditures will amount to $126.7 billion in 1967 and $135 billion in 1968. In these 2 years, revenues in the administrative budget are estimated to rise from $117 billion to $126.9 billion. As a result, the budget deficit will fall from $9.7 billion in the current fiscal year to $8.1 billion in 1968.

Administrative budget expenditures in fiscal year 1967 are $13.9 billion higher than the expenditures I estimated in my budget message a year ago; $9.6 billion of the increase is accounted for by the enlarged military program. Another $3 billion results from the impact of tight money on the Federal budget, and $1.3 billion from expenditure reestimates, as workloads increased in such programs as public assistance, medicare, and the postal service. Potential further expenditures of $2.6 billion, from congressional additions to my 1967 authorization and appropriation recommendations, were roughly offset by the budget reductions I instituted last fall. Of the $3 billion expenditure reductions, $2.6 billion will occur in administrative budget programs and about $0.4 billion in the trust funds.

In 1968, defense outlays will account for $75.5 billion, or 56 percent, of the total budget. Of the remaining expenditures, some $29.4 billion, or 22 percent, are spent on programs under which payments are fixed by law or are otherwise uncontrollable—interest on the public debt, veterans compensation and pensions, public assistance, Federal general revenue contributions to medicare, and the like. Another $15.3 billion or 11 percent will be spent in 1968 to complete

contracts or obligations entered into in prior years—the purchase of mortgages under earlier commitments, the completion of construction begun in 1966 or 1967, and so forth.

The remaining $14.9 billion, or 11 percent of the budget, may be considered as "controllable" expenditures in 1968. And even these include such indispensable programs as law enforcement, the collection of taxes and customs, the upkeep of our national parks, and the operation of the Nation's air navigation facilities.

Administrative budget expenditures

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Type of controllability	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
National defense	$57.7	$70.2	$75.5
Relatively uncontrollable civilian expenditures:			
Major programs	24.1	28.3	29.4
Interest	12.1	13.5	14.2
Veterans pensions, compensation, and insurance	4.2	4.7	4.9
Public assistance grants	3.5	3.9	4.2
Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation)	1.3	1.6	1.6
Postal public service costs and revenue deficit (existing law)	.8	1.1	1.1
Health insurance payments to trust funds		1.0	.9
Legislative and judiciary	.3	.4	.4
Other	1.8	2.2	2.3
Payments on prior contracts and obligations	11.5	14.3	15.3
Relatively controllable civilian expenditures	13.6	13.9	14.9
Proposed pay increases			1.0
Sale of financial assets	−3.0	−3.9	−5.3
Other	16.6	17.8	19.2
Total administrative budget expenditures	107.0	126.7	135.0

In the 1968 budget I have sought to recommend increases only where these are vitally necessary to meet the needs of a growing society. I have given particular, but selective, attention to programs designed to bring into the mainstream of American life those to whom opportunities are now denied.

At the same time, my 1968 budget incorporates substantial economies in operations. New projects under many Federal construction programs will be held to a modest level, well below the average of prior years and below the level to which they can rise when our fiscal problems are less urgent.

By 1966, Federal civilian agencies had achieved improvements in operations which netted a saving in that year of $1.7 billion compared to their level of efficiency 2 years earlier. The Defense Department's cost reduction program begun in 1961 yielded savings of $4.5 billion in 1966. Those efforts will continue in fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The effect on the Federal budget of selective expansions in high priority programs combined with economies in operation are summarized in the accompanying table.

Civilian administrative budget expenditures

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate	Change, 1967 to 1968
Total civilian	$49.3	$56.5	$59.5	+$3.0
Major education programs	2.8	4.0	4.6	+.6
Major health programs	2.5	4.3	4.8	+.5
Other major social programs:				
Welfare, labor, and economic opportunity programs	5.1	6.1	6.5	+.4
Housing and community development, regional development, and pollution control	1.2	2.0	2.4	+.4
Interest	12.1	13.5	14.2	+.6
Proposed pay increases			1.0	+1.0
Sale of financial assets	−3.0	−3.9	−5.3	−1.4
All other civilian expenditures	28.4	30.5	31.3	+.8

In the 1968 budget I am proposing to sell $5 billion in participation certificates. These certificates are a means by which Federal credit programs can be financed, and point up the role of the Federal Government as an intermediary, assisting borrowers to find sources of credit. The sale of these certificates also has the advantage of making the cash and administrative budgets more closely akin to the national income accounts budget since, in effect, it removes the impact of new lending from the cash and administrative budget totals.

My detailed budget plans provide for the possible sale of $5,750 million of these certificates. The overall budget totals, however, make an allowance for a possible shortfall of $750 million in the actual sales of these certificates. While this tends to raise the reported deficit in the administrative budget, I have made such an allowance in order to present more conservative estimates to the Congress, taking into account the uncertainty of future conditions.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

New obligational authority recommended for fiscal year 1968 in the administrative budget totals $144 billion. This is an increase of $4.4 billion over the current estimate for fiscal year 1967, of which $2.5 billion is for the Department of Defense and the military assistance program combined.

Of the total new obligational authority estimated for 1968, the Congress will have to act this year on $126.5 billion. The remaining $17.5 billion will become available under "permanent" authorizations without further congressional action; interest on the public debt represents 80 percent of this amount. Most of the $50.2 billion in new obligational authority estimated for 1968 for trust funds represents revenues from special taxes which are also appropriated automatically.

Apart from defense and military assistance, the 1968 new obligational authority recommended for congressional action in the administrative budget will amount to $51.3 billion. The proposed amounts result from a thorough evaluation and review of program levels and needs and have been held to the minimum that will assure orderly progress in meeting national program objectives.

Major increases in new obligational authority, other than for the Department of Defense, include $1.2 billion for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including the newly enacted model cities program; $1 billion for proposed civilian and military pay increases; $0.9 billion for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, mainly for public assistance, education, medicaid, and various other health activities; $0.6 billion for the permanent appropriation for interest on the public debt.

Major decreases include $1.8 billion for the Department of Agriculture, largely due to the reduced capital needs of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the proposal to establish revolving funds for the Rural Electrification Administration; $1 billion for the Tennessee Valley Authority since its needs for bond-issuing authority for the next several years were met by an increase of this amount granted in fiscal year 1967; $0.6 billion for the Post Office, reflecting proposed postal rate increases.

The 1967 estimate in the administrative budget includes $14.3 billion in recommended supplemental appropriations which the Congress is being requested to enact this year. Of this total, $12.3 billion is for support of military operations in southeast Asia. The remaining supplemental amounts are needed mainly (1) to provide adequate financing for certain relatively uncontrollable costs which are based on eligibility and demand for services under provisions of existing law—such as for public assistance grants, postal services, and veterans' compensation and pensions and (2) to cover part of the cost of military and civilian pay increases and new programs which were enacted last year but for which appropriations were not provided. The estimates presented in this budget reflect fully this additional new obligational authority for the current year and the related expenditures.

New obligational authority

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Total authorizations requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	$110.9	$123.9	$126.5
Trust funds	.5	5.1	1.7
Total authorizations not requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	15.5	15.7	17.5
Trust funds	36.2	45.8	48.6
Total new obligational authority:			
Administrative budget funds	126.4	139.6	144.0
Trust funds	36.7	50.8	50.2

FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

Military forces able to defend the cause of freedom in Vietnam and to counter other threats to national security require substantial resources.

Yet we cannot permit the defense of freedom abroad to sidetrack the struggle for individual growth and dignity at home. Under my budget proposals, we will move forward at a reasonable rate the programs to broaden opportunities for the poor or disadvantaged and continue the steady advance in their effectiveness achieved in the last 3 years.

Payments to the public

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Function	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Administrative budget expenditures:			
National defense	$57.7	$70.2	$75.5
Excluding special Vietnam	(51.9)	(50.8)	(53.6)
International affairs and finance	4.2	4.6	4.8
Excluding special Vietnam	(3.9)	(4.1)	(4.3)
Space research and technology	5.9	5.6	5.3
Agriculture and agricultural resources	3.3	3.0	3.2
Natural resources	3.1	3.2	3.5
Commerce and transportation	3.0	3.5	3.1
Housing and community development	.3	.9	1.0
Health, labor, and welfare	7.6	10.4	11.3
Education	2.8	3.3	2.8
Veterans benefits and services	5.0	6.4	6.1
Interest	12.1	13.5	14.2
General government	2.5	2.7	2.8
Allowances:			
Civilian and military pay increase			1.0
Possible shortfall in asset sales			.8
Contingencies		.1	.4
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.6	.8	.7
Total, administrative budget expenditures	107.0	126.7	135.0
Trust fund expenditures:			
Health, labor, and welfare	26.4	31.5	37.1
Commerce and transportation	3.8	3.7	3.7
National defense	.8	1.1	1.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources	1.2	1.4	1.2
Housing and community development	3.2	3.0	1.0
Veterans benefits and services	.6	.8	.6
All other	−.2	.1	.3
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.8	.7	.7
Total trust fund expenditures	34.9	40.9	44.5
Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments (deduct)	4.0	6.8	7.1
Total payments to the public	137.8	160.9	172.4

To assure that the budget fully covers all the costs which we might reasonably expect in the coming year, the total includes $2.2 billion in special allowances to provide for: First, proposed increases in the pay of military and civilian personnel, including postal employees; second, the possibility of some shortfall in planned sales of financial assets; and third, unforeseen contingencies and the possible costs of programs on which definite decisions have not yet been made, such as the development of a prototype supersonic air transport and a nuclear space rocket.

The highlights of the proposed Government program for 1968 follow:

National defense: Today, our military requirements are dictated by two fundamental realities. We must continue to counter aggression in South Vietnam. We must also continue to enhance our ability to meet changing threats to our freedom and security elsewhere. The 1968 budget will insure that our forces remain equal to both these tasks.

Though small in relation to the Nation's total economic activity, the cost of honoring our commitment to South Vietnam is nevertheless substantial. Expenditures necessary to support military operations in southeast Asia will total $21.9 billion in 1968, about three-tenths of budget expenditures for national defense. A year ago we were in the midst of a rapid buildup of our forces in Vietnam. Rather than submit a budget to the Congress based on highly uncertain estimates, I requested funds sufficient to finance the conflict through fiscal year 1967. At the present time the situation is different. While unforeseen events can upset the most careful estimate, we are in a much better position to determine our future requirements in Vietnam. As a consequence, my 1968 budget provides for those requirements on a continuing basis, including the possibility of an extension of combat beyond the end of the fiscal year.

In 1968, we will:

Continue intensive development of Nike X but take no action now to deploy an antiballistic missile—ABM—defense; initiate discussions with the Soviet Union on the limitation of ABM deployments; in the event these discussions prove unsuccessful, we will reconsider our deployment decision. To provide for actions that may be required at that time, approximately $375 million has been included in the 1968 budget for the production of Nike X for such purposes as defense of our offensive weapon systems.

Maintain our decisive strategic superiority by initiating procurement of the advanced Poseidon submarine-launched missile, improving our present stategic missiles, and further safeguarding our capacity to direct our forces in the event of attack.

Provide our forces in Vietnam with all the weapons and supplies they need and add to our war reserves at the same time.

Add to the mobility and effectiveness of our general purpose forces by increasing the firepower of our ground forces, enlarging our helicopter strength, pursuing a vigorous shipbuilding and conversion program, and purchasing additional modern tactical aircraft.

Increase our airlift and sealift capabilities by further procurement of the giant C-5A transport plane, and procurement of five fast-deployment logistics ships.

Continue the vigorous research and development programs vital to maintaining the most modern, versatile, and potent forces in the world.

These sizable increases in our capabilities for nuclear, conventional, or countersubversive conflict are necessary and prudent. Nevertheless, security needs will continue to be met without waste or extravagance. Our defense programs must be conducted as efficiently and economically as possible. In 1968, the defense cost reduction program will continue to produce significant savings.

International affairs and finance: In the long run, greater opportunities and security for our own citizens will be possible only if other peoples also share in progress toward a better and more secure life. To this end, our international programs in the coming year will emphasize helping the less developed nations to increase their food production, expand their educational opportunities, and improve the health of their citizens.

Based on a thorough review of our economic assistance objectives and programs, I will recommend new legislation and specific actions to—

Require more effective self-help measures by recipient countries as a condition for U.S. aid;

Increase the amount of assistance for the key sectors of agriculture, health, and education;

Support regional arrangements and

make greater use of multilateral channels through which other nations cooperatively share the costs of economic development;

Encourage greater participation by private enterprise in the development process; and

Concentrate our aid in those countries where successful development is most probable.

We are gratified by the achievements of the Alliance for Progress and shall continue to work closely with our hemispheric neighbors to help build schools and homes, create new jobs, and improve health and nutrition. But much remains to be done. I shall be meeting shortly with the chief executives of the other American governments to review the goals and progress of the Alliance. At that time we will consider new cooperative programs to accelerate growth in critical areas.

In South Vietnam, we will increase our economic assistance for projects directly aiding people in the villages and hamlets. This stepped-up effort is urgently needed to help these people construct their farms and houses in safety and build the foundation for a better life in that strife-torn country.

To pursue the war on hunger more effectively, our assistance to agriculture and our food-for-freedom shipments will encourage and support efforts by the developing nations to increase their own food production. In cooperation with other nations, we will also carry out a pioneer program to find ways to utilize the vast unexploited food resources of the sea.

The International Development Association, which is managed by the World Bank, has proven an effective means of international cooperation to promote economic development. Its current resources, however, will soon be exhausted. Following the successful conclusion of negotiations between the IDA and the developed nations of the world, I will request authorization for the United States to pledge its fair share toward an additional contribution to this organization in ways consistent with our balance-of-payments policy. I also intend to propose legislation which will permit us to join other members in a replenishment of the Inter-American Development Bank's Fund for Special Operations.

To enable the Export-Import Bank to fulfill its role of assisting our export trade, which is so vital to our balance of payments, I am recommending that its lending authority be increased and its life extended for another 5 years.

Space research and technology: In 1961, this Nation resolved to send a manned expedition to the moon in this decade. Much hard work remains and many obstacles must still be overcome before that goal is met. Yet, in the last few years we have progressed far enough that we must now look beyond our original objective and set our course for the more distant future. Indeed, we have no alternative unless we wish to abandon the manned space capability we have created.

This budget provides for the initiation of an effective follow-on to the manned lunar landing. We will explore the moon. We will learn to live in space for months at a time. Our astronauts will conduct scientific and engineering experiments in space to enhance man's mastery of that environment.

The Surveyor and Orbiter projects, in photographing the moon, have demonstrated dramatically the value of unmanned spacecraft in investigating other objects in the solar system. Accordingly, we are proceeding with the development of the Voyager system for an unmanned landing on Mars in 1973. We will also continue other unmanned investigations nearer the earth.

In recent years the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission have jointly undertaken the development of nuclear rocket propulsion technology. We are now considering whether that effort should be expanded to the development of the rocket itself. The overall budget totals allow for the possibility of proceeding if an affirmative decision is reached.

These new ventures are the result of careful planning and selectivity. We are not doing everything in space that we are technologically capable of doing. Rather, we are choosing those projects that give us the greatest return on our investment.

To support these new projects and to maintain our existing programs, an increase of $82 million is requested in new obligational authority for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for 1968. Expenditures, however, will decline by $300 million in the coming year, primarily because of reduced requirements for the manned lunar landing program.

Agriculture and agricultural resources: Rising domestic and foreign demands have highlighted the importance of maintaining a healthy and productive agricultural economy. During the past year our surplus commodity stocks have been substantially reduced. As a result, restrictions on the production of wheat and feed grains have been eased in order to allow the Nation to maintain adequate reserves.

The increasing demand for agricultural commodities provides a favorable outlook for many of our commercial farmers. However, a large number of rural people cannot achieve an adequate income even with a prosperous agriculture. Labor requirements on the Nation's farms have declined drastically in the last quarter of a century. Unemployment and underemployment in rural areas have resulted. Consequently, rural communities are often unable to provide and maintain essential public services—good schools, modern hospitals, and other necessary community facilities—to meet today's needs.

I have directed the Secretary of Agriculture to take the lead in helping rural people achieve a quality of living comparable to other segments of our population. To this end, the Department of Agriculture will work with State and Federal agencies and with local groups to help rural communities make the best use of all existing governmental programs. In addition, legislation is needed to encourage establishment of pilot multicounty development districts.

To assure modern and efficient electric and telephone services for rural people, legislation should be enacted promptly to provide new sources of private financing for Rural Electrification Administration borrowers, while minimizing Federal outlays.

Natural resources: My recommendations in this budget for natural resource conservation and development will help meet the most urgent needs of our people and the requirements for economic growth.

Action must be taken now to—

Reduce water pollution in our lakes, rivers, and estuaries.

Insure an adequate supply of pure water.

Preserve scenic areas of irreplaceable natural beauty—scenic rivers, the Redwoods, North Cascades in the State of Washington, and the historic Potomac Valley.

Forestall the escalation of land prices in the acquisition of Federal lands for recreational use.

The continued pollution of our rivers, lakes, and estuaries is one of the major resource problems facing this Nation. The transfer last year of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the Department of the Interior now permits a major attack on the problems of water pollution in entire river basins. In 1968, the Department will also give major emphasis to reviewing and approving State standards required by the Water Quality Act of 1965.

Many regions of the country are facing increasingly critical problems of adequate supply and efficient use of water. I urge prompt enactment of legislation to establish a National Water Commission to assess our major water problems and develop guidelines for the most effective use of available water resources.

I also recommend legislation to enable the Department of the Interior to participate with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and the Atomic Energy Commission in developing and constructing a large prototype power and desalting plant. This will be a major step toward the development of economical projects for conversion of sea water to fresh water.

This budget provides for continued investment in the development and improvement of our vital water resources. Last fall, however, in order to help relieve inflationary pressures on the economy, I directed Federal agencies to slow down or defer construction projects wherever possible in fiscal year 1967. For 1968, I am recommending that a small number of new water resources projects be started. Advance planning will begin on a num-

ber of projects to be constructed in later years.

Authorized recreation areas must be acquired as promptly as possible to avoid speculative increases in land prices. Accordingly, I propose that an advance appropriation be made to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for this purpose.

A significant advance in research on the fundamental structure of matter will be made possible with the construction of a 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator by the Atomic Energy Commission. This research machine, to be located near Chicago, Ill., is expected to provide U.S. physicists with the world's highest energy proton beam. Design funds are provided in the 1968 budget.

Commerce and transportation: A strong and balanced national economy requires: Accurate and timely information; efficient transportation facilities; rapid communication; and special aids to lagging regions and sectors of the Nation.

Accordingly, the Federal Government will augment significantly its investment in commerce and transportation programs in the year ahead. The 1968 budget provides funds to:

Increase technical services and other aids to business;

Undertake a special sample survey to pinpoint the social and economic needs of our people;

Give added impetus to our efforts to encourage travel to the United States and our export promotion programs to improve our balance of payments;

Support a world weather watch to improve long-range weather forecasting;

Explore means for modifying the weather and examine the implications of this new science;

Strengthen our effort to encourage regional economic development; and

Improve our transportation facilities and services under the leadership of the new Department of Transportation.

Our transportation programs in 1968 will include an all-out attack to reduce the alarming carnage on the Nation's highways, using the tools made available in the highway safety legislation enacted last year. We are currently considering the construction of a prototype civil supersonic transport. The allowance for contingencies is adequate to cover the possible costs of this effort, should an affirmative decision be made to proceed.

Special emphasis will be placed on improved management and acquisition of modern facilities and equipment to increase the efficiency of our postal system, one of the largest business operations in the world. To provide improved services, to cover proposed pay increases for postal workers and largely offset the remaining postal deficit, a postal rate increase is both necessary and desirable. As required by law, I am proposing such an increase. The budget reflects $700 million in postal revenues from this source.

Housing and community development: The problems of the American city are great and vexing. They involve the entire physical and social fabric of deteriorating central cities and rapidly growing suburbs. Trapped in the declining centers of our cities are the poor and the victims of discrimination—who lack the resources to solve their problems without outside help.

This budget provides funds to help meet these needs. Outlays for grants and loans for programs directed specifically at community development will total an estimated $1.3 billion in 1968, triple the level in 1963. Moreover, other programs providing aid to urban areas will make substantial additional amounts available.

I have directed that community development programs emphasize aids for the poor. The recently enacted program of rent supplements is an essential element in helping the needy obtain adequate housing facilities and increasing their freedom of choice as to where they can live. To carry on this important program, I am requesting the full amount authorized for rent supplements for 1968, and urge the Congress to act favorably on this request.

To be effective, concerted attacks on city problems must be planned by the cities themselves. The new model cities program is now the primary incentive provided by the Federal Government to accomplish this objective. Special grants will be made to help transform entire blighted areas into attractive and useful neighborhoods. To receive these grants, cities must: Develop imaginative and comprehensive plans of action; and enlist Federal, State, local, and private resources in a concerted effort to bring their plans to fruition.

Many cities are now planning their programs. It is essential that the funds I am requesting for these special grants be available in 1968 when these cities are ready to begin the task.

Under a new program enacted last year, further encouragement will be given to the planned development of entire metropolitan areas. Supplementary Federal grants will be made under 10 Federal aid programs in those metropolitan areas which demonstrate that they are carrying out through joint planning efforts all activities which affect metropolitan development. I urge enactment of the appropriations requested for this program.

One of the most serious difficulties in solving city problems is our inadequate knowledge about the roots and nature of these problems. I urge that sufficient funds be provided the Department of Housing and Urban Development to start a systematic research effort to acquire needed information on the causes and possible solutions for the housing and urban problems which we face today.

To be effective, our aids for community development must be put to use by competent, well-trained local employees. I am therefore requesting the appropriation of funds to initiate the authorized program for grants to States to help them provide training for State and local employees in community development programs.

The problems of the city are many; the resources, limited. More resources are essential if we are to build better cities for the future. We must start now to provide them.

Health, labor, and welfare: The 89th Congress enacted a far-reaching series of programs to improve the health and well-being of American citizens—particularly the less fortunate.

In the year ahead we must proceed to carry out these programs effectively, and seek the revisions and additions needed to maintain our progress. This budget so provides.

Health: The specter of inadequate health care is being removed from the aged and needy as we move ahead with the new medicare and medicaid programs, and with other activities aimed at bringing comprehensive modern treatment to all. With expanded Federal aid, more medical resources will become available, including medical facilities and qualified health personnel. The Nation's system for providing health care—public and private—will be improved to make it more efficient and to insure use of the latest advances of medical science.

In 1968, we will—

Strengthen our partnership with the States in health planning and in using broader and more flexible grants to fill gaps in health services.

Begin operating the new regional medical programs which will narrow the gap between the advanced methods used at university hospitals and day-to-day medical practice in the community.

Continue research and development to prevent or control diseases.

Expand programs to increase efficiency in hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and neighborhood health centers.

Additional measures are needed and will be proposed to:

Extend medicare to disabled workers.

Expand child health services, including dental care.

Reduce the menace of air pollution which is a threat to the health and safety of our citizens.

Labor and manpower: My budget proposals provide increased opportunity for the disadvantaged to participate in and contribute productively to our expanding economy.

I am recommending funds for 280,000 trainees under the Manpower Development and Training Act, an increase of 30,000 over the current year.

Programs under that act and those of the U.S. Employment Service will continue to emphasize serving the severely disadvantaged.

In addition, under programs financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, 355,000 jobs and training will be made available for youths in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. An estimated $328 million will be provided for expanded work-training programs, primarily for adults, with special emphasis on reaching the hard-core unemployed and underemployed in slum areas.

Economic opportunity programs: Poverty remains an ugly scar on the Nation's conscience. The war against it will be long, difficult, and costly. But we are making headway.

The $2.1 billion of new obligational authority included in the 1968 budget for the Office of Economic Opportunity will enable us to expand programs which help people rise out of poverty. The increase of $448 million over the 1967 level will be used largely for community action programs, for training programs, and for new Headstart followup efforts.

In addition to those helped by the work-training programs described above, the budget will provide for: 737,000 children in Headstart; $135 million for improving primary school services as a followup to Headstart; 38,000 enrollees in the Job Corps; 6.5 million persons to be served through other activities by 1,100 community action programs.

Benefits and services which aid the poor are being provided by a number of Federal agencies. In total, 10 agencies will devote $25.6 billion in 1968 to help the more than 31 million poor people in our Nation. This represents an increase of $3.6 billion or 16 percent from the current year, of which $2 billion will be from trust funds.

Federal aid to the poor

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Category	1960 actual	1963 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Education and training	$0.3	$0.3	$3.1	$3.8
Health	.7	1.0	3.6	4.2
Cash benefit payments	8.3	10.4	12.8	14.6
Services, economic and community development, and other	.7	1.2	2.5	3.1
Total funds	9.9	12.9	22.0	25.6

Social security and public assistance programs: More than a third of our citizens receiving social security exist on incomes below the poverty level. Cash assistance to welfare recipients generally fails to meet even State standards of need, which are often unrealistically low. And many of the poor are not even eligible for this meager assistance. As a step toward correcting these inequities, I will propose legislation to:

Provide an overall 20-percent increase in social security benefits for retired workers and their survivors, with a 59-percent increase at the bottom of the scale;

Assure that the public assistance program provides incentives for work and training and more nearly meets economic need;

Assure public assistance support and work training opportunities for unemployed fathers in impoverished families with dependent children.

Education: Our Nation's greatness depends upon the full development of the talents and abilities of its citizens.

The 89th Congress wrote a memorable record in education legislation. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 marked a significant advance in Federal support to help improve and enlarge educational opportunities at all levels. Our task now is to use this authority in an imaginative, creative, and responsible way.

New obligational authority for education will total $5.2 billion in 1968, $622 million more than in 1967. These funds will be used to—

Assist the disadvantaged by increasing grants to improve elementary and secondary education for about 8½ million less fortunate children from low-income families and by providing new grants for education of handicapped children;

Encourage creative change through an increase of almost 80 percent in grants for supplementary centers and other special projects designed to introduce better teaching and innovation in our educational programs.

Widen higher educational opportunities by providing more than $1.1 billion in scholarships, loans, and part-time work for students, a 22-percent increase over 1967; and

Improve teacher training through additional funding and amendments providing for a more flexible use of legislative authority.

I will propose legislation to—

Extend and enlarge the Teachers Corps;

Initiate experimental projects to improve vocational education, particularly for the disadvantaged and those not planning to attend college;

Extend and expand Federal support for educational television; and

Strengthen education program planning and evaluation by State governments and localities.

Veterans benefits and services: This Nation continues to recognize a particular obligation to those who have served in the Armed Forces. Special programs have long been available to aid the veteran and his dependents in the event of disability, death, ill health, or old age.

More recently, following World War II and the Korean conflict, extensive programs were enacted to assist the veteran in his readjustment to civilian life. In the second session of the 89th Congress, this type of assistance was again provided, through enactment of the third major veterans readjustment benefit program or GI bill. Upon leaving the Armed Forces, young men of recent military service will find their readjustment made easier through the availability of substantial education, training, medical, and home loan benefits.

In addition, the 1968 budget continues the improvements of the past few years in hospital staffing and the provision of new medical services and facilities. The objective is to provide both a higher quality of care and to reduce the duration of hospitalization, enabling the veteran to return sooner to his home and job.

Certain gaps currently exist in the benefits available to veterans of service in Vietnam relative to those for veterans of previous active military operations. I will propose legislation to fill these gaps so that fair and equitable treatment is provided for those who bear the brunt of the struggle in southeast Asia. I will also submit proposals to the Congress to remove or modify certain longstanding but outmoded or inequitable provisions of law governing veterans programs.

General government: This administration is determined to help our States and cities reduce crime in America. Significant strides have already been taken. The Law Enforcement Act of 1965, the Bail Reform Act of 1966, and the Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965 have helped to strengthen law enforcement agencies, establish more equitable bail procedures in Federal courts, and improve the effectiveness of prisoner rehabilitation programs.

However, still greater efforts must be made. In 1965, I appointed a Commission of prominent citizens to study law enforcement and the administration of justice. With the aid of its findings, I will propose legislation for a major new program to help strengthen State and local government law enforcement and criminal justice systems.

District of Columbia citizens should have a voice in their own affairs. Our commitment to democracy demands no less. I again urge the Congress to grant home rule to the Nation's Capital.

PUBLIC DEBT

On the basis of the receipts and expenditures estimated in this budget, the public debt on June 30, 1967, will be $327.3 billion, and will increase to $335.4 billion on June 30, 1968.

The temporary limit of $330 billion on the public debt under present law will expire on June 30, 1967. If no action is taken, the limit will revert on that date to the permanent ceiling of $285 billion.

The present temporary debt limit, enacted last June, was based on an estimated administrative budget deficit for fiscal year 1967 of $1.8 billion. The request then made to the Congress was for a temporary debt limit of $332 billion. In reducing this request by $2 billion, the Congress indicated that if increased costs for Vietnam or other contingencies required reappraisal of this tight limit, the Congress would take whatever action is necessary.

The increase in the 1967 deficit, coupled with the tightness of the current limit on the outstanding debt, make an immediate increase imperative. Without such an increase, management of debt operations and other fiscal policies will be seriously hampered.

Later this year, when the fiscal requirements for 1968 are more precisely known, specific recommendations will be presented for modifications in the temporary limit for that year. The exact amounts of the revisions in the temporary limit will depend not only on the specific outlook for the fiscal year as a whole, but also on the time pattern of receipts and expenditures in prospect.

Public debt at end of year

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1965 actual	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Owned by Federal agencies and trust funds	$63.0	$66.5	$74.9	$80.0
Owned privately and by Federal Reserve banks	254.8	253.8	252.4	255.4
Total	317.9	320.4	327.3	335.4

NOTE.—For further details see table 11 in pt. 2 of this document.

Both for 1967 and 1968 the debt limits requested will provide the margin of flexibility necessary to manage the debt most prudently—to permit the Treasury to take full advantage of the most favorable market conditions and thus avoid unnecessary interest costs or adverse effects on the economy.

IMPROVING GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

In the past few years, the Federal Government has undertaken an unprecedented number of forward-looking programs which promise to enrich the quality, the justice, and the opportunity of American society to an extent no one would have dared hope only a few short years ago.

But our responsibilities to the American people are not discharged with the enactment of new programs which meet the needs of the Nation. There exist two other closely related obligations of equal gravity:

First, we are obligated to assure effective and economical management of governmental programs—both old and new. Effective management of government activities enhances the benefits of those programs. Economical management releases resources for the people's use.

Second, we are obligated to maintain close and harmonious working relationships with State, county, and local governments—our partners in a new and creative federalism.

Government organization: We have made significant strides in the last 2 years to improve Government organization—

By creating the Departments of Transportation and of Housing and Urban Development.

By transferring the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the Department of the Interior.

By reorganizing the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the scientific programs of the Department of Commerce, and the Bureau of Customs.

But additional action to improve the management of the Federal Government is necessary. One of the Government's major objectives is the promotion of a vigorous and growing economy. While there are many ways in which the Government pursues this objective, there are a number of highly interrelated activities now carried on separately by the Departments of Labor and Commerce and several other agencies:

Planning and execution of manpower programs designed to increase the skills and productivity of the labor force;

Promotion of the economic development of depressed areas and regions, to help them achieve balanced economic growth;

Provision of technical and other services to business and labor;

Collection, dissemination, and analysis of data about economic conditions of the Nation, its various industries, and its geographic areas;

Advising the President and carrying out national policies for improved labor-management relations.

The Secretaries of Commerce and Labor have recommended to me, and I strongly agree, that the President, the Congress and the Nation will best be served by bringing together these closely related operations into one institution headed by a single responsible official of Cabinet rank. I will, therefore, propose legislation to merge the Departments of Labor and Commerce and the functions of several related agencies into a new Department of Business and Labor.

Federal-State-local cooperation: Our agenda must give high priority to a stronger and more effective federal system of government in the United States. To meet urgent and growing needs, the Federal Government is providing a wide range of programs to assist State and local governments. Now the chief task is to manage these programs efficiently at every level of government to assure the most effective public services. This effort will require support and action by the Congress.

At the national level the Federal Government has a responsibility to examine and improve the grant-in-aid system, making it more flexible and responsive to State and local fiscal realities. Last year we began a new partnership in health program through which numerous separate grant programs are being brought together. The model cities legislation enacted last year will also help to integrate the wide range of Federal aids available to communities. In the coming year we will examine other areas of Federal aid to determine whether additional categorical grants can be combined to form a more effective tool for intergovernmental cooperation.

Another aspect of the problem of intergovernmental cooperation has been the process of consultation with elected officials of State and local governments on matters concerning the development and administration of Federal assistance programs. Governors and local chief executives are responsible for the management of their units of government. The Federal Government should take all practical steps to increase the role of these executives in the administration of federally aided programs. I recently instructed Federal officials to work directly with State and local chief executives to accomplish this objective.

The Federal Government has a vital stake in the workings of our federal system. Federalism is not a one-sided partnership, and the States and local governments do not exist simply to carry out programs on behalf of the National Government. When we lose sight of these facts the federal system suffers, governments work at cross-purposes, and the programs fail to achieve their objectives. Our task now is to improve Federal programs and administration, while we do more to help State and local governments strengthen their machinery for planning and management.

At the same time, State and local governments must help themselves. Serious problems of modernization in State and local governments can be solved only by the people directly concerned. The Federal Government cannot and should not seek to remedy their internal deficiencies of organization or obsolete restraints on financing and executive direction. The Federal Government can, however, increase its technical assistance to general units of government. As one example, we can work with State and local executives to improve budgeting and management. In a similar way, the Federal Government stands ready to cooperate with the States in developing more adequate general systems of comparative statistics—an area where State governments have great needs.

Capable personnel are essential for effective service to the public at the State and local level no less than at the national level. I am recommending legislation to broaden educational and training opportunities for students planning careers in the public service and for public employees who desire to improve their skills. Provision will also be made for financial and technical assistance to strengthen State and local personnel management and to permit interchange of personnel between the Federal Government and State and local governments.

Some States have created special offices concerned with community development, which focus their organizational and financial resources on urban problems within their borders. The work of these offices can be made more effective, and other States can be encouraged to make similar efforts, by the new program authorized last year for grants by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to States to support technical assistance and information services to their local communities. I urge the Congress to stimulate such improvements by providing the funds I am requesting for this new program.

Budgetary concepts: As I have already made clear in this message, some of our traditional budget concepts do not adequately portray the Federal Government's activities. The conventional administrative budget, for example, excludes the expenditures and receipts of the trust funds. Both the administrative and cash budgets treat repayable loans in the same way as nonrepayable grants or purchases. While the national

income accounts budget has been carefully formulated to measure Federal activities in relation to the flow of income and production in the economy, it is not now well suited for an analysis of individual Federal programs.

For many years—under many administrations—particular aspects of the overall budget presentation, or the treatment of individual accounts, have been questioned on one ground or another.

In the light of these facts, I believe a thorough and objective review of budgetary concepts is warranted. I, therefore, intend to seek advice on this subject from a bipartisan group of informed individuals with a background in budgetary matters. It is my hope that this group can undertake a thorough review of the budget and recommend an approach to budgetary presentation which will assist both public and congressional understanding of this vital document.

PLANNING-PROGRAMING-BUDGETING SYSTEM

Our most comprehensive effort to improve the effectiveness of Government programs is taking place through the planning-programing-budgeting system. This system, which was initiated throughout the executive branch a little over a year ago, requires all agencies to—

Make explicit the objectives of their programs and relate them carefully to national needs;

Set up specific proposed plans of work to attain those objectives; and

Analyze and compare the probable costs and benefits of these plans against those of alternative methods of accomplishing the same results.

The system is primarily a means of encouraging careful and explicit analysis of Federal programs. It will substantially improve our ability to decide among competing proposals for funds and to evaluate actual performance. The full effects of this effort will not be felt until next year and later, as the necessary data are gathered and analyses now in progress are completed.

A few examples of the kind of work which is in progress indicate the wide range of matters to which organized analysis and programing can be applied.

Disease control: The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has completed an analysis of the relative cost and effectiveness of selected disease control programs. Cost per life saved and other criteria of relative effectiveness were developed. These programs are being reviewed and funding priorities are being reexamined in light of these findings.

Child health: The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare completed an analysis of alternative programs aimed at reducing infant mortality and improving child health. This analysis led to the legislative program focused on early identification and treatment of needy handicapped children and experimental projects aimed at improving delivery of medical care to children.

Urban planning: Experimental projects in urban planning designed to link planning with budgeting are underway at the local level. These efforts should produce a more effective allocation not only of Federal outlays but also of local resources.

Agricultural research: On the basis of a long-range study conducted by the Department of Agriculture and the land grant universities, a new set of priorities for agricultural research has been established. Increasing emphasis is being given to research on improvement of nutrition and health, efficient low-cost housing, improved community services, and other means which can help directly in raising the level of rural living.

Tax administration: As a result of intensive analyses of the tax administration system, Internal Revenue Service programs have been steadily improved to produce higher tax collections per dollar of cost, while strengthening the emphasis on equity and voluntary compliance on which our tax administration is based.

With its emphasis on developing better methods of accomplishing program objectives, the new planning-programing-budgeting system is also helping our Government-wide cost reduction program. We will continue to offset a significant part of increased costs of important new programs by increasing efficiency throughout the Federal Government. Savings from this source have been substantial during the past year under our drive for cost reduction. I have made it clear to the heads of all departments and agencies that they are to continue their emphasis on cost reduction in the coming year.

The careful research and analysis which is required under the planning-programing-budgeting system does not just happen. It requires the efforts of intelligent and dedicated men and women. The number of analysts required is not large—but the need for them is great. I urge the Congress to approve the funds requested in the budgets of the various Federal agencies to make possible this improvement in the management of Federal resources.

CONCLUSION

Our Nation is stronger today than ever before. We need not, indeed we dare not, forsake our basic goals of peace, prosperity, and progress.

The pursuit of peace is essential for the continued advancement of our Nation and all mankind.

Prosperity and progress will lead us toward a society where all can share in the bounty of nature and the products of man's ingenuity and creativity.

At various times in the past, democracies have been criticized for their seeming inability to make hard choices—for seeking soft, easy answers to critical problems. This Nation has proven the doubters wrong time and again, and will not fall prey to such weakness now.

We can afford to achieve our goals. Let us not retreat from the task, no matter how demanding it may be.

This budget represents a careful balance of our abundant resources and our awesome responsibilities. As President, I have weighed the alternatives and made the hard choices as best I could. The responsibility for similar action now rests with the Congress. I urge your support for the goals and programs embodied in this budget for the coming fiscal year.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 24, 1967.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Maurice Cecil Mackey, Jr., of Alabama, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 712 (a)(2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (title 50, Appendix, United States Code, sec. 2162(a)(2)), the Speaker has appointed Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, Mr. MULTER, of New York, Mr. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania, Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, and Mr. FINO, of New York as members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 376) fixing the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Joint Economic Committee, and it was signed by the Vice President.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is a unanimous-consent agreement at the desk?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is; and routine morning business will be conducted until 12:30 p.m., under the 3-minute limitation.

APPROPRIATION TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF OPERATIONS OF ALL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the

following original resolution (S. Res. 53); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 53

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations or any subcommittee thereof is authorized from February 1, 1967, through January 31, 1968, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided,* That, in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee thereof shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from February 1, 1967, to January 31, 1968, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study to the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1967, to January 31, 1968, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State and, further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1968, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees, from February 1, 1967, to January 31, 1968, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony, either orally or by sworn statement; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (7) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and, further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee: *Provided further,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

(b) For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman, from February 1, 1967, to January 31, 1968, inclusive, is authorized, in its or his or their discretion, as may be deemed advisable, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents.

SEC. 6. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $450,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 54); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 54

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1967, through January 31, 1968, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills;

(3) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relationships between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(4) legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods, processes, and relationships.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1967, to January 31, 1968, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 55); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 55

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by subsection 1(g)(2)(D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86-380, approved by the President on September 24, 1959, as amended by Public Law 89-733, approved by the President on November 2, 1966.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1967, to January 31, 1968, inclusive, is authorized (1)

to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1968.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $140,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 610. A bill for the relief of Lilliana Grasseschi Baroni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 611. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. LONG, of Missouri, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MILLER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HART, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 612. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE 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 3, 1967 for additional cosponsors.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 613. A bill for the relief of Manuel Rodriguez-Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 614. A bill to amend section 333 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to bring up to December 31, 1962, the cutoff point for stock and securities acquired by the liquidating corporation; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONTOYA, and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 615. A bill to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 616. A bill for the relief of Albert L. Chapman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 617. A bill to authorize the State of Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for schools and other public institutions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 618. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chandrasekarapurm Narayanan; his wife, Yamuna Narayanan; and their three children, Manoj Narayanan, Vinodh Narayanan, and Pramilla Narayanan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. BAKER):

S. 619. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 620. A bill to consolidate and reenact certain of the shipping laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 621. A bill to provide for certain jury trials in condemnation proceedings in district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 622. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes", approved March 30, 1949, in order to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to the procurement of communication and power services necessary to carry out the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 623. A bill to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 624. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; and

S. 625. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants offered by a foreign government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself, Mr. HART, and Mr. KENNEDY of New York):

S. 626. A bill to establish the Office of Ombudsman in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 627. A bill to increase the membership of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. TOWER):

S. 628. A bill to amend the antitrust laws to provide that the refusal of nonprofit blood banks and of hospitals and physicians to obtain blood and blood plasma from other blood banks shall not be deemed to be acts in restraint of trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 629. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rates of duty on certain fabrics containing wool and silk; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 630. A bill for the relief of Kenrick Hamilton Vernon, Sylvia Louise Vernon, Francis Mclaudie Vernon, Carrie Hellouise Vernon, Richard Seymour Bickham Vernon, Marion Rosalee Vernon, Marie Elizabeth Vernon, and Elvet Anthony Vernon; and

S. 631. A bill for the relief of Harold Albert, Lona Sarah, Karen Therese, and Bruce Alex Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 632. A bill to provide for a highway bridge across the Little Missouri River at the Garrison Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 633. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening and improving the Foreign Service personnel system of the U.S. Information Agency through establishment of a Foreign Service Information Officer Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 634. A bill to strengthen the security of the United States, lessen a burden on interstate commerce, and protect the right of privacy by prohibiting eavesdropping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 635. A bill to change the name of the lakeshore known as the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore to the Henry F. Schricker National Lakeshore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

RESOLUTIONS

INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF OPERATIONS OF ALL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MCCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 53) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of Government, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MCCELLAN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 54) to study certain aspects of national security and

international operations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JACKSON, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 55) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MUSKIE, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESSES

Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 56); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. RES. 56

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, as amended and supplemented, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1967, to January 31, 1968, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $145,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

DAIRY IMPORT ACT OF 1967

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today it is my pleasure to introduce for myself and Senators JORDAN of Idaho, YOUNG of North Dakota, LONG of Missouri, CARLSON, JACKSON, MCGOVERN, MORSE, CURTIS, THURMOND, MUNDT, MAGNUSON, MILLER, BURDICK, NELSON, MONDALE, BREWSTER, GRUENING, DOMINICK, HRUSKA, HART, HARTKE, MCCARTHY, and ALLOTT, the Dairy Import Act of 1967.

This proposed legislation would place strict but sensible controls on the importation of all dairy products containing 5 percent or more butterfat, nonfat milk solids, or a combination of the two. It would do this by permitting imports in an amount equivalent to the 1961–65 average. It would also allow imports to share in any growth in domestic consumption. Finally, it would give the President the power to authorize additional imports if he felt they were in the national interest. However, if domestic market prices were less than parity the Secretary of Agriculture would have to purchase an amount of domestic dairy prices corresponding to the amount authorized to be imported by the Presidential order.

Why is such a bill necessary? Part of the answer to this question lies in the nature of the commodity. Fluid milk is perhaps the most perishable farm commodity produced today. The milk our children drink cannot be shipped in its fluid form from one continent to another without deteriorating substantially.

Congress has recognized this perishable attribute as well as the value of the product by authorizing the creation of a milk marketing order system. The system arose out of the economic facts of life in the milk industry. Because fluid milk is so perishable and because it is essential in the diet of our youth a standby supply, or surplus, must always be available to meet possible increases in demand. This necessary surplus, however, dampens prices because it means supply always will outstrip demand. Milk marketing order areas are geographical territories in which the effects of this constant surplus are alleviated by assured prices arrived at by general agreement. The alternative would be prices so low that a great number of dairy farmers would be driven out of business. In the long run this would mean sky high prices to the consumer as a result of very low milk production. This is the boom-or-bust approach that milk marketing orders are meant to remedy.

It is also the type of problem, on an international scale, that the Dairy Import Act of 1967 is meant to remedy. Ever-increasing imports destroy the balance between supply and demand with resulting lower prices to dairy farmers. As more and more dairy farmers go out of business because of high imports and lower prices the supply of fluid milk contracts. Ultimately, this will mean higher prices for the consumer because the supply of fluid milk will not be able to meet demand, and fluid milk is too perishable to be imported.

The adverse impact on domestic milk production of excessive imports was recognized by the Federal Government back in 1953 when Presidential proclamation 3019 limited the entry of certain dairy products into the United States. Unfortunately, for too long these existing dairy import quotas have been circumvented by blatant attempts to doctor dairy products to escape the letter of the law. For example, when butteroil was placed under a quota, evasion of the quota took the form of butterfat-sugar mixtures. The first product of this kind, Exylone, was barred by a regulation applying only to mixtures containing 45 percent or more of butterfat. Almost immediately Junex, containing 44 percent butterfat, started to pour into the country.

My legislation, as I have already indicated, tightens existing controls by setting a 5-percent butterfat or nonfat milk solids limitation on items that can be imported into the United States without restriction. This is essential to the stability of the dairy industry at a time when total imports of dairy products are 12 times as great as the amount authorized under import quotas.

In the short run, it might be argued, continually increasing dairy imports will mean lower prices, even if they result in higher prices over the long haul. Even this argument does not hold water. In past years each pound of butter and cheese imported from abroad has compelled the Government to purchase an equal amount of the domestic product under the price support laws. This means, it is important to note, that under present conditions any advantage the consumer gains through lower import prices is offset by the expenditure of tax dollars through the Federal Government's purchase of domestic dairy products which have been displaced by imports. Thus my bill would cost the consumer nothing. Yet it would hold milk prices at a reasonable level in the long run.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent analysis of this issue prepared by the National Milk Producers Federation be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask that this bill be laid on the table for additional cosponsors through Friday, February 3, and that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the analysis will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 612) to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 612

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 "Dairy Import Act of 1967."

SEC. 2. No imports of dairy products shall be admitted into the United States for consumption except pursuant to authorizations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. No authorization for imports of dairy products shall be issued by the Secretary which would result in total imports for consumption in any calendar year of butterfat or nonfat milk solids, in any form, in excess of the respective average annual quantities thereof which were admitted for consumption during the five calendar years 1961 through 1965.

SEC. 4. In the event that total annual domestic consumption of milk and milk products in any calendar year shall be greater or less than the average annual domestic consumption of milk and milk products during the five calendar years 1961 through 1965, the total volume of imports

for such calendar year authorized under Section 3 shall be increased or decreased by a corresponding percentage. For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may estimate such total annual domestic consumption on a quarterly basis and reflect adjustments of such estimates in the level of imports authorized in subsequent quarters or in the subsequent year. In computing or estimating such annual domestic consumption under this Act, milk and milk products used in Federal distribution programs shall be excluded.

SEC. 5. The President may permit, if he finds such action is required by overriding economic or national security interests of the United States, additional quantities of imports of any dairy product. Additional imports permitted under this section shall be admitted for consumption under special authorizations issued by the Secretary. No additional imports shall be admitted for consumption under this section at a time when prices received by dairy farmers for milk on a national average as determined by the Secretary are at a level less than parity, unless the Secretary shall, at the time such imports are authorized, remove from the domestic market, in addition to and separate from other price support purchases and operations, a corresponding quantity of dairy products. The cost of removing such dairy products from the domestic market shall be separately reported and shall not be charged to any agricultural program.

SEC. 6. "Dairy products" for the purpose of this Act includes all forms of milk and dairy products, butterfat, nonfat milk solids, and any combination or mixture thereof, and includes also any article, compound, or mixture containing 5 percent or more of butterfat, or nonfat milk solids, or any combination of the two.

SEC. 7. The Secretary may prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary for the effective administration of this Act.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act or any import limitation established thereunder; but the total annual quantitative limitations on imports of butterfat and nonfat milk solids prescribed by this Act shall prevail, and all imports authorized under said section 22 or any other law shall be included in computing such total.

The analysis, presented by Mr. PROXMIRE, is as follows:

INVASION BY EVASION: IMPORTS AND THE DAIRY FARMER

(Published by the National Milk Producers Federation, Washington, D.C.)

INVASION BY EVASION

The most important dairy farmer need in 1967 is the strengthening of import controls on foreign produced dairy products. Ever since quotas were first invoked in 1953 they have been continuously enlarged and eroded. The one remaining recourse is legislation.

To achieve remedial legislation will require the coordinated efforts of every member association of the National Milk Producers Federation. It will need the wide understanding and support of every dairy farmer in America. The facts are clear and unmistakable. They are summarized in this brochure. Your reading time will be well invested.

IMPORT CONTROLS ARE INDISPENSABLE

Effective control of dairy imports is indispensable to dairy farmers and of vast long-range importance to the general public.

Effective import controls are necessary in order that farmers may have an opportunity to achieve parity prices for their milk and butterfat. Achievement of parity prices as a goal of national public policy is clearly set forth in all major agricultural legislation, including the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and the Agricultural Act of 1949. This parity price goal cannot be attained if large scale imports are permitted because they either will (1) render the price support program ineffective, or (2) involve the government in the purchase of such large volumes of imported products so as to cause the discontinuation of the program.

Effective import controls are necessary to provide dairy farmers a level of income commensurate with that received by other segments of our economy, and to enable farmers to maintain a strong and progressive industry in the face of ever-increasing costs. Prices to farmers for milk and butterfat last reached the parity level in 1952. Since that time they have been considerably below parity. In four of the last five years they have barely been above 75 percent of parity.

Effective import controls are necessary also to assure an adequate supply of fluid milk and other dairy products for our growing population, to meet our needs for national defense and security, to meet the critical needs of our government for use in foreign nations as an integral part of our foreign policy, and to provide for essential uses within the United States. If imports are allowed to impair our production capacity, it cannot be quickly restored.

Effective import controls are necessary to provide an opportunity for U.S. dairy farmers operating in our high-price and high-wage economy to compete free from inroads of large supplies of foreign products made cheap through subsidy arrangements. In the common market countries minimum import prices for butter range from a low of 70 cents per pound in the Netherlands to 94 cents per pound in Belgium and Luxembourg. Such prices are maintained by import levies. These same nations export butter at prices as low as 20 cents per pound.

Effective import controls are necessary to neutralize the great pressures which are generated by the vast difference in subsidized world market prices and the prices which public policy demands be received by American dairy farmers.

BRIEF HISTORY OF DAIRY IMPORTS

Imports will show an increase of 567 percent—almost 7 times above 1953—if U.S.D.A. estimates of dairy products imports for 1967 are realized. Last year imports showed a startling increase. Whereas from 1953–1965 the increase in imports was 75 percent, in 1966 this jumped to 433 percent.

The first dairy proclamation under Section 22, issued in 1953, established annual quotas equal to 189 *million* pounds of milk equivalent in the form of dairy products. In that year total imports were 525 *million* pounds. U.S.D.A. estimates that in excess of 3½ *billion* pounds of milk equivalent will be imported in 1967.

Import quotas established by Presidential Proclamation No. 3019, effective July 1, 1953, and milk equivalent (fat basis)

[In pounds]

Product	Quota	Milk equivalent
Cheese:		
Cheddar	2,780,100	27,244,980
Blue mold	4,167,000	37,890,531
Italian	9,200,100	73,416,798
Edam and Gouda	4,600,200	34,869,516
Total cheese	20,747,400	173,421,825
Butter	707,000	15,235,850
Dried cream	500	9,300
Malted	6,000	15,900
Dried whole milk	7,000	51,450
Dried skim milk	1,807,000	
Dried buttermilk	496,000	709,280
Total milk equivalent of quotas		189,443,605

INVASION BY EVASION

Quotas intended to limit entry of dairy products into the U.S. were established July 1, 1953, by Presidential Proclamation 3019. The proclamation reasonably could have been expected to have established maximum quantities of dairy products which may be imported.

The ink on the proclamation was scarcely dry, however, before exporters abroad and importers within the U.S. quickly discovered that import quotas were easy to circumvent and reprisals by the executive branch would not result from such circumvention. It was soon found that any product—irrespective of whether it had ever been imported or even existed—could be imported in unlimited amounts. Such imports establish a "history of imports" which was useful to foreign exporters and U.S. importers in later establishment or enlargement of quotas.

The first overt circumvention of established quotas involved the splitting of "loaves" of Italian-type cheese. The original quotas specified *in original loaves*. As a consequence, Italian-type cheees began entering the U.S. as "split" loaves. Also, varieties of cheese, not specified in the original proclamation, entered the market. The import quotas as established were not full or effective since cheese imports outside the quotas exceeded those permitted by a ratio of 3 to 2 the first year.

The tug of war over cheese imports continues to this day. At present the big non-controlled item is Colby cheese, a product practically identical to Cheddar cheese. Colby cheese is entering the country at a rate ten times the volume established as a quota for cheddar.

When Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act was invoked July 1, 1953, imports of butter were limited to 707,000 pounds annually, but this was circumvented immediately by the importation of butteroil, a product not previously imported. After much urging and a hearing, the Tariff Commission established an import quota on butteroil at 1,200,00 pounds annually. Total imports of butterfat (as butter and butteroil) thus became nearly three times as great as intended when the 707,000-pound quota was established.

Once the quota for butteroil was made effective, evasion and circumvention of such quotas took the form of butterfat-sugar mixtures.

Exylone, the first product of this type to be imported, was used principally in the ice cream trade as a replacement for domestic cream. The domestic cream, of necessity, was churned into butter for sale to the government under the price support program at lower returns to dairy farmers.

The Tariff Commission held another hearing. This time, however, it relied upon a representative period predating imports of Exylone, and established a quota for Exylone at zero.

In barring imports of Exylone, however, the regulation applied only to products containing 45 percent or more of butterfat. The dairy industry argued that this limitation would merely invite new imports in mixtures containing less than 45 percent butterfat. This happened at once.

A new mixture, called Junex, promptly made its appearance. Junex contained 44 percent butterfat and 55 percent sugar. In 1966 alone, 104.5 million pounds entered the United States, dwarfing the quota on butter and butteroil to meaningless terms.

As a substitute for action under Section 22, the executive branch negotiated with Australia, Ireland, and New Zealand, limiting imports for Colby cheese, cream and butterfat-sugar mixtures, all nonquota products, in 1962 through 1964. These agreements could not bind nonsignatory countries. As shipments from the latter countries increased, the agreements were abandoned. In

mid-1966 the Secretary of Agriculture promulgated regulations under the Sugar Act limiting the importation of products containing 25 percent and more of sugar.

This regulation, too, proved ineffective. Mixtures containing 44 percent butterfat, 24 percent sugar, and 31 percent nonfat milk solids were at sea before the regulation was issued. In 1966 imports of butterfat-sugar mixtures displaced a market for U. S. dairy farmers equal to 10 percent of total ice cream production.

Imports of dairy products thus continued to increase. The U. S. Department of Agriculture predicts that the total of imports in 1967 will approximate 3.5 billion pounds of milk (calculated on a butterfat basis). This level of imports is 12 times the total authorized by import quotas.

LEGAL BACKGROUND OF IMPORT CONTROLS

In earlier years the dairy industry in the United States was largely self-sufficient, and the small differences in domestic and foreign prices were offset by modest tariffs.

Following World War I, the butter tariff was increased from 2.5 cents to 12 cents per pound to reflect increasing price differentials. The Tariff Act of 1930 set the tariff rate at 14 cents per pound on butter with corresponding rates on other dairy products. Although these were fixed rates, they operated effectively for several years.

These tariff rates were subsequently reduced to inadequate levels under the trade agreement acts. The reduced tariffs were unrealistic in that they failed to take into account the substantial price differences which were developing between domestic and world price levels for dairy products.

The tariff reductions were not correlated with the programs of the Department of Agriculture and the results were at cross purposes. Moreover, ready use by foreign nations of heavy export subsidies, currency devaluation, exchange manipulations, and similar practices operated to render fixed tariff rates practically meaningless and to require the use of import quotas.

Import quotas were imposed on major dairy products in 1942 under the Second War Powers Act. This was done primarily to keep fats needed in the allied countries from being drawn to the high-priced American market, and to help carry out an international allocation of dairy products.

These controls continued in part through 1948. Later, in the 1949–51 period, imports of butter were controlled under special legislation to permit the orderly liquidation of stocks the government had acquired under the support program.

To prevent excessive imports from resulting in unnecessary expenditures under the price support program, Congress in 1951 authorized import quotas in Section 104 of the Defense Production Act. These controls were maintained until 1953, when they were shifted to Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act was enacted back in 1935 as a part of the agricultural programs designed to provide fair returns to agricultural producers as measured in terms of parity prices. Its purpose was to assure that the government programs would not be rendered ineffective by imports. It was materially strengthened in 1951 when Congress amended it to state clearly and forcefully that the protection which it had authorized for the agricultural programs would take precedence over the trade agreements.

Although Section 22 has been available since 1935, it was not until 1953 that use of it was made to protect the agricultural programs provided by Congress for dairy farmers.

Since that time, the controls set up in 1953 have been continuously eroded because administration of the section has been weak and ineffective.

Particularly in more recent years, evasion of the import controls has become a popular and profitable pastime for importers and foreign nations. Huge quantities of imports are being brought into the country in open and flagrant evasion of the import quotas.

These have resulted in millions of dollars of added and unnecessary cost to the dairy price support program, and they are interfering substantially with the attainment of the goal of the program which is parity prices in the market place.

"DAIRY IMPORT ACT OF 1967"

The National Milk Producers Federation, after careful study and consultation with members of Congress, developed a new import control program which was incorporated in a bill introduced last year by Senator Proxmire and 21 other Senators. Numerous similar bills were introduced in the House.

Legislation has now been introduced in the new Congress, and the Federation will make an all-out fight for its passage. This will not be an easy task, since it must be assumed that there will be strong opposition. The bill should be supported because it sets a fair guideline under which government and industry can operate.

Opposition will arise in spite of action by other nations, such as those in the European Common Market, to protect their own agriculture, and in spite of tremendous differences between our domestic prices and world export prices which make free trade concepts with respect to dairy products completely visionary and unrealistic.

The legislation proposed would use as a base the average annual quantities of butterfat and nonfat milk solids imported during the five calendar years 1961–65. 1966 would not be included in the base because it was not a normal year. Heavily subsidized exports of surplus production in foreign nations, coupled with price increases in this country needed to stop a dangerous decline in domestic production, resulted in abnormally large volumes of imports of evasion-type products during 1966. The same condition threatens serious harm to American dairy farmers in 1967, unless Congress acts to fix a limit on imports under this legislation.

The 1961–65 average would be an automatic control and would not require lengthy and unsatisfactory Tariff Commission proceedings as under present law.

The controls would be flexible as between products and countries, subject to the overall limitation that the annual total of all dairy-product imports could not exceed the 1961–65 average. This would permit recognition of any legitimate new dairy products which might be developed while at the same time preventing evasion.

Provision is made to permit the President to authorize additional imports in the national interest. If additional imports are admitted under this provision, at a time when dairy farmer prices are below parity, a corresponding quantity of dairy products would be removed from the domestic market. This would permit the market to respond to domestic market forces and help attain the goal of the agricultural program authorized by Congress, which is parity prices in the marketplace for American dairy farmers.

The bill also provides that as the domestic market expands due to population or other factors, the import total would increase in the same ratio.

Thus foreign countries would share in the growth of the United States market in the same relative proportion as our own farmers, but their exports to this country could not grow by displacing domestic production. This would prevent serious impairment of our dairy industry which is much too important to our national economy and national security to be sacrificed for concepts of free trade which, so applied to the dairy industry, are unrealistic and impractical.

Most important, the new bill would put an end to the subterfuge and evasion practiced under the present inadequate import controls.

Furthermore, a definite and known level of imports would be established to which the market could adjust and on which our own farmers and foreign countries could make sound future plans.

A BILL TO REGULATE IMPORTS OF MILK AND DAIRY PRODUCTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America to Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Dairy Import Act of 1967."

SEC. 2. No imports of dairy products shall be admitted into the United States for consumption except pursuant to authorizations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. No authorizations for imports of dairy products shall be issued by the Secretary which would result in total imports for consumption in any calendar year of butterfat or nonfat milk solids, in any form, in excess of the respective average annual quantities thereof which were admitted for consumption during the five calendar years 1961 through 1965.

SEC. 4. In the event that total annual domestic consumption of milk and milk products in any calendar year shall be greater or less than the average annual domestic consumption of milk and milk products during the five calendar years 1961 through 1965, the total volume of imports for such calendar year authorized under section 3 shall be increased or decreased by a corresponding percentage. For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may estimate such total annual domestic consumption on a quarterly basis and reflect adjustments of such estimates in the level of imports authorized in subsequent quarters or in the subsequent year. In computing or estimating such annual domestic consumption under this Act, milk and milk products used in Federal distribution programs shall be excluded.

SEC. 5. The President may permit, if he finds such action is required by overriding economic or national security interests of the United States, additional quantities of imports of any dairy product. Additional imports permitted under this section shall be admitted for consumption under special authorizations issued by the Secretary. No additional imports shall be admitted for consumption under this section at a time when prices received by dairy farmers for milk on a national average as determined by the Secretary are at a level less than parity, unless the Secretary shall, at the time such imports are authorized, remove from the domestic market, in addition to and separate from other price support purchases and operations, a corresponding quantity of dairy products. The cost of removing such dairy products from the domestic market shall be separately reported and shall not be charged to any agricultural program.

SEC. 6. "Dairy products" for the purpose of this Act includes all forms of milk and dairy products, butterfat, nonfat milk solids, and any combination or mixture thereof, and includes also any article, compound, or mixture containing 5 percent or more of butterfat, or nonfat milk solids, or any combination of the two.

SEC. 7. The Secretary may prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary for the effective administration of this Act.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act or any import limitation established thereunder; but the total annual quantitative limitations on imports of butterfat and nonfat milk solids prescribed by this Act shall prevail, and all imports authorized under said section 22 or any

other law shall be included in computing such total.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 333 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending section 333 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to bring up to December 31, 1962, securities acquired by the liquidating corporation.

It is and has been for a number of years the established policy of Congress to encourage liquidation of personal holding companies. Provisions to this end were first made by enactment of section 112(b)(7) of the Revenue Act of 1938. Twice thereafter the provision was restored to permit additional liquidations within limited periods of time. When section 333 of the 1954 code was adopted it was expressly recognized that encouragement of such liquidations had permanent value and should be made a regular part of the Internal Revenue Code. See Senate Report No. 1622, 83d Congress, second session, page 256—1954.

Section 333 and its predecessors have facilitated liquidation by postponing until disposition by individual shareholders capital gains tax on securities that have appreciated in value while held by the liquidated corporation.

On the other hand, cash distributed is immediately taxed as a dividend. In order to prevent this conversion of cash into securities to avoid the tax imposed, it has been provided that stock and securities acquired after a specified date should be treated as money. The cutoff date set in 1954 was December 31, 1953.

With the passage of time, the cutoff date has rendered the section increasingly obsolete. There are few corporations whose securities were all acquired more than 12 years ago. If section 333 is to have the permanent effect intended at the time of enactment, it is essential that the cutoff date be advanced.

It should be emphasized that the effect of this proposal on the revenue is not a material consideration since it has been noted in reports of the Senate Finance Committee that any revenue loss resulting from an updating of section 333 is "negligible." See Senate Report No. 781, 82d Congress, first session, 61—1951.

In view of the changes made by the Revenue Act of 1964 in the rules relating to taxation of personal holding companies, Congress should, in the interests of fair administration, provide again the same opportunity for liquidation of existing holding companies that has been recognized for more than 25 years.

My bill would provide a reform in our basic tax structure that has long been needed. Such updating of section 333 has been widely recognized by such bodies as the American Bar Association and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

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

The bill (S. 614) to amend section 333 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to bring up to December 31, 1962, the cutoff point for stock and securities acquired by the liquidating corporation, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill and ask that it lie on the desk for the remainder of the day in the event another Senator wishes to add his name as a cosponsor.

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

The bill (S. 619) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn., introduced by Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. BAKER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this bill provides authority and direction for the transfer of certain property now known as the Kennedy Hospital, a property under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, to Memphis State University.

Mr. President, I realize that we have established procedures for the disposition of property surplus to the needs of the U.S. Government. I am well aware, too, that the bill I have just introduced provides an exception.

Mr. President, I wish to indicate why I think an exception is justified in this instance. An exception is justified first, because of an urgent educational need. Memphis State University now has an enrollment of more than 14,000 students. The curriculum of the university has been expanded to meet the needs of the student body, and the student body is constantly growing. It is anticipated that by 1970 this will be a university of more than 20,000 students. Memphis is one of the large and one of the most rapidly growing cities in America.

Both the city and the university are truly of importance to the entire mid-South. This is a regional school and is rapidly becoming more so.

Naturally, those who first established the campus and the physical layout of the university did not envision—indeed, who could have envisioned, then?—that this would become a university of truly major proportions.

Nevertheless, the problem is upon us. It is not just a local problem but a State and regional problem as well; therefore, it is a national problem.

The urgency of the need, the good purposes to be served and the need for expeditious action, would justify this exception to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I should like to address a few remarks to the Senate about the need for expedition.

There are a number of unused buildings on the property at the present time. The university can make considerable use of these buildings, particularly if they are acquired before further deterioration takes place. Therefore, upon reference of this bill to the committee, I shall hope to appear and request those who share my views in this regard to join in a request that the committee act expeditiously in dealing with what I regard as an urgent and fully justified need.

I have asked that the bill lie on the desk for further sponsorship for the remainder of the day. I should add that I have spoken to the three Members of the other body representing congressional districts in west Tennessee about the bill and have, as an act of courtesy, supplied them with a copy.

I would hope that Representatives and Senators from Arkansas and Mississippi would likewise join in this effort because, as I have said, it is truly a regional university, soon to become even more so in its importance and its magnitude.

CONSOLIDATION AND REENACTMENT OF CERTAIN SHIPPING LAWS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to consolidate and reenact certain shipping laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

For a number of years the Committee on Commerce, and others interested in promoting the American merchant marine have been conscious of the need to organize rationally and reenact the multitude of statutes affecting the U.S. shipping and maritime programs.

The U.S. laws relating to the merchant marine, Coast Guard, Customs, and admiralty are collected and organized under about 30 chapters in title 46: Shipping of the United States Code. The Bureau of Customs and the Coast Guard have undertaken a comprehensive revision of about 20 chapters of title 46. This bill brings up to date the other 10 chapters dealing with the U.S. merchant marine.

Many of the laws are of ancient origin. Chapter 17, for example, requires certain fishermen and masters to sign a written agreement on length of time of employment by season or voyages and provides severe penalties for fishermen who desert without leave of the master. The difficulty of relying on the United States Code in this area has also prompted a need for consolidation and compilation.

The project involved the collection of all merchant marine laws, the reorganization of the law, and the rewording of the law after all amendments were incorporated and repealed sections drafted.

During the last Congress, the Senate adopted a resolution authorizing funds to the committee for compilation and revision of the maritime statutes. The committee, under this authorization, contracted with a private consultant, Pike & Fischer, Inc., of Washington, D.C., to prepare the initial draft of the revi-

sion. A directive was given that no amendment to the substantive law should be made unless required by recent organizational changes or similar requirements. This work was accomplished in an excellent manner and made available to the committee on schedule in December of 1965. The draft was printed, after careful review by the committee staff, and distributed to Government agencies, maritime industry, labor, and interested persons generally. Numerous comments were received by the committee from all segments of the merchant marine and from all agencies that have an interest and responsibility for our merchant marine policy. On the basis of these comments, legislation was prepared which I introduced in the second session of the 89th Congress.

The bill received wide support and was subsequently passed by the Senate. However, the House of Representatives failed to act upon the bill before adjournment.

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

The bill (S. 620) to consolidate and reenact certain of the shipping laws of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CERTAIN INCREASES IN ANNUITIES FROM THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to provide for cost-of-living increases in the annuities payable from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund.

The provisions of this bill are similar to those of S. 3247, approved by the Senate on October 5, 1966, but not acted on in the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter to the Vice President from Assistant Secretary of State Douglas MacArthur II, the text of the bill, and certainly explanatory material concerning it.

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

The bill (S. 624) to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 624

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 Foregin Service Annuities Adjustment Act of 1967.

SEC. 2. Each annuity payable from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund on January 1, 1967 shall be increased effective on that date by 5.7 per centum. No increase in annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

SEC. 3. Effective January 2, 1967, section 882 of the Foregin Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1064(b), is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever a cost-of-living annuity adjustment is made in annuities payable from the Civil Service Retirement Fund pursuant to 5. U.S.C. 8340, as amended by P.L. 89–205, such increase shall apply in the same manner to annuities payable from the Foreign Service Retirement Fund."

The letter and explanatory material presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 6, 1967.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Enclosed is draft legislation to provide cost-of-living increases in annuities payable from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund that would establish and continue equity between the Civil Service and Foreign Service retirement systems with respect to cost-of-living adjustments.

A recommendation to this end made by the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems was endorsed by the President on March 7, 1966.

Under the current provisions of the cost-of-living adjustment formula applicable to Foreign Service annuities, adjustments now lag 5.7 percent behind adjustments that have been made in Civil Service annuities. Unless this proposed bill is enacted early in the 1st session of the 90th Congress, it is not anticipated that a cost-of-living adjustment will become effective for Foreign Service annuitants until April 1, 1968, and even then equity between Civil Service and Foreign Service may not be established.

Provisions for the establishment of and continuance of equity between Civil Service and Foreign Service cost-of-living adjustments were included in S. 3247, a bill passed by the Senate on October 5, 1966. This bill did not receive House action before adjournment of the 2nd session, 89th Congress.

Early action by the Senate on this important legislation is urgently requested.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presentation of this draft legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,
DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations
(For the Secretary of State).

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This bill is regarded as emergency legislation to establish and continue equity between the Civil Service and Foreign Service Retirement Systems with respect to cost-of-living adjustments.

P.L. 89–205, commonly known as the "Daniels bill", provided a 6.1 percent cost-of-living adjustment in Civil Service annuities effective December 1, 1965. Under an improved cost-of-living formula also in P.L. 89–205, Civil Service annuitants are receiving a 3.9 percent cost-of-living adjustment effective January 1, 1967.

Under the provisions of the current cost-of-living adjustment formula applicable to Foreign Service annuities, a 4.3 percent increase was effective April 1, 1966. Under the provisions of this same Foreign Service cost-of-living formula Foreign Service annuitants are not expected to be eligible for another cost-of-living increase until April 1, 1968.

The President's Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems recommended in 1966 that steps be taken to provide for the equitable application of cost-of-living annuity adjustments. It is the objective of this bill to match for Foreign Service annuitants those adjustments provided for Civil Service annuitants in December 1965 and January 1967 and to provide that future cost-of-living annuity adjustments for Civil Service annuitants will trigger identical adjustments for Foreign Service annuitants.

The 4.3 percent cost-of-living annuity adjustment received by Foreign Service annuitants on April 1, 1966 left them 1.8 percent below the 6.1 percent cost-of-living annuity adjustment received by Civil Service annuitants effective December 1965. By adding this 1.8 percent adjustment to the 3.9 percent adjustment which became applicable to Civil Service annuities on January 1, 1967, we arrive at the total 5.7 percent increase sought in this bill.

COST ESTIMATES

The first year cost of this 5.7 percent Foreign Service annuity increase would be $565,000.

This compares to a first year cost of $67,000,000 for the 3.9 percent Civil Service annuity increase which became effective January 1, 1967. Increases in the unfunded liability for the two systems are as follows:

Increase in unfunded liability:	
Annuity increase (5.7 percent FS)	$7,200,000
Annuity increase (3.9 percent CS)	739,000,000
Annual interest cost at 4 percent:	
Annuity increase (5.7 percent FS)	288,000
Annuity increase (3.9 percent CS)	29,560,000

It should be noted that in comparing the cost of the Foreign Service and Civil Service benefits the 1.8% benefit previously approved for Civil Service annuitants has not been included.

JANUARY 1967.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO ACCEPT FELLOWSHIPS, SCHOLARSHIPS, OR GRANTS OFFERED BY A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to permit members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants offered by a foreign government.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Department of the Army.

I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comment.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when it is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In this connection, I can perceive of no valid reason why the scope of the bill should be limited to members of the Armed Forces. It seems to me that if the acceptance of fellowships and scholarships offered by foreign governments is a good thing and to be authorized by law, the authority to accept them should also extend to civilian employees of the U.S. Government. Moreover, since the proposed legislation involves relations with foreign governments, I think it would be more appropriate if the program were carried out under the auspices

of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended, and administered by the Department of State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed bill may be printed in the RECORD together with the letter received from the Department of the Army.

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

The bill (S. 625) to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants offered by a foreign government, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 625

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 2603(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the benefits of any fellowship, scholarship, or grant which may be offered by a foreign government, or by a corporation, fund, foundation, or educational institution that is organized and operated primarily for scientific, literary, or educational purposes to any member of the Armed Forces, may, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, be accepted by him—

"(1) in recognition of outstanding performance in his field;

"(2) to undertake a project that may be of value to the United States; or

"(3) for development of his recognized potential for future career service."

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the armed forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants offered by a foreign government."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for the 90th Congress, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposal is to amend Section 2603 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the armed forces may accept appropriate scholarships, fellowships, or grants offered by a foreign government.

Section 2603 of title 10, United States Code, permits qualified members of the armed forces to accept, from nongovernmental sources, scholarships, fellowships, or grants offered by a corporation, fund, foundation, or educational institution that is organized and operated primarily for scientific, literary, or educational purposes. Typical of these are the Rhodes and Fulbright scholarships, and the Ford, Carnegie, Sloan, and Guggenheim fellowships.

Article I, section 9, clause 8 of the Constitution states in part ". . . And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust . . . shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State." This provision prevents acceptance of scholarships granted by a foreign government, such as those under the Marshall Scholarship Program sponsored by the British Government as an expression of gratitude for assistance from the United States Government. The reasons which prompted the present provision of law have equal applicability to this proposal—that members of the armed forces may benefit from opportunities to seek higher education which will be an advantage to the Government, and that further education will assist in qualifying persons for greater military responsibilities and enhance the prestige of its personnel among Government, civilian, and foreign people.

Section 2603 of title 10, United States Code, places a limitation on applicable benefits and prescribes a mandatory period of active service upon completion of education or training. There will be no change in these provisions if the attached proposal is enacted.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the United States.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. MCGIFFERT,
Acting Secretary of the Army.

OMBUDSMAN FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues know, the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, of which I am chairman, has been looking into the subject of ombudsman. Ombudsman is a form of citizens' defender against maladministration or misadministration by Government agencies; ombudsman is the one who fights city hall.

The institution was first established in Sweden in 1809. Other Scandinavian countries have recently become interested in the concept and today there are ombudsmen in Norway, Finland, and Denmark. New Zealand recently created an ombudsman; West Germany has a military ombudsman, and Great Britain is about to create a similar office.

Since the Congress adjourned last year, there have been several recent developments which I believe merit the attention of my colleagues. In New York City, following the defeat of the civilian review board which Mayor Lindsay had created, several influential groups in the city—including the Bar Association of the City of New York, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association—have diligently been studying various proposals for a New York City ombudsman. There seems to be considerable support for such an ombudsman and Mayor Lindsay has given it his endorsement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, two editorials from the New York Times discussing the value of an ombudsman for the city of New York.

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

[From the New York Times, Nov. 18, 1966]

PROTECTOR OF THE PUBLIC

The concept of an ombudsman, or public protector, is much more than a suddenly agreeable substitute for the now dead Civilian Complaint Review Board in the Police Department. It isn't that simple. The bandwagon enthusiasm for an instant device to assure all citizens that they have the right of redress is commendable; but it needs to be channeled into a thorough study lest the controversy that ended the review board be renewed in another form.

At the moment, all citizen complaints to Box 100 at City Hall concerning city employes and all the critical telephone calls are referred to the Commissioner of Investigation. These are parceled out for answer and action to the agencies involved. Except for some highly successful conciliation of misunderstandings between police and public by the short-lived civilian board, the proceedings by the Commissioner of Investigation and the police are essentially accusatory and disciplinary.

But the ombudsman idea, as established and developed in the Scandinavian countries, works quite differently. The ombudsman is a sort of super-official, a kind of untouchable grievance committee chairman, appointed to look into citizen complaints about action or inaction by public servants.

He recommends whatever steps he thinks necessary. He may suggest improvements in procedures, he may reject the complaint, or he may propose some specific action. He does not attempt to judge individual guilt or innocence. The agency concerned handles its own discipline, if that is necessary. The ombudsman does not participate as an adversary at any time.

The first ombudsman in this country was appointed in Nassau County in July to protect the public against "inefficiency, maladministration, arrogance and abuse on the part of government." Although the principal weapon of the office is public exposure, no publicity has been needed or used in the 110 complaints handled so far. The complaints have included grievances of government employees as well as civilians.

Is New York City too large, its government too diffuse, for one individual public protector? These are questions for careful investigation.

Several points are already clear. All citizens must be entitled to a definite chance for complaint and redress, an opportunity particularly important for minority groups. The ombudsman fills this need.

Many police believed that establishment of a civilian review board singled them out unfairly. The proposed ombudsman would be for all city employes.

By eliminating the accusatory aspects of complaints, the ombudsman has an opportunity to look for the reasons behind complaints, the hows and whys. This could be his most significant contribution to the welfare of the community.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Nov. 26, 1966]

THE AVAILABLE OMBUDSMAN

Two members of a committee to advise the Board of Supervisors of Nassau County on the question of making permanent the office of ombudsman there, the only one in the nation, have warmly endorsed the idea on their return from Scandanavia, home of the public protector. But the two did not agree on details.

One, Nassau County District Attorney William Cahn, says the ombudsman should not have jurisdiction over the police, the courts or the D.A.'s office. Garden City Attorney

Joseph Marino says the police should be included, explaining that Scandanavian police chiefs to whom he talked said that the existence of an ombudsman increased confidence in the police.

Certainly an ombudsman in New York City without authority to receive criticism of police actions would not be acceptable here. It was because many citizens, particularly Negroes and Puerto Ricans, felt such uneasiness in this very area of police-civilian relations that the civilian review board was established in the first place. An ombudsman must look at all phases of government and must be available to all citizens.

It is important now not to lose the momentum of the consensus on basic principles that followed the demise of the civilian review board. Spokesmen for board supporters and for the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association agreed then on application of the ombudsman idea to all arms of municipal government.

Such an experiment "would be unlikely to succeed without topnotch personnel, some understanding support (journalists among them), and a public service that, if not altogether friendly, is at least not actively antagonistic," writes Walter Gellhorn, Columbia law professor, in his new book, "When Americans Complain." These conditions appear to exist here.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. In late November, the Harvard University Press published two books by Walter Gellhorn, distinguished Betts professor of law at Columbia University. These books are entitled "Ombudsman and Others," a review of ombudsman and ombudsmen-like offices in various countries of the world, and "When Americans Complain," an excellent summary of the problems which our American citizens face when they complain to their local, State, and Federal Government officials.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to read both of these fine studies, and ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, a book review which I wrote for the New York Times.

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

[From the New York Times, Nov. 27, 1966]

PUBLIC DEFENDER

"Ombudsman and Others." 450 pp. $6.95. "When Americans Complain." 196 pp. $3.95. By Walter Gellhorn. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

(By EDWARD V. LONG)

Ombudsman. What an interesting word and an even more striking concept. Translated literally from Swedish, Ombudsman simply means "one who represents someone." But, as the Scandinavians know, and as Walter Gellhorn has written, it really means a whole lot more. In those nations that have created the Ombudsman, the system has come to be a combination of red-tape cutter, external critic and "institutionalized public conscience." In the words of Mr. Gellhorn, the Ombudsmen have become "society's family doctors, binding up relatively minor wounds, prescribing for discomforts not likely to become disasters, and pointing paths to healthful living."

Walter Gellhorn, Betts Professor of Law at Columbia University, is in a unique position, for he is perhaps the only man who has met all the Ombudsmen in the world. This is not an easy task, for they occupy the far corners of this complaining earth. Mr. Gellhorn and his wife spent 15 months interviewing and observing in nine countries; "Ombudsmen and Others" is the result of this work.

All the Scandinavian countries—Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Finland—have Ombudsmen; New Zealand has recently created an Ombudsman and Great Britain's Parliament is currently appraising the institution. Japan has an Administrative Management Agency, Yugoslavia a Bureau of Petitions and Proposals, while the Soviet Union has a Procurator General. Call them what you will, all are designed to handle citizen grievances against bureaucracy.

Earlier this year, my Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure was privileged to hold a public hearing with Alfred Bexelius, the distinguished Ombudsman from Sweden. This was, to my knowledge, the first public Congressional hearing in this area. And quite frankly, until that time, I was unsure of the exact role of an Ombudsman. During the hearing, we were most impressed as Mr. Bexelius explained the simplicity of his function (to help a citizen to exercise his rights) and the complexity of his task.

In my opening statement at the hearing, I pointed out that "any new idea meets with immediate opposition. It is too early to say whether the institution of Ombudsman can work here in the United States; we do not even know how it operates in other countries." Mr. Gellhorn's first book, "Ombudsmen and Others," goes a long way toward answering the second point "When Americans Complain," his second book should become indispensable in analyzing our first problem: Do we need an Ombudsman here in the United States?

Before we begin to tackle this question, let us start with a basic assumption. We are not unhappy with our system of government or generally with our government employees. On the contrary, it is my belief that we have a very workable system. Our Federal civil servants are, with some exceptions, a most dedicated and effective group. It is true, of course, that there are many complaints, but the existence of complaints does not prove their validity.

Woven through Mr. Gellhorn's two books is one central theme: Ombudsmen cannot work where government is generally corrupt, or where officials are not highly and ideally motivated. If statistics prove anything, let us look to Sweden, Denmark or New Zealand where 80 to 90 per cent of all citizens' complaints are unfounded (although made in all sincerity). The net result is to turn the Ombudsman into a "bureaucrats' defender" as well as a "citizen's defender."

One should not read "When Americans Complain" without being familiar with "Ombudsmen and Others." But, concerned as we are with citizen grievances at all levels on the American scene, the former book presents some formidable issues which must be explored.

"When Americans Complain" presents a comprehensive and quantitative analysis of citizen complaints at all levels of government—national, state and local. Gellhorn treats each level with equal care and length, and makes the significant but often overlooked observation that "the individual is much more frequently touched by local and state governmental operations than by national." Statistically again, whereas the national government employs a little more than 2.5 million civilians, state and local governments carry nearly seven million on their payrolls.

On the Federal scene, Gellhorn catalogues for us the many watchmen in Washington, including of course the Congress, General Accounting Office, Bureau of the Budget, and self-policing by the agencies themselves.

Perhaps the largest number of citizen complaints are received by Congress. We call these complaints "casework," and in this area Gellhorn himself has a complaint. "Too much reliance is being placed on an unperfected critical device," he says. While Gellhorn and I agree on goals—the establishment of some form or forms of Ombudsman—I cannot agree that casework does not work because it is unperfected. In my opinion, casework works best because it is unperfected. It differs from state to state and from complaint to complaint—and differ it must. What is good for the State of Missouri may not be applicable for the State of New York.

I recognize that this reasoning may lead me to conclude that we cannot have one national Ombudsman empowered to handle all complaints from all citizens. Perhaps it would be better to compartmentalize our Ombudsman. One such example would be the so-called "tax Ombudsman" bill, which Senator Warren Magnuson of Washington and I sponsored this last session of Congress. This bill, which incidentally was co-sponsored by 51 other Senators, would create regional Tax Commissioners who would have authority to negotiate and settle tax problems under $2,500.

In the final analysis, however, agreement is reached with Mr. Gellhorn when he asks the question: What have we to lose by experimenting with a national Ombudsman? It would cost us very little money; it would take no organizational restructuring. And, happily enough, says Gellhorn, "The external critic is one of those promising experiments that can be tried without committing its proponents so deeply they can never afterward bear to admit failure."

One further watchdog must be considered before we leave the Federal level—the Administrative Conference of the United States. Permanently created by the Congress in August, 1964, this conference was to be for the governmental agencies what the Judicial Conference has been for the courts. It is to be composed of the heads of major administrative bodies, other administrators, and persons who can broadly represent "the views of private citizens and utilize diverse experience"—practicing lawyers and scholars in administrative law. This conference, according to Gellhorn, might very possibly become a "sort of American Ombudsman for broad aspects of administrative functioning while Congressional casework might continue to salve individual hurts."

Here might be our solution. It would remove the Gellhorn objections to Congressional casework and at the same time preserve to our constituents one of their basic democratic rights—the right to have their man in Washington. But good things come in exceedingly small packages. More than two years have passed and the Administrative Conference has not been activated for want of an appropriate head. Would that Mr. Gellhorn would assume this post.

On the state and local level, "When Americans Complain" clearly shows the need for some kind of Ombudsman. There are today over 7,800 state legislators, many of whom do not have their own desk from which to work. Governors and other elected officials vainly try to handle citizens' complaints, but often they bog down in their own red-tape. In the best of circumstances, Gellhorn suggests, "haphazard complaint-handling by legislators, gubernatorial officers and other public officials gives slight assurance that a grievance will be fully investigated." Here, at these levels, we can import the Scandinavian Ombudsman. Here, then, is where he can be most effective.

It is for this very reason that Senators Hart of Michigan, Kennedy of New York and I recently co-sponsored legislation to create an Ombudsman for the District of Columbia. Many of us would have preferred to let a city council authorize such a D.C. Ombudsman, but the Congress has not yet willed to grant the District home rule. That being so, we introduced the bill and hearings should be held early next year.

One omission is notable in both books: Mr. Gellhorn clearly shows the value of trying the Ombudsman here in the United States. But what shall we call this external critic? Many have objected to importing

the name along with the institution; the word "Ombudsman," they say, is too esoteric, too difficult, too foreign. Perhaps it is for these very reasons that my own preference is for it. I readily confess uncertainty as to whether my pronunciation is correct or my accent is proper. I do know, however, the Ombudsman is the man who will help the citizen stand on an equal footing with his government.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. During the month of December, as State legislatures throughout the country were preparing for their upcoming legislative sessions, it was reported in the press that several ombudsman bills were being contemplated. It is my understanding that bills have already been introduced, or will be introduced, in the State legislatures of Alaska, California, Illinois, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Utah. I am pleased to learn that a similar bill will soon be introduced in the legislature of my own great State of Missouri.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], I today introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create and ombudsman for the District of Columbia. This ombudsman would be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall be appointed without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of his or her fitness to perform the duties of the office. The ombudsman shall be learned in the process of law and government and shall have a distinguished intellectual standing in the legal profession. I was extremely impressed by Swedish Ombudsman Bexelius' background which included nearly 30 years as a judge in the various law courts of Sweden.

The ombudsman shall hold office for a period of 3 years. He may be reappointed, but in no case shall he hold the office for more than four full terms, or a total of 12 years. According to the provisions of the bill which I introduce, the ombudsman shall receive compensation equal to that of the chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals; it is my understanding that this salary is now set at $25,000 per year.

Basically, the ombudsman shall have jurisdiction to investigate any oral or written complaints submitted by any resident of the District of Columbia, where the complaint relates to an action or inaction taken by any agency of the government of the District of Columbia. The bill specifically excludes from the jurisdiction of the ombudsman the courts, any entity of the Federal Government, any multistate government entity or compact, and the District of Columbia Commissioners and their personal staff.

When the ombudsman investigates a complaint, he shall have authority not only to hold private hearings with both the complaining individual and agency officials, but also where necessary to enter and inspect the premises of an agency, and to make inquiries and obtain any and all information from the agency or agencies as the ombudsman thinks fit. The ombudsman shall inform the complainant of the results of his investigation. Furthermore, the ombudsman is required to present his opinions and recommendations to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to the District Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to the public.

The ombudsman shall not have authority to correct the situation on his own motion. The ombudsman does not have authority to change agency actions. The ombudsman does not have authority to bend the law. The ombudsman only has authority to take a complaint, fully investigate it, and report to an appropriate official what suggestions and changes may be necessary to help the individual resident of the District of Columbia.

In short, he shall have broad investigatory powers but narrow enforcement authority.

Mr. President, as I informed my colleagues when this bill was introduced in the Senate late last year (S. 3783), we are introducing this bill to create an ombudsman for the District of Columbia for two reasons. First, the residents of the District of Columbia need this citizens' defender, this public protector. Additionally, the concept of ombudsman is a most fascinating one. Soon, I shall introduce a bill to create a form of administrative ombudsman with authority to investigate citizen complaints against the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and the Bureau of Prisons. The Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure intends to continue its study of the concept of ombudsman, and shall follow with interest the development of the District of Columbia ombudsman.

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

The bill (S. 626) to establish the Office of Ombudsman in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself, Mr. HART, and Mr. KENNEDY of New York), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BLOOD BANKS AND ANTITRUST

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is a well-known adage that the wheels of justice grind slowly but they also grind exceedingly fine.

As true as this is of justice meted out in the court system, it is even more true of justice as dealt with by the administrative agencies, especially the regulatory agencies.

Some of my constituents, both individual and corporate, in Kansas City have—to their great sorrow and expense—become enmeshed in the web of one of the most ponderous of all Federal agencies, the Federal Trade Commission.

These constituents have been enmeshed for 5 or 6 years, although they are not merchants of any kind and do not engage in what most of us ever think of as "trade" or "commerce." In fact, they are medical doctors and pathologists who organized a nonprofit community blood bank for the greater Kansas City area.

You might well ask what has this got to do with the Federal Trade Commission. Just enough, apparently, for the Commission to disrupt the activities of the blood bank for 5 years and with no end in sight.

When I first heard of this problem, I knew little or nothing about blood banks. In order to educate myself with respect to blood bank problems, I asked the National Institutes of Health if they could supply me with a listing and description of the various blood banking organizations throughout the country. They sent me an inch-thick publication by the American Association of Blood Banks which contained much helpful factual information on more than 6,000 separate organizations which collect, store, and dispense blood and blood products.

These 6,000 organizations range from huge ones, such as the Red Cross, to minuscule ones that deal with very small quantities of blood. The vast majority range between the two extremes.

These 6,000 organizations range from those organized wholly for profit to those which are wholly nonprofit. Again, there are many banks which fall between the two extremes.

These 6,000 organizations range from those having the highest medical standards to those with very low standards. Control of these standards by NIH is very sketchy.

The result of the American system of organization—or, more accurately, lack of organization—of blood banking is utter chaos.

Every year there are untold numbers of cases of infections through inadequate medical controls over blood banks.

Every year, there are a sizable number of needless deaths due to the low medical standards in many blood banks.

Rare types of blood are frequently difficult to get and often unattainable in a particular community.

Blood is often extremely expensive and too often of low quality.

Much blood is wasted by nonuse, as whole blood can be stored for only 21 days.

The major effort to replace the existing chaos with some degree of order and efficiency has come from a number of communitywide or metropolitanwide nonprofit blood banks.

As I said previously, my interest in this subject has been heightened by the situation in Kansas City, an early example of communitywide nonprofit blood banking. Until the mid-1950's, the situation in Kansas City was similar to that in New York. There were a multitude of separate blood banking facilities, some large, some small, some for profit, some nonprofit. Each hospital in the area had its own separate blood banking facility. These varied widely in size and in services.

Beginning in about 1955, a number of Kansas City's leading doctors and a number of other civic-minded citizens began organizing a communitywide nonprofit blood banking system. There was merged into this system almost all of the separate blood banking facilities in the Kansas City area including those of all of the hospitals in the area. The area's pathologists joined in the effort. In time, the system became known as the Kansas City Community Blood Bank.

It had the most modern equipment and a most distinguished medical staff. Its medical standards were as high as those of any blood banking organization in the country. It was truly a model of communitywide nonprofit blood banking. The people of Kansas City took great pride in this system, and it gave promise of setting an example for establishing similar organizations throughout the country.

Yet, today, this community blood bank in Kansas City is in the process of being torn apart. And it is being torn by, of all things, a Federal agency which, obstensibly, is trying to preserve competition in our free enterprise system of economy. It is being torn apart by the Federal Trade Commission.

Not only is it being torn apart—which is terrible in itself—the FTC also reveals in the process its own decrepitude and utter inefficiency.

The complaint was filed on July 5, 1962. It took from then until June 19, 1964, for a tentative decision by the trial examiner. And then—and this is the astounding part—it took the Commission itself an additional 2 years to reach a decision.

No matter what they do, one would think that the Commission could affirm or deny the examiner's tentative opinion in a fraction of 2 years.

In addition to a great waste of time on the part of both the Government and the defendants, the legal fees have been immense—enough to put most organizations out of business, whether guilty as sin or pure as the driven snow.

This is a perfect example, if another one were needed, for passage of a revised Administrative Procedure Act to speed up the administrative process. And our distinguished minority leader and I have reintroduced a bill very similar to S. 1336 of the 89th Congress which passed the Senate on June 21, 1966, and which is designed for this very purpose.

To get back to blood banking, you may ask what has community blood banking in Kansas City got to do with American free enterprise, and why is the Federal Trade Commission trying to throttle this civic enterprise.

The answer is not simple, but the FTC action against the Kansas City Community Blood Bank arose out of complaints made by two small commercial blood banks which remained in Kansas City after the organization of the community blood bank. In its complaint, the FTC charges that the participating doctors and hospitals of the community system are "conspiring" to drive the private blood banks out of business. The FTC is charging that this "conspiracy" is a violation of the antitrust laws. I seriously question, first, if the Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction over nonprofit blood banks, or second, if blood is an article of commerce as that term is used in the antitrust laws.

These same problems worried the two FTC Commissioners who dissented in the 3-to-2 order of October 26, 1966. As Commissioner Philip Elman put it:

> This commission was not established to sit as a board of review over professional medical judgments made by doctors in course of their practice.

The following are a few quotes from Commissioner Elman's opinion:

> It is not for us to decide whether the respondents were exercising sound medical judgment in insisting on higher standards for the blood to be used in treating *their* patients. If a group of doctors have concluded not to use certain blood because of genuine doubts as to its safety and reliability, they should not be compelled by order of the Federal Trade Commission to accept such blood. This Commission was not established to sit as a board of review over professional medical judgments made by doctors in the course of their practice.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Under the Commission's order in this case the respondent doctors will *not* be free to exercise their own professional medical judgment, as they see fit, in accepting or rejecting blood from commercial blood banks. They will *not* be free to meet, discuss, and recommend the use or non-use of such blood. If there should be any such meetings or discussions and if any doctor should refuse to accept blood from a commercial blood bank, he will be subject to $5,000-a-day penalties for violation of the order. The right of the respondent doctors to practice medicine is thus seriously restricted by the order, which deprives them, individually and collectively, of the freedom to exercise a professional medical choice in accepting or rejecting blood to be used in treating their patients.
>
> This case is atypical, to the point of freakishness, of the kind of proceedings this Commission is equipped to bring in the restraint of trade area. It does not involve monopoly or competition in the usual sense. It does not involve conduct having commercial motives or ends; the participants are not business concerns actuated by the profit motive. What this case really involves is an acrimonious private controversy, professional and personal in character and origin, between the pathologists and the commercial blood bankers in Kansas City. The Commission, whose mandate and function is to foster and protect the competitive process, should not intrude itself in such controversy. If there is need for governmental intervention in this matter, the State of Missouri has ample authority to take such regulatory measures as protection of the public interest may require. We should stick to our own job: the elimination of unfair methods of competition in interstate commerce. Regulating the professional conduct of doctors is not our business.

However, the point I wish to emphasize is that the FTC should not have jurisdiction over community blood banks, and blood should not be considered an article of commerce for purposes of the antitrust laws. We should have a specific statute on the books to this effect, because, if the FTC wins its argument on the question of jurisdiction, and if it wins its argument on the question of blood being an article of commerce, and if it finds a conspiracy on the part of the Kansas City Community Blood Bank, then the whole effort to replace confusion with order in the field of blood banking will go straight down the drain.

Community blood banks cannot survive and flourish if the FTC can force them to "hold an umbrella" over any merchant of blood for profit who wishes to operate in their area.

There is no question about the fact that the FTC's case against Kansas City is a test case. If the FTC wins this case, the nonprofit facilities and systems in a large number of communities across the country will be put in grave danger of being crippled or put out of business. I have a partial list of such nonprofit facilities which is as follows:

NONPROFIT FACILITIES LISTED AS MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF BLOOD BANKS

Aurora Area Blood Bank, Aurora, Ill.
Bay County Blood Bank, Inc., Panama City, Fla.
Beaumont Blood Center, Inc., Beaumont, Tex.
Becker County Blood Bank, St. Mary's Hospital, Detroit Lakes, Minn.
Belle Bonfils Memorial Blood Bank, Denver, Colo.
Bender Blood Bank, Albany, N.Y.
Bergen Community Blood Bank, Paramus, N.J.
Blood Bank of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii.
Blood Bank of San Bernardino-Riverside Counties, San Bernardino, Calif.[1]
Blood Bank of the Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association, Oakland, Calif.[1]
Blood Center of Mount Sinai Medical Research Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
Boulder Blood Bank, Boulder, Colo.
Broome County Blood Center, Binghamton, N.Y.[1]
Carter Blood Center, Fort Worth, Tex.
Central Blood Bank, Inc., South Bend, Ind.
Central Blood Bank of Pittsburgh, Falk Clinic, Pittsburgh, Pa.[1]
Central California Blood Bank, Fresno, Calif.[1]
Central Florida Blood Bank, Inc., Orlando, Fla.[1]
Cerro Gordo County Medical Society Blood Bank, Mason City, Iowa.[1]
City of Kingston Laboratory Blood Bank, Kingston, N.Y.[1]
Community Blood Bank, Norton, Va.
Community Blood Bank, Inc., St. Petersburg, Fla.[1]
Community Blood Center, Inc., Appleton, Wis.
Community Blood Council of New York.
Delta Blood Bank, Stockton, Calif.
Des Moines County Medical Society Blood Bank, Inc., Burlington, Iowa.[1]
Dubuque Blood Bank Association, Dubuque, Iowa.[1]
Elks Blood Bank, Danville, Ill.
Escambia Blood Bank, Inc., Pensacola, Fla.[1]
Essex County Blood Bank, Inc., East Orange, N.J.[1]
Hamilton Blood Bank, Inc., Hamilton, Ohio.
Hospital Blood Service, Inc., Detroit, Mich.
Houchin Community Blood Bank, Bakersfield, Calif.[1]
Inter-County Blood Banks, Inc., Jamaica, N.Y.[1]
Irwin Memorial Blood Bank of San Francisco Medical Society, San Francisco, Calif.[1]
J. K. and Susie L. Wadley Research Institute & Blood Bank, Dallas, Tex.[1]
Jacksonville Blood Bank, Inc., Jacksonville, Fla.
Jacob Blumberg Memorial Blood Bank of Lake County Medical Society, Inc., Waukegan, Ill.
John Elliott Blood Bank of Dade County, Miami, Fla.[1]
John Henry Thomas Memorial Blood Bank, Alachua General Hospital, Gainesville, Fla.[1]
Kenosha County Blood Bank, Inc., Kenosha, Wis.[1]
King County Central Blood Bank, Inc., Seattle, Wash.[1]
Lane Memorial Blood Bank, Eugene, Oreg.[1]
Leon County Blood Bank, Inc., Tallahassee, Fla.[1]
Lewiston Clarkston Blood Bank, Inc., St. Joseph's Hospital, Lewiston, Idaho.[1]
Lorain County Blood Bank, Elyria Memorial Hospital, Elyria, Ohio.[1]

---

[1] Blood banks similar in operation to the Community Blood Bank of the Kansas City Area, Inc.

Lower West Coast Blood Bank, Memorial Hospital, Sarasota, Fla.[1]
Manatee County Blood Bank, Inc., Bradenton, Fla.[1]
Marathon County Blood Bank, Inc., Wausau, Wis.
Marion County Blood Bank, Munroe Memorial Hospital, Ocala, Fla.[1]
Michael Reese Research Foundation Blood Center, Chicago, Ill.
Milwaukee Blood Center, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.[1]
Minneapolis War Memorial Blood Bank, Minneapolis, Minn.[1]
Northern & Northeastern Michigan Blood Bank, Bay City, Mich.
Northern California Community Blood Bank, Eureka, Calif.[1]
Northern Illinois Blood Bank, Inc., Rockford, Ill.[1]
Oklahoma City Community Blood Bank, Inc., Oklahoma City, Okla.
Palm Beach Blood Bank, Inc., West Palm Beach, Fla.
Peninsula Memorial Blood Bank, Burlingame, Calif.[1]
Polk County Blood Center, Inc., Lakeland, Fla.[1]
Potter County Memorial Blood Center, Amarillo, Tex.
Putnam County Blood Bank, Palatka, Fla.
Sacramento Medical Foundation Blood Bank, Sacramento, Calif.[1]
St. John's County Blood Bank, Inc., St. Augustine, Fla.[1]
San Diego Blood Bank, San Diego, Calif.[1]
Scott County Medical Society Blood Bank, Inc., Davenport, Iowa.[1]
Shreveport Emergency Blood Bank, Inc., Shreveport, La.
Skagit County Blood Bank, Skagit Valley Clinical Laboratory, Inc., Mount Vernon, Wash.[1]
Snohomish County Blood Bank Association, Inc., Santa Rosa, Calif.[1]
Southeast Iowa Blood Bank, Ottumwa, Iowa.
Southern Michigan Blood Center, Inc., Detroit, Mich.
Southwest Blood Banks, Inc., Scottsdale, Ariz.
Southwest Florida Blood Bank, Inc., Tampa General Hospital, Tampa, Fla.[1]
Spokane and Inland Empire Blood Bank, Spokane, Wash.[1]
Superior-Douglas County Community Blood Bank, Superior, Wis.
Tacoma-Pierce County Blood Bank, Inc., Tacoma, Wash.[1]
Topeka Blood Bank, Inc., Topeka, Kansas.
Tri-Counties Blood Bank, Inc., Santa Barbara, Calif.[1]
University of Cincinnati Blood Transfusion Service, Cincinnati General Hospital, Cincinnati, Ohio.[1]
Upper Pinellas County Blood Bank, Inc., Clearwater, Fla.[1]
Virginia Blood Bank, Inc., Richmond, Va.
W. E. Stewart Blood Bank, Inc., Tyler, Tex.

When the basic antitrust laws were enacted, there were no equivalents of blood banks. If there had been such organizations in existence in those early days, I do not believe that the Congress would have evidenced a desire to include them within the operation of those laws.

Equally, today, I do not believe it is the sense of the Congress that such valuable, communitywide, nonprofit blood banks should be subject to FTC harassment under the antitrust laws. In view of the FTC's dogged determination to push the Kansas City case to an eventual conclusion, notwithstanding the civic result of such action, I think we have no alternative except a statutory amendment to the antitrust laws giving a specific exemption to those community organizations. Therefore, I am introducing for appropriate reference a bill for this purpose and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

[1] Blood banks similar in operation to the Community Blood Bank of the Kansas City Area, Inc.

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. 628) to amend the antitrust laws to provide that the refusal of nonprofit blood banks and of hospitals and physicians to obtain blood and blood plasma from other blood banks shall not be deemed to be acts in restraint of trade, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri (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. 628

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall not be deemed to be an act in restraint of trade under any law of the United States for any nonprofit blood bank, nonprofit reservoir of other human tissue or organs, any hospital or any physician to refuse, or to join together with others in refusing, to obtain from or to accept delivery of blood, blood plasma, other tissues or organs from any other such blood bank or reservoir.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I am honored to have as cosponsors on this bill, Senators CARLSON, HOLLAND, PEARSON, SCOTT, SYMINGTON, and TOWER.

You will note that the bill refers not only to blood banks but additionally to banks for other tissues and organs of the body. Although banking of other tissues and organs is in its infancy, there are many indications that these repositories will become quite common in the future. I believe that the Congress should encourage their organization on a community nonprofit basis, rather than on a private commercial basis. The addition of repositories of organs and tissues—other than blood—was made at the suggestion of a number of distinguished doctors and I believe it is a worthy addition to the original draft of the bill.

USIA PERSONNEL BILL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening and improving the Foreign Service personnel system through the establishment of a Foreign Service Information Officer Corps.

Near the close of the last session, I offered an identical bill, S. 3907, as an alternative to the proposal that 697 of the U.S. Information Agency's top Foreign Service officers be blanketed into the Foreign Service of the United States. I believe that USIA will be able to implement its mission more successfully by having a separate personnel system in which its Foreign Service officers may be trained, developed, and promoted as professionals in the field of public persuasion; but it should also be a system which is closely enough related to that provided by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 so that the officers of USIA and the Department of State may work smoothly together both in Washington and overseas. This bill is designed to meet all these requirements.

During this period of our history, hundreds of thousands of our young men are devoting critical years of their early manhood to the military service of their country. I deem it wrong to lose sight of their sacrifice when they are mustered out and have to compete for civilian careers. Therefore, in the final paragraph of the bill, I have stipulated that the principle of veterans' preference be applied during the recruiting stage of this proposed new career service.

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

The bill (S. 633) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening and improving the Foreign Service personnel system of the U.S. Information Agency through establishment of a Foreign Service Information Officer Corps, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROTECTION OF RIGHT OF PRIVACY BY PROHIBITING EAVESDROPPING

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen the security of the United States, lessen a burden on interstate commerce, and protect the right of privacy by prohibiting eavesdropping.

Although I realize this bill goes much further than any similar legislation yet introduced, I do not believe it goes too far.

My bill runs not only against wiretapping, but against all forms of eavesdropping through the use of mechanical or electronic aids of any kind, except normal hearing aids used by persons with hearing deficiencies. The prohibitions of this bill would cover wiretapping, the placement of "bugs" or any other electronic listening devices, the use of parabolic sound reflectors, "black light" beams, or any other method of eavesdropping which has been devised or which may be devised.

Exceptions would be permitted in national security cases, but only when authorized and supervised by the Attorney General. In organized crime cases, a Federal judge could issue a warrant based upon a proper showing of probable cause, by affidavit, which would authorize maintenance of specified surveillance for a period up to 6 months. In other crime cases, similar warrants could be issued, to be valid for not more than 72 hours. Warrants issued in crime cases could be renewed upon a proper showing of continuing probable cause. These are the only exceptions in which eavesdropping of any kind would be permitted under the terms of my bill.

One of the big problems in drafting antiwiretapping legislation in the past has been the difficulty of defining the proposed crime without violating the

due process clause of the fifth amendment through vagueness, or indefiniteness.

I believe we have solved that problem, and I feel sure my bill will withstand a judicial test on the due process issue.

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

The bill (S. 634) to strengthen the security of the United States, lessen a burden on interstate commerce, and protect the right of privacy by prohibiting eavesdropping, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE HENRY F. SCHRICKER NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to change the name of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which was established by act of Congress—Public Law 89-761—last year, to the Henry F. Schricker National Lakeshore. I do this because of the widespread veneration in my State for Mr. Schricker, the only two-term Governor in the history of Indiana, who died on December 28, 1966, after a long and honorable life as a public servant.

Few men command the respect, admiration and affection of the people to the degree that belonged to Henry Schricker. Born in 1883 to immigrant parents in a small, rural town of Indiana, he rose through the ranks of business and politics to become a legend in his time. He was a man of the people, one who spoke their language and was always available to them. He was noted for his honesty, forthrightness, thriftiness, and courage. His contributions to his community, his State, and to his Nation were many and enduring.

Henry Schricker's career was marked by a slow but steady rise from humble beginnings to his post as chief executive of his State. As a young lad he clerked in his father's grocery store, then, following high school, worked in the Starke County clerk's office. Not being able to attend law school, he read law at night and was admitted to the bar. After losing his first political race for county clerk, he turned to banking and newspaper work, serving both as cashier and as editor. He became the president of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association, but was defeated in his first attempt to become a member of the Indiana General Assembly.

In his home community he was a leader in many civic activities—member of the school board, chief of the volunteer fire department, head of the liberty loan drive in World War I, president of the chamber of commerce, and numerous other positions of responsibility.

His career in state politics began in 1932 with his election to the State senate. Four years later he was nominated and elected Lieutenant Governor, and in 1940 he was chosen Governor of Indiana. During his first term he faced a legislature which, under the control of the opposing party, adopted a series of "ripper" laws which attempted to take away much of the powers of the chief executive. Although his veto of these bills was overridden by the legislature, they were later held unconstitutional by the State supreme court.

As Governor during much of World War II, Mr. Schricker devoted his energies selflessly to the task of leading the people of Indiana during those trying times. His spotless white hat soon became a symbol or trademark, recognized throughout the State. He was forced into temporary retirement from politics in 1945 by the provision of the Indiana constitution which prohibits any Governor to succeed himself. The great confidence which the people placed in this man, however, was demonstrated in 1948 when be became the only person to be elected again to the office of Indiana Governor. He was also nominated by his party for U.S. Senator, but was defeated in a close election.

Mr. President, the people of my State loved Henry Schricker. Although he was a Democrat, he drew support from both parties and from all areas of the State. He was a man of many virtues and talents, one who believed firmly in democracy, and a dedicated public servant. He had a strong sense of duty and adhered strongly to his principles. To him public office was a public trust in every sense of the word, and no one ever charged him with shirking his duty or hesitating to act according to his convictions.

Mr. President, no more fitting memorial to this great American could be devised than designating the new national park in Indiana the Henry F. Schricker National Lakeshore. He loved his native State; he was a resident of the northwestern section. Although he had retired from active governmental office before Congress established the park, he did much in his day to promote conservation and to develop the natural resources of Indiana. In view of his long, devoted record of public service, I urge that serious consideration be given to this proposal.

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

The bill (S. 635) to change the name of the lakeshore known as the Indiana Dunes Lakeshore to the Henry F. Schricker National Lakeshore, introduced by Mr. BAYH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

IMPROVEMENT OF OPERATION OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 32

MICROPHONES IN THE SENATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], I send to the desk an amendment to S. 355, and ask that it be printed.

The Senate will be considering the resolution as the next order of business after the order of business which will be voted on today.

By this amendment, I seek—at long last—to have installed in the Senate a suitable electronic public address system, including microphones to be placed on the desk of the Presiding Officer and on the desk of each Senator.

There have been many instances of misquotation in the Press Gallery. The ladies and gentlemen of the press all suffer from very serious ear strain because it is practically impossible to delineate clearly what is said on the floor, notwithstanding the tremendous gift for ad hoc debate in this Chamber, which is an ornament of the Senate.

One of its principal ornaments, in that regard, our distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], sits at his desk right now.

Mr. President, the men and women in the Press Galleries often cannot follow the speeches being made, unless a Senator has taken the precaution of having it written out and sent up to them, or they will chase down after him when he has made his speech in order to be sure that they have quoted him correctly. If there is any difference, well, that is one of those very difficult situations.

It is interesting that the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] brought a small electronic device into the Senate the other day in order to make himself heard, because momentarily his voice is not equal to the task.

I hope very much the Senate will give this matter consideration and will modernize itself so that at least the microphones are consistent with the snuff boxes.

Last year, I introduced Senate Resolution 65 which called for the installation of microphones in the Senate. This measure was cosponsored by 15 Senators, and is similar to a measure I introduced in 1957 during my first term in this body. At that time, the Architect of the Capitol was directed to look into the feasibility of the plan, but found that a great many Senators objected to the proposal on the ground that large, unsightly microphones would mar the appearance of the Senate Chamber. During the 10 years which have elapsed since that survey, the science of electronics has been improved to a substantial degree making it possible, for example, to have powerful microphones of a small size installed inconspicuously—perhaps in the little used inkwells which adorn our desks.

The House of Representatives has a public address system in its Chamber and, as a result, Members have not been confused because of difficulty in hearing the Presiding Officer or another Member—as occasionally happens—and the public and the press are able to follow the debate more fully.

In order to give the original cosponsors of this resolution an opportunity to join me in offering this amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment remain at the desk until the close of business tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The amendment (No. 32) is as follows:

On page 80, line 3, insert the following new subsection:

"(a) In order to insure that debates of the Senate may be heard in all parts of the Senate Chamber and in the galleries thereof, the Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized and directed to take such action as may be required for the installation and operation within the Senate Chamber of a suitable electrical public address system, including a microphone placed at the desk of the Presiding Officer and at the desk of each Senator.

"(b) To the extent authorized by law, the expenses incurred for the installation and operation of such public address system may be defrayed from the contingent fund of the Senate."

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—S. 5

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on January 11 I introduced S. 5, the truth in lending bill, and requested that it be held at the table until January 25 for additional cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that the final printed version of S. 5 be amended, as follows:

Under section 2, following the words "would be enhanced," insert the words "and that competition among the various financial institutions and other firms engaged in lending or the extension of credit would be strengthened."

The purpose of this technical change is to make clear that the basic purpose of the bill is to insure competition among financial institutions as well as to promote economic stabilization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTIONS

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 resolutions:

Authority of January 11, 1967:

S. 15. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a deduction for certain amounts paid by individuals for the support of their parents and other relatives who have attained the age of 65: Mr. BAKER, and Mr. HRUSKA.

S. 23. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MCGEE, and Mr. MOSS.

S.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim "National CARIH Asthma Week": Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DODD, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TOWER, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

Authority of January 12, 1967:

S. 273. A bill to provide for the issuance by the Secretary of Agriculture of a 25-cent-per-bushel export marketing certificate on wheat for the 1967, 1968, and 1969 crops of wheat: Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MONDALE.

S. 275. A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in real estate subdivisions sold through the mails and instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes: Mr. BIBLE.

S. Res. 16. Resolution to amend rule XXV to create a Committee on Veteran's Affairs: Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. RIBICOFF, and Mr. TALMADGE.

Authority of January 18, 1967:

S. 467. A bill to provide for a study with respect to the utilization of systems analysis and management techniques in dealing with problems relating to unemployment, public welfare, education, and similar problems: Mr. FONG, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. PROUTY.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 275, THE INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Securities of the Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on Tuesday, February 28, on S. 275, the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act. The hearings will commence at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with this bill should notify Mr. Stephen Paradise, assistant counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, telephone 225-3921.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 24, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 376) fixing the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Joint Economic Committee.

SENATOR DIRKSEN AND HIS STATE OF THE UNION APPRAISAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement which I made relative to the state of the Union appraisal by the distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN.

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

The distinguished Minority Leader in the Senate (Mr. Dirksen) in his Republican appraisal of the State of the Union, has, indeed, in his own phrase and actions, demonstrated the meaning of loyal opposition.

On the gravest of the issues before us, Viet Nam, Senator Dirksen has stood substantially with the President and where he has differed, he has done so constructively. He has called for "full, free and orderly discussion" of the best ways and means to seek a solution to that conflict.

I am sure the President appreciates his view that we must look ahead to negotiations and beyond negotiations to the kind of Asia we hope will emerge in the years ahead. Beginning with the Johns Hopkins speech in Baltimore in April 1965, the President has taken very active steps in that direction and I am sure he would be glad to give consideration to any other such steps which the Minority Leader might suggest.

Elsewhere in the world the Minority Leader sees problems and difficulties. He raises questions and points to problems. I would only say most respectfully that while the problems are real, more progress is being made than Senator Dirksen suggests.

In Latin America, for example, the Alliance for Progress moves forward. For three years in a row—1964, 1965, 1966—the countries of Latin America have moved forward in real terms at or close to 2.5% per capita in gross national product. Some 12 countries in Latin America in 1966 transferred power peacefully through free elections. The inner security of most Latin American countries appears to have improved and the threat of aggression has diminished. Inter-American trade is expanding rapidly. In Central America, and throughout Latin America, the concept of mutually beneficial Common Markets seems to be taking hold.

In Africa there are indeed grave difficulties; but they are hardly of our making or, in any great measure, amenable to our resolution. In Africa, as in the case of other continents, the Africans themselves will be primarily responsible for what happens. I am sure that the Minority Leader is not suggesting that we substitute ourselves and take on the responsibilities which properly rest with the Africans.

In Europe there is ferment and change. The concept of NATO still prevails, however, and there are some welcome tendencies to a lessening of tension which the distinguished Minority Leader will help to encourage, I am sure, by the sober and non-political consideration which he will give the East-West trade and other questions of European relations, if and when they reach the floor.

Yes, there are points of danger. This is not a simple world with which we have to deal. But we remain a strong and prosperous nation. Under the President's leadership, we will make our contributions and seek to have others make contributions so that the underlying tide in the world will flow towards the things we stand for, not away from them.

I am sure that any constructive suggestions which were made or may be made in the future by the distinguished Minority Leader will be examined most seriously and given every consideration by President Johnson.

VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, many commentators, columnists, and editorial writers see the issue of the Vietnam war in shades of black and white with no great gray areas in between Under their terms of definition, a person is classified either as a dove or a hawk; and, according to some, if a person raises questions about the war, he is considered suspect, and if he does not, he is considered secure. The same reasoning works in reverse, because there are dogmatic columnists, commentators, and editors at both poles of this question.

We are, however, very fortunate in having people in the news profession who try to see the whole picture of Vietnam, to consider it against a background of all colors of the spectrum and, on that basis, set down their views either orally or in writing. One in the latter group is Robert Sherrod, a distinguished combat correspondent of World War II, who, since that time, has served as chief Time-Life correspondent in the Far East, and has covered the Pentagon in Washington. Since 1952 Mr. Sherrod's career has included assignments with the Saturday Evening Post. He began his serv-

ice on that publication as a Far Eastern reporter and later became the managing editor as well as editor and editor at large. Then he was named vice president and editorial coordinator of the Post's parent company, Curtis Publishing.

Mr. Sherrod has now returned to Life magazine and to reporting. In the January 27 issue he has written a most worthwhile article entitled "Notes on a Monstrous War." Bob Sherrod has tried to do, and in my opinion has done, a straight and honest job of reporting on the war and Vietnam. In his article he points to some factors in the Vietnamese situation which may be hard for us to swallow; but his reporting is not only first rate, his views and observations are also well thought out and worthy of the consideration of the Senate, the administration and, most important of all, the American people. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article by Bob Sherrod be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

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

NOTES ON A MONSTROUS WAR

(By Robert Sherrod)

Why go to Vietnam? I asked myself that question a dozen times before starting my semi-circumnavigation of the globe. (How many times had I crossed the Pacific? Was it 31? Or 32?) After all, there were already 500 correspondents present, half of them Americans—surely enough to tell everything worth mentioning about the war in this Florida-sized corner of Southeast Asia. Despite the generally incredulous attitude of many Americans, one heard the same question asked in New York as in Chicago or San Francisco, "What's really going on out there?"—and I did not expect to discover anything new or astonishing about this war which started so small and grew into one of the most historic and traumatic episodes of our era. No censorship hid vast and overwhelming events, such as the deadly kamikaze attacks of World War II, which in six months sank or damaged more than 300 American naval vessels before a word about them was allowed to appear in the American press.

Nonetheless, out of a consuming curiosity I was glad to be going to Vietnam. I had seen the war almost from the beginning, just after the Viet Minh, as the Vietcong were then called, attacked Hanoi on Dec. 19, 1946, and I had seen it near the last, demoralized gasp of the French regime, just before Dien Bien Phu was overrun in 1954. At that time I had written an article speculating on the possibility that one day American blood might be spilled in Indochina, but in my wildest dreams I never imagined that within a dozen years half a million of us would be locked in a death struggle with an inferior force of litle men who didn't even have any artillery. How could such a monstrous situation have come to pass? Why couldn't we win this war into which we had drifted, willy-nilly, and sunk deeper throughout the years? Why?

At the outset I heard the fear expressed which would arise in every conversation I had with the men who run the war. En route to Vietnam I stopped in Pearl Harbor to see Admiral U.S. Grant Sharp, commander-in-chief of the Pacific, eighth in line of succession to the late, great Chester Nimitz. Admiral Sharp said, "The only thing that can defeat us is for the American people to get tired of the war." This was not only known to the enemy; it formed the basis of his strategy. Ho Chi Minh has said he can hold out for 10 years because he knows very well the American people will not stand for another decade of war in Vietnam.

As my plane sailed in from Hong Kong, I looked once again upon the red tile roofs and the palm trees of Saigon. During the next two months I recorded some random impressions of this war we never expected to have to fight.

We moved inch by inch through the unspeakable traffic and the blue fumes of the five-mile, 45-minute drive from Tan Son Nhut, preposterously the busiest airport in the world, to Saigon, a city meant to hold 200,000 people which today festers with more than two million. "I had a dream the other night," said the colonel sitting beside me. "I dreamt the war here in Vietnam cost us more than World War II." That would be something over $350 billion.

Nothing I had read, no photographs I had seen prepared me for the immensity of the American effort. It is impressive enough to read that we have committed more troops to Vietnam than were necessary to fight the North Koreans and Chinese combined in 1950 and to realize that each American soldier carries six times the firepower he had in World War II. But the fantastic expense of Vietnam—$20 billion last year, $10 billion beyond the estimate—can only be comprehended in the viewing.

Literally everything is Texas-sized, from the new "Pentagon West" ($25 million), which will provide offices for most of the 68 American generals stationed in Saigon, to a cantonment for 60,000 troops under construction at Long Binh ($90 million). Both projects should be ready for occupancy this fall.

In World War II the engineers or Seabees would level a 3,000-foot strip of topsoil, lay some pierced steel plank and report the airfield ready to receive planes. With jet planes it's different. Jets need dust-free, 10,000-foot strips of aluminum or concrete—which cost $5 million or more. We have built nine new jet landing fields between Da Nang and Saigon. The total number of airfields in South Vietnam is now 282, one of the highest in the world. Will these become the Stonehenges—or, more appropriately, the Angkor Wats—of Vietnam, the relics of a civilization which passed that way? Or will the Vietnamese dig up the concrete so that rice can be planted here again?

In less than two years the number of American troops based on Vietnamese soil has leaped from 25,000 to more than 400,000. To support them 150 cargo vessels are always on the seas or at the docks. The trouble was the lack of docks, which often forced ships to wait a month to unload at Saigon. Okay, build deep-water piers. Saigon has three, and nearby New Port will have four. The big Marine Corps base at Da Nang had no piers; all supplies had to be unloaded by lighter. So we dredged channels and built three piers which, with attached facilities such as a four-lane concrete bridge, will cost $120 million. Development of the great natural harbor at Cam Ranh Bay, the site of President Johnson's visit last November, will come cheaper—only $110 million.

One evening I flew from the demilitarized zone down to Saigon, about three quarters of the length of this 900-mile string bean of a country. Much of the coast was lit up by flares; artillery shells twinkled in 40 or 50 different spots. No battles were being fought that night but the Vietcong, if present, presumably were being kept awake and the interdicting fire prevented them from traveling certain routes in case they intended going that way. This lavish use of firepower, whether effective or not, contributes to the cost of killing the enemy, which is calculated at $400,000 per soldier—including 75 bombs and 150 artillery shells for each corpse.

The diplomat was dressed all in blue—pale-blue suit, medium-blue shirt, dark-blue tie. He slumped in a leather chair, stretching his long legs halfway across his air-conditioned office.

"I pity the poor bastard who takes the 5:07 to Larchmont and tries to understand this war on the basis of his service in Europe," he said. "It's like the difference between the Middle Ages and World War II."

How long will the war last? Foremost Dairies has a contract (for $18 million) with the Navy to build and operate a plant at Chu Lai and one at Da Nang which will produce each day for the U.S. armed forces 9,000 gallons of reconstituted milk, 2,500 gallons of ice cream and 3,000 pounds of cottage cheese. The contract expires in 1971.

Things look more optimistic at the Saigon offices of the great consortium known as Raymond Morrison-Knudsen Brown & Root and J. A. Jones, whose $1 billion contract (the biggest in history) for airfields, piers and other heavy construction will be completed sometime in 1968.

The most striking aspect of the Vietnamese war is the professionalism of the whole operation. In spite of the arrival of many thousands of draftees in the past few months, one doesn't get the impression that this is yet a war of civilians in uniform. I did not meet a single battalion commander, Army or Marine, who wasn't a regular officer. Most of the Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps fliers are either regulars or reserves who intend to become regulars. The tenor of the war is as professional as the banana war the Marines fought in the Nicaraguan and Haitian jungles in the 1920's, which were the nearest precedent—on a minuscule scale—we have had to Vietnam.

One can hardly blame President Johnson and Secretary McNamara for resisting demands that the reserves be called up and the National Guard mobilized. What they have in Vietnam is a smoothly functioning machine that does its job with the detachment of a surgeon in an accident ward. It is a war without songs, slogans or humor.

Morale is unquestionably good, with less griping in a month than one used to hear in a day. For once the military pychiatrists are underemployed. Said one of them, "If you count the combat-fatigue factor in World War II as 25, the Korean war as five, then the Vietnamese war would be one."

What are the reasons for this phenomenal decline in crackups? Most important is a man's guarantee that he will be sent home after 12 months (13 in the case of the Marines); he receives a card with his return date on it even before he leaves the States for Vietnam. Every soldier I met could tell me precisely how many days he had left in Vietnam.

There are other factors. In Vietnam there is no such thing as spending long weeks "in the line." Most battles last only a few hours. Then, too, in this war the troops have no fear of enemy artillery or bombs or tanks. The hundred-a-week killed-in-action rate is militarily acceptable (though this is small consolation to those platoons which occasionally must take heavy casualties).

One finds few of the gung-ho glory hunters who turned up in great numbers in the war against Japan. The argument that this is a holy crusade against Communism is sometimes put forth by officers, but I observed that it usually fell flat. On the other hand, the deep doubts that affect some American college students do not seep into the ranks, possibly because so few of these soldiers ever got beyond high school.

There is little doubt that this is a poor boy's war, with a heavy percentage of Negroes (up to 30% in some extra-pay airborne units). The boys are taller, stronger and neater than their World War II counterparts, because the Army can pick and choose when it is only one-eighth the size it was a quarter

century ago. What we have achieved in Vietnam is the equivalent of a half-million-man Foreign Legion.

As professionals our troops don't flinch from the unpleasant duty of killing a 90-pound underdog. One day I asked Marine Corporal Tony de Vargas from Espanola, New Mexico how he felt on this point. He replied, "Charlie may be little, but he carries a big gun."

Without a Pearl Harbor to remember, what motivates the men who must do the killing? The foremost incentive, I believe, is revenge on the cunning, ruthless enemy who kills a man's friends or blows their legs off with booby traps. This comradeship factor probably has been underestimated in previous wars and should be ranked above flag, honor, duty or mom's apple pie.

All good military units cultivate this one-for-all, all-for-one spirit, of course. In Vietnam a soldier can take pride in belonging to the finest outfits in American military history, such as the 1st Infantry Division ("the Big Red One"), the airmobile 1st Cavalry Division ("the First Team"), the 101st and the 173rd Airborne brigades. Nearly a third of the combat battalions in Vietnam belong to the Marines, who long ago claimed the patent on *esprit de corps*.

One finds many officers who are serving their second tour in Vietnam usually in the advisory teams attached to the South Vietnamese army; I found a few who are in the country for a third time. A colonel with the Vietnamese IV Corps in the Mekong Delta said one day, "I was one of those who told McNamara in 1964 that the war would be over by the end of 1965; I swear I thought it would be. But don't you dare print my name."

From a helicopter I watched a sharp, two-hour fight in the Mekong Delta in which three battalions of South Vietnamese soldiers landed in a rice paddy and attacked a battalion of Vietcong just beyond the tree line. Our chopper arrived back at a division headquarters as other machines were hauling in our side's dead (23) and wounded (86), who were covered with a mixture of their own blood and the putrid slime of the paddy.

My companion, Colonel Charles Davis, USA, who has seen a lot of combat in his time—he won a Medal of Honor at Guadalcanal in 1943—looked upon the miserable pile of human cargo and said, "Whether it's a big war or a small war, when you're dead, you're very dead."

Other Vietnamese soldiers arrived with stretchers and lifted the casualties into Red Cross-marked ambulances. I was startled to see that this transfer was accomplished without even a modicum of diagnosis—on one stretcher lay a stone-dead soldier; the man beside him, a big hole in his back, waved his arms weakly and tried to talk. Then I realized I was back in the Orient, where death is commonplace and Western niceties frequently go unobserved.

Nothing amazes me more than the smooth and swift integration of the U.S. armed forces. One day at Dong Ha, near the North Vietnam border, I talked to a group of Marines from the force reconnaissance company, an outfit that is qualified in both parachute jumping and submarine landings. Thirteen of them, including four Negroes, had just returned, their faces camouflaged green and black, from a three-day jungle patrol—a dangerous mission that by its nature requires every man to rely completely on every one of his comrades. All of them, it developed, came from different states except two of the white boys who were from Alabama—Kenneth Carlisle from Selma, Larry Smith from Montgomery.

Seventy-five years have passed since Rudyard Kipling penned his cynical lament about the white man's problems east of Suez:

Now it is not good for the Christian's health
to hustle the Aryan brown,
For the Christian riles and the Aryan smiles
and he weareth the Christian down;
And the end of the fight is a tombstone white
with the name of the late deceased,
And the epitaph drear: "A fool lies here
who tried to hustle the East."

One day, while flying at 20,000 feet from Pleiku to Saigon, I found that General William Westmoreland, the trim, jut-jawed commander of U.S. forces in the country, knew the Kipling quote very well indeed.

General Westmoreland, an Episcopalian, would be less than human if he didn't get a bit riled occasionally. From Phan Thiet, a provincial capital on the South China Sea, he helicoptered not long ago to a nearby Special Forces camp on the edge of a village that had been frightened by the Vietcong. After the camp was established, the villagers began to trickle back, demonstrating their confidence in the change of command.

The captain in the green beret said, "The Catholics in the village have cooperated completely. But the Buddhists are still sitting on the fence. The chief *bonze* wants a bribe; he says dig him a well and give him 10,000 *piastres* [about $85]." The general frowned, but diplomatically said nothing.

At lunch in Saigon one day several old Asia hands were discussing the perennial subject: how could we have avoided this war? Is it really Lyndon Johnson's war? What would Kennedy have done? Suppose Eisenhower had tried to save Dien Bien Phu by American intervention in 1954, as advocated by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Arthur Radford?

A Catholic priest with a quarter century's experience in Asia spoke up: "We had two chances. In 1916 if we had got tough with the French about colonialism, as we did with the Dutch and the British, Ho Chi Minh would have come in on our side. Despite some evidence to the contrary, I believe Ho would have been a Tito even before Tito told off Stalin.

"Our last chance was 1949–1950, when we ought to have cut off all aid to the French; remember they were fighting this colonial war with American weapons. At that time Ho was still scared of the Chinese; he didn't take much comfort from the Communists taking over China. After 1950 the French defeat became inevitable and American involvement inevitably followed."

The President of the United States in 1946 and 1950 was Harry S. Truman. He had other things on his mind—such as rescuing France herself from chaos and possibly Communism.

Nothing in 1966 caused more surprise than the collapse of the Buddhist leaders' rebellion, which almost tore South Vietnam apart last spring. One evening Prime Minister Ky told a group of Americans that his success against the Buddhist dissidents was due to his grandmother-in-law. "She is a Buddhist nun and she told me, 'Now you can attack them,'" he said. "That's when I attacked."

Dr. Nguyen Huu Chi, one of two province chiefs among Vietnam's 45 who are civilians, holds a Ph.D. in political science from Michigan State University. Since the Quan Nam provincial capital, Hoi An, is only 15 miles from Da Nang, I arranged to visit Dr. Chi there one morning and set out with Marine Staff Sergeant Knight in a jeep.

Halfway between Da Nang and Hoi An we stopped at an American advisers' camp. "Goddlemighty," said the Army sergeant stationed there, "you can't drive to Hoi An. The Vietcong killed three Vietnamese in a truck on this road last night and wounded the American driver. It happens all the time."

This put a different light on my proposed visit, so I decided to try to reach Dr. Chi on the radio-telephone. This proved about as easy as building a space capsule out of bailing wire, but I finally got through. "Nonsense, the road is perfectly safe—until four o'clock, anyway," said Dr. Chi.

The adviser provided us with reinforcements in the person of a tiny Vietnamese rifleman so Sergeant Knight and I proceeded to Hoi An and lunched with Dr. Chi (chicken and rice and the universal sauce called *nuoc mam*, which is made of rotten fish and tastes good). An AID official offered me a tour of the province in his white helicopter, so I deserted Sergeant Knight, leaving him to go it alone with his elfin bodyguard. I was relieved to learn later that he made it back to Da Nang within the prescribed time limit.

Sure enough, at 4:30 p.m. that afternoon a Vietcong land mine blew up another American truck on the Hoi An-Da Nung road. I'll credit Dr. Chi with the gift of prophecy—but he was cutting it pretty fine, in my opinion.

Aboard carriers during World War II, aircraft which were badly damaged on landing were simply pushed over the side. "Jeezus" we used to say, "there goes $40,000." One day on the carrier I was riding 40 miles off the North Vietnamese coast we lost an F-4 Phantom. Cost $2.5 million.

For every military operation that gets into the newspapers or on the home television screens, a dozen more never rate a mention because they turned out to be dry—or insignificant—runs. One morning I flew in an F-100F with a 26-year-old Air Force pilot, Captain Dave Anderson, the first combat mission I had undertaken in a jet and, to tell the truth, my first combat mission of any kind since 1945. Anderson, a stocky, phlegmatic young man, had already flown one mission a few hours earlier; he had also been shot down by enemy ground fire several weeks before but, since a helicopter had rescued him within minutes, he shrugged it off.

Our mission was to fly from the air base at Bien Hoa and help prepare a zone about 30 miles east of Saigon where a battalion of the 173rd Airborne Brigade could land. Our three-plane flight would drop bombs around the edges of the chosen zone in order to protect the helicopters as they hovered near the ground bringing in the infantrymen. Anderson and I donned 60 pounds of gear apiece—helmet with built-in microphone, parachute, G-suit, oxygen mask, survival vest containing drinking water, a pistol, a knife and a wonderful small radio which could be switched on to give off either an automatic beep or detailed instructions from ground to air.

The ground crew armed our plane by slinging two 250-pound bombs and two 750-pound napalm tanks under the wings. After I climbed into the jet's rear seat, Anderson showed me how to pull out the red pins which would detach me, along with my parachute, in case it became necessary to eject. He pointed to a red button which would fire the ejection charge. "Don't forget to slide back the canopy first," he said. "You don't have to pull a ripcord or anything. The parachute will open itself."

Our three planes, with Major Leslie Leavoy in the lead, hustled along the concrete and lifted smoothly into the air. To our left, beyond the snakelike Saigon River, lay Tan Son Nhut, its airfield cluttered with hundreds of planes and helicopters, its approaches choked with thousands of jeeps, cars, trucks, motorcycles and bicycles. Like a thousand mirrors, the paddies shimmered in the noonday sun. Here and there a peasant in a conical straw hat and hitched-up black trousers worked his tiny, waterlogged plot, possibly conscious that all of our jets, our napalm and bombs and soldiers and Marines were only part of an effort to persuade him over to our side.

One flight sailed easily, almost silently, at 460 knots between sky and paddy.

Our target was as sharply outlined as a bull's-eye, a patch of light green shaped like a baseball diamond, 500 yards between bases, set in the dark green of the surround-

ing jungle. We knew from intelligence reports that three battalions of Vietcong had been located within one to five miles of the landing zone.

The Forward Air Controller, a 34-year-old Texan named Eric Miller, was flying his little Bird Dog light plane far beneath us, just over the 75-foot-high jungle, marking the targets with white phosphorus. On his instructions our planes began their descent in single file. When our turn came, FAC Miller radioed to Anderson, "Put yours due east of the last one, in the heavy woods."

Half a mile from the designated area Anderson started our dive from 5,500 feet; the speedometer needle spun clockwise, up to 700 knots; the altimeter twirled in the other direction. When we reached 2,600 feet, a dull klunk under the right wing told us that Anderson had released a bomb. Going down was fun, like riding on a roller coaster, but the pull-out at 5½ Gs—five and one-half times gravity—was a new, unearthly sensation for me. The upsweep tied my stomach into a hard knot and my legs felt as if they had been transformed into iron. Then I understood what the gravity suit was for; it had automatically inflated to act as a tourniquet around my thighs, damming the flow of blood from its rush to my legs and thereby preventing a blackout.

The FAC gave us a "Good hit!" on our drop. But he added, "A little long."

In World War II we used to make one dive, drop our bombs and head for home. But I soon realized we were dropping our bombs one at a time, which meant that we would repeat the process until we had laid all four of our eggs. It was quite a morning for an overage war correspondent.

After the last bomb run, the artillery—105s and 175s—opened up, firing from five and 10 miles to the north. Then 10,000 feet beneath us the helicopters (Hueys) swam into view, like so many minnows in a tank. The first 10 choppers hovered over the landing area for about 60 seconds, until the 173rd's soldiers jumped out and started running toward the woods. Then 10 more Hueys arrived, and 10 more, until the full battalion had landed. Everything seemed to go off smoothly, so we headed back to Bien Hoa.

General Westmoreland's communiqué the next day gave one sentence to our landing and the newspapers didn't use a word of it.

It was two weeks before I had a chance to visit the 173rd Airborne to find out what had actually happened on the ground. By then the landing zone had lapsed back into Vietcong control and I couldn't visit the scene of our operation, but the 173rd's First Battalion commander, Lt. Colonel Lewis Goad, a weather-beaten professional, told me the story.

"We didn't have any opposition; only three snipers fired at us all day," said Goad. "We've been chasing that V.C. regiment for three or four weeks. These people aren't going to stand up and fight until they have an overwhelming advantage. I can't say I blame them. They know every inch of every trail; they can cover in 15 minutes what would take us four hours, so they just melt into the heavy woods."

The Vietcong had been in the vicinity all right, just as the captured maps indicate. On the second day Colonel Goad's men found a tunnel 200 yards long, 20 feet underground, that even contained a surgery room about 15x30 feet. The First Battalion blew it up with the V.C.'s own TNT, of which they captured about 300 pounds. The Americans also captured 400 Communist Chinese mortar rounds, about 5,000 rounds of rifle ammunition, a ton of rice and "one typewriter, one notebook, two gallons of kerosene, one pair of crimpers." The only casualty on either side in this unsung operation was Pfc. Tommy Traxler Jr., 18, of Crystal Springs, Miss., killed by a sniper on the fifth, and next-to-last, day.

"I don't doubt they have a dozen caches in this area for every one we have destroyed," said Colonel Goad gloomily. "The Vietnamese believe there may be underground factories around here."

Could we have surprised the enemy? Colonel Goad's soldiers found warm ashes around the landing zone. The fact that the enemy left so much equipment behind also indicated that he departed in a hurry.

"A couple of times we've gone into the landing zones without prep, and we got shot up badly," said Colonel Goad. "It's expensive to pave the way with artillery and bombs—we're sitting ducks if there's somebody waiting around to shoot at us."

Thus, as the Australian jungle fighters are quick to point out, we drive away the enemy while simultaneously trying to lure him into combat—a dilemma that never confronted U.S. troops in the more orthodox wars we fought on the Pacific islands and in Korea. We learned how to fight the Japanese in the islands, the North Koreans and Chinese on a peninsula. The Asian continent is something else again.

"This is not a military war; its a political war," said Goad. "If the villagers will tell us who the Vietcong are, things will get better." War in Vietnam wears many faces, and one of these belongs to Senior Captain Dang Doan, who commanded the 93rd Battalion of the 2nd Vietcong Regiment until he was captured in 1966. It is a haughty face, more expressive than most Orientals', exuding fanatical self-confidence. After he was wounded in a battle in Binh Dinh province early last year, Senior Captain Doan told his American captors, "Our men may die, but our children will carry on. We can take it."

A large color photograph of Doan adorns the office of Brig. General J. A. McChristian, chief intelligence officer to General Westmoreland. He keeps it simply as a reminder that he is up against a grimly determined enemy.

The Vietcong's resolution bewilders other American soldiers. A lieutenant in the 25th Division shook his head and said, "I just don't understand what motivates these people." I was to hear the same remark dozens of times throughout Vietnam.

Oddly enough, no special ideology appears to inspire the V.C. in the fashion, for example, that reverence for the emperor impelled the Japanese to fight to the last man. Most of the Vietnamese people couldn't care less about Communism. Rather, say the experts, the Vietcong's success against overwhelming odds stems from superb organization perfected over the last 25 years. American intelligence officers marvel at the ability of guerrillas to organize whole villages, convince the inhabitants that the Americans are no better than the French were and persuade them to hate the white men enough to join in the killing of them.

The American leaders believe that to win the war it will be necessary to root out the guerrilla "infrastructure" and expose its falsity. But that job isn't likely to be completed this year—or next.

And then I stole all courtesy from heaven,
And drest myself in such humility
That I did pluck allegiance from men's hearts.
—King Henry IV, Part One.

When he first sets foot on Vietnamese soil, the American in uniform is handed a wallet-size card labeled "Nine Rules," exhorting him to be nice to the people. Rule No. 1: "Remember we are guests here: we make no demands and seek no special treatment." Rule No. 5: "Always give the Vietnamese the right of way."

General Westmoreland, who travels the length of his command frequently, tells a newly arrived battalion: "Your mission is to help the Vietnamese people and to defeat the enemy. Never before in history have soldiers been called upon to help build a nation while fighting."

The result is to make the soldiers fantastically native-conscious. Almost every man has a theory about what to do about the Vietnamese, which more often than not adds up to the words: "We've got to change these people's minds." Scratch a soldier and find an evangelist.

A Marine Corps civil affairs officer: "Most of the people in my area are pro-North Vietnamese. We have to find a way to change their attitudes."

A battalion commander: "How are you going to get democracy to these people? They have no sense of nationality, they think only of the village that they have always lived in."

A U.S. information officer: "Their education is still French-oriented. We've got to end the *lycée* system."

A private in Saigon: "The only thing to do is to kill everybody in the country over five years old."

A sergeant in Cu Chi: "We ought to take over the country— the hell with these Vietnamese generals and politicians—win the war, then give it back, like we did in Korea."

An AID man in Quang Nam province: "We can't even slow down the Vietnamese truck drivers. How can we expect to change the generals and province chiefs?"

A sailor in My Tho: "Pretty soon we'll have the country paved over. Then we won't have to worry about it any more."

A facetious reporter: "General Westmoreland, there are 15 million people in South Vietnam. We put that many people in uniform in World War II. Why not mobilize enough troops to give every South Vietnamese a personal American bodyguard?

To change any Oriental's ways of thinking—or, as Kipling put it, to hustle the East—is a major undertaking. Vietnam's complexities make it the most difficult task we have ever tackled in foreign relations.

The country's political instability left it without a father figure like Syngman Rhee in Korea or Chiang Kai-shek in Taiwan. Its political and religious divisiveness lead into a bewildering tangle of Buddhists of many stripes, Catholics, Montagnards, Hoa Hao, the Cham and such an outlandish, two-million-member sect as the Cao Dai (who worship God in the from of an eye). Their colonial legacy left most of the country's leaders speaking French in preference to their own tongue but, almost alone in the Far East, Vietnam is virtually without English. The South Vietnamese armed forces, notably excepting elite units like the marines, paratroopers and Rangers, have proved poor in performance and in motivation, so their army is being relegated to rural pacification (which is probably the worst place to put them; they systematically steal from the peasants).

The performance of the South Vietnamese army provides the single greatest disappointment of the war. It was the hope we placed in this army which prompted President Johnson to declare honestly in 1964 that we would not "supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do." If our Asian boys had lived up to their American advisers' estimates, we wouldn't be involved in South Vietnam now, of course.

One expert who began his first Vietnam tour 10 years ago estimates that the ARVN (Army of the Vietnamese Republic) operates at only 15% efficiency. Why? A question of leadership which would inspire grass-roots support of the army, he says.

"These are good soldiers," one hears on all sides, "when they are properly led." Alas, the leadership from lieutenants to generals is too often based on political favor instead of merit, and the Vietnamese are extremely touchy about American interference in their internal organization, political or military. General Westmoreland is ever conscious that

he is not a supreme commander; this title still is Commander of the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. He has managed to institute a few important reforms, such as setting up an officers' training school for the Vietnamese whereby 100 talented peasant soldiers might rise from the ranks.

"I wish we had the North Vietnamese on our side," said a civilian political officer one day. He had a point. The French always used to say that the northerners had more energy—when the French wanted laborers for their New Caledonia nickel mines, they chose Tonkinese from the Hanoi region—and more intelligence, too. It's not surprising that the northern refugees, like Prime Minister Ky, dominate the South Vietnamese government. The southerners, on the other hand, never had to work very hard in their bountiful, more tropical climate. They were dogged by absentee landlordism—only one eighth of the arable land was owned by smallholders—and American prodding has produced sluggish reaction to reform, which is necessary to gain support among the peasants. In postwar Japan the United States was in a favorable position to insist upon land reform; in Vietnam, no.

Nevertheless, the Americans wade firmly into this Augean stable with characteristic determination, working seven 10-hour days a week (Vietnamese government officials take the weekends off), dispensing love, good Western advice and dollars by the ton. U.S. economic aid came to $600 million in 1966, which sounds like a lot of money, though it amounts only to $39 per South Vietnamese, compared to $1,400 for the military effort in behalf of each inhabitant of the country, counting those under Vietcong control.

Those figures include only the amounts allocated by the U.S. AID mission, which imports rice for the Vietnamese, trains 5,000 of them at a time in trade schools, teaches them more modern farming methods and enlists the services of medical teams from 10 different countries.

Some of AID's projects work out better than others. It recruited U.S. police officers to train the national police force, which was being enlarged from 27,000 to 72,000 men. But the plan has been only half successful because the pay is so low ($20 per month) and the Vietnamese army refuses to exempt the police from the draft. AID printed 14 million schoolbooks, but many rural teachers believe that books diminish their authority over students, so a high percentage of the books remains stacked in closets.

U.S. Deputy Ambassador William Porter, who is in charge of civilian programs, says candidly, "Only the United States would undertake this thing. The diplomats here think we're nuts. But we had to start somewhere."

Every U.S. military outfit has its own private charities. The 25th Division's "Helping Hand" warehouse, filled by residents of the division's home base back in Hawaii, holds boxes of clothing, school supplies, sewing machines and soybean oil.

Marine Corps Reserves in the U.S. set up a CARE program last year and collected $286,000, which was passed out by Marines in Vietnam in the form of carpenters' tool kits ($8 each), children's school kits (50¢) and similar items. One of the most touching sights in Vietnam is a makeshift hospital set up by two young doctors for treating emaciated children, whose beds are simply boxes nailed to the walls. Here children are wormed ("they all have worms") and introduced to soap. When they are not treating wounded Marines, doctors of "A" Medical Company in Phu Bai specialize in harelip operations, of which hundreds have been performed—to the delight of those Vietnamese otherwise condemned to a life of ugliness.

But charity in Vietnam, as elsewhere, badly needs supervising. Last year the Marines in Vietnam distributed nearly a million pounds of soap, but it had a way of reappearing on the black market. Now the Marines hand out smaller bars.

Once in a while one hears an American official say, "Maybe we're doing too much for these people; we're overwhelming them. We've got to do more toward helping them to help themselves." But I observed that American impatience too often prevails, and the Americans find themselves taking over, just as they have taken over most of the fighting.

One meets few doves in Vietnam. Nearly every man appears to believe in what he is doing, whether it is killing Vietcong or teaching a peasant how to use a better fertilizer. The most vociferous dove I encountered was a doctor from a British Commonwealth country who treated Vietnamese civilians in one of the provincial hosiptals.

"I work in a 400-bed hospital," he said, "and it generally has 600 patients at a time, which means a lot of doubling up. Most of the patients have been wounded, and 90% of the wounds are caused by American and South Vietnamese artillery, bombs and naval gunfire.

"Pity the poor peasant. The villagers are supposed to be warned to get out before the bombing starts, but it is a lie to say that this is done even half of the time. Besides, what are they to do? If they leave their villages, they go to refugee camps where they're supposed to get enough money to live on, but the *piastres* disappear into someone's pocket. If they stay and miraculously survive the bombing and shelling, the infantry comes in and shoots them as V.C.

"One old woman in the hospital has been wounded three times in two years. One man came in last year with his right leg gone; he's back again with his left arm amputated.

"I've learned some Vietnamese and I speak French. I'd say 80% of my province sympathizes with the Vietcong. Even the contractor who is building a hospital annex says he wishes the Americans would go away because it's humiliating to have them here.

"I'm sick of the corruption I see everywhere, from the lowliest hospital workers to the Vietnamese doctors to the heads of the government. If a man comes in with his pants shot off, it's the Americans who furnish new pants. If he needs food, the Americans furnish it, though Vietnamese funds have been appropriated for the purpose. God knows where the money goes. Vietnam will never get well unless the Americans take over or the Vietcong take over."

After nearly two months in Vietnam I find this the most hateful war we have ever fought. Surely, we never would have got into it if we had known how deep was the well, but we are the victims of one tragic miscalculation after another. We find ourselves supporting a government of mandarins with little basis of popular support, fighting for an army that has little inclination to do its own fighting.

Yet in all candor I see nothing to do except continue on the course we now pursue, hoping that a merciful Providence will show us a way out. We have committed our national honor to defend our policy and our allies. The key question is the one asked so often by Lyndon Johnson, "What would *you* do?" At this point it makes no sense to say "Give up," or to ask "Why did *you* do what you did?"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Also, Mr. President, in a similar vein of highly competent reporting, there is an article in the January 28 issue of the Saturday Evening Post by the well-known correspondent Stewart Alsop, which I read with great interest. I think Mr. Stewart Alsop's comments and analysis are sober and highly responsible and worthy of the same consideration which pertain to the Sherrod story. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's article be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM: WHOSE WAR?

(By Stewart Alsop)

SAIGON.—The young Buddhist leader from Saigon University had a big bush of black hair, and an air of quiet authority.

"Among the intellectuals in the city, like those in this room," he said, "it is understood that the presence of the Americans is a necessary evil." He waited calmly while his words were translated, and then continued: "But among the simple people, the peasants in the countryside, the Americans are of course hated and feared by ninety percent—by all those who do not work for them, or profit from them in some way."

At this point an argument broke out in Vietnamese. There were seven other "student leaders" from Saigon University in the living room of the cultural attaché of the American embassy. All the boys were products of Vietnam's tiny ruling class. They had to be, for only the children of the ruling class have much chance of being admitted to Saigon University and thus exempted from military service. The parents of seven worked for the government, or had close connections with it. The eighth came from an old mandarin family.

The argument had started when a Catholic student leader objected that the Americans were not hated and feared by as many as 90 percent of "the simple people." There was much discussion, and finally the young Buddhist conceded that it might be more accurate to say that the Americans were hated and feared by "more than half" of the simple people. Then he continued to speak, in the tone of one who lectures a backward student.

The Americans, he said, are of course responsible themselves for the danger of a Communist takeover. As everyone knew, the Americans had placed the dictator Ngo Dinh Diem in power when the French left. If the Americans had not interfered, South Vietnam would have developed into a stable, independent state. But the inevitable revolt against Diem's misrule left a vacuum, and the Americans, having installed Diem in the first place, had no choice but to fill the vacuum.

No one seemed inclined to dispute this version of history. A second boy complained that the Americans were too weak, that they had failed to use their power to give Vietnam the economic and social reforms that were needed. There was much nodding of heads. A third boy agreed, and added that the Americans also interfered too much in the internal affairs of Vietnam. As a result, most Vietnamese now regarded the Americans as colonialists, like the French. Again there was much nodding of heads, and no one seemed aware of any contradiction between what the second and third boys had said.

As the talk proceeded, one thing became abundantly clear. Not one of those eight young men—not even the Catholics—felt any sense of commitment to the war against the Communists in their own country. The war, in their eyes, was the business of the Americans.

How could the war be ended? This question stimulated another spirited argument in Vietnamese. A Buddhist boy had said that there ought to be direct negotiations with the National Liberation Front, and a couple of Catholics had protested that he ought not to say such a thing in front of Americans, but he insisted. Then another boy suggested mildly that the only way to end the war was for the Americans to to go war with Communist China. Yes, said another, that was true, and of course it was the only reason the

Americans were in Vietnam—they were planning to attack China, but they had not yet found a pretext.

Was the election in September a meaningful event? It was a small but useful step in the direction of democracy, said a Catholic student. It was a farce said the Buddhist who wanted direct negotiations with the Communists. The returns were faked by the government, and he had refused to vote. Another Buddhist said that he had voted, "but only because otherwise I might have been sent to military school." Several heads nodded in sympathy.

As the polite good-byes were said, it struck me that there was something very sad about these young men, with their graceful hairless arms and their charming smiles. They are at the age of idealism and they have nothing to be idealistic about. They know too much about the Viet Cong to be pro-Communist. But they know too much about their own government and social system to find any inspiration or allegiance there. So they end up against everything—against, above all, the Americans who are fighting their war for them.

A few "student leaders" from Saigon University no more represent Vietnamese national opinion than the "student leaders" of Berkeley represent American opinion. On the other side of the ledger must be placed the "Popular Forces"—the undersized, underarmed, undertrained local boys who often defend their villages against the V.C. with remarkable bravery. Without them the war would long since have been lost.

And yet that talk in the attaché's living room seemed to me significant in one way. It helped to explain why South Vietnam has so dismally failed to produce what South Vietnam so desperately needs—a political leadership with a genuine national following.

To an extent very little understood in the United States, the Vietnamese ruling class is identified with the French colonial regime. The people who run the government and the army—the military, the *fonctionnaires*, the landowning and *bourgeois* families—come from a class created by French colonialism. *All* the generals in the ruling junta fought on the side of the French before Dienbienphu, and all but one (Premier Ky, who was too young) wear French decorations. The vast majority of province and district chiefs are also products of French colonialism.

This makes it easy for the Communists to picture all those who resist them as "puppets" of American "neo-colonialism." Far more than the British system, moreover, the French colonial system created a ruling class alienated from "the simple people"—*i.e.*, those not similarly privileged. This phenomenon of alienation is visible in all the former French colonies. Indeed, it was visible in France itself during World War II, when the French ruling class remained until the last moment studiously aloof from the mass resistance to the Nazis. Inevitably, moreover, the Vietnamese ruling class has inherited all the more unlovable French characteristics—notably the tendency to blame all their troubles on anyone but themselves, and to resist all change not clearly to their personal advantage.

"It is *their* war," President Kennedy said before he died. "They are the ones who have to win it or lose it." The amiable young men in that apartment did not regard it as "their war" at all. The war will never be won by such as they. And the genuine national leadership which South Vietnam must have, if the war is ever to be won, will not come from the tiny, alienated, French-created ruling class which produced those sad young men.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Again, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of both articles to my colleagues in the Senate. I repeat, there is a great deal to think about in what these two very capable reporters have had to say.

BUDGET MESSAGE MAY "KISS OFF" SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am glad to see in the budget message language that apparently cuts the supersonic transport out of the 1968 budget. This may be the beginning of the end for Federal spending on the supersonic transport. The President's budget message does say that the President is "currently considering the construction of a prototype civil supersonic transport," but that the "allowance for contingencies is adequate to cover the possible cost if an affirmative decision to proceed should be made."

This language could be the "goodby kiss" to Federal subsidy of a commercial supersonic venture. Prototype construction would take $40 million a month. The President's language would seem to cut this off on June 30 of this year. Of course, it can be resumed when budget pressure eases. But that could easily be 2 or 3 years from now.

With the prospective cost of this proposal at a whopping $4 billion and with evidence cascading that the economic payoff is increasingly dubious, this moratorium could mean the end of the program as it is presently constituted.

Technological advances in aviation will proceed apace and in unpredictable directions during this supersonic moratorium. And a year or two from now, the President and Congress may have a far different view of the wisdom of subjecting the taxpayer to the risk of huge loss involved in the present proposal.

So the President's budget language may mean a multibillion dollar saving to the American taxpayer for this single item.

SENATE RATIFICATION OF POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN IMPERATIVE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the struggle for human rights—throughout recorded history—has been a continuing battle against that lethal enemy of reason and decency: discrimination. No nationality, no religious sect, no race, no people in history has been subjected to the oppressive and dehumanizing discrimination that has been visited upon women.

In every epoch—no matter how glorious or how gross—the blight of inequality of women has persisted. At the time of the signing of the United Nations Charter, women were granted political rights in only half of the sovereign countries of the world.

The United States—where the political equality of women is constitutionally established—has failed to ratify the United Nations Convention on the political rights of women. Four long years ago President Kennedy sent this treaty to the Senate, asking ratification, but for 4 years this Senate has failed to act. We, a nation which has disclaimed and disdained almost the last vestige of discrimination from our statutes, have again remained internationally mute on one of the vital issues of our time.

Here in America—where women have made momentous contributions to our national life as Senators, jurists, cabinet officers, scientists, university presidents, and ambassadors—we have proved not only the wisdom but also the inherent value of full equality of women. I doubt that any one of my male colleagues, be he bachelor or benedict, does not bear daily witness to this fact of American life.

The time has arrived for the United States to join China, Japan, India, Nigeria, Lebanon, Turkey, Thailand, Pakistan, and the 37 other members of the United Nations in ratifying the convention of the political rights of women.

Again: Let the record of the United States in human rights serve as a beacon for the old nations as well as the new—demonstrating for all mankind that the elimination of all forms of discrimination is more than worth the labor and the pains. I once again ask my colleagues to join me in seeking immediate ratification of the human rights conventions on political rights of women, on slavery, on forced labor, and on genocide.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL WHO IS NOT AN ARCHITECT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is shocking that the so-called Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, recently purchased at a cost of more than $21,000 of taxpayers' money a scale model of the Capitol as it would appear if his proposed scheme for extending the west front were permitted to be perpetrated. There is no doubt that this model, which is now on display in Statuary Hall in the Capitol, is the Nation's most expensive dollhouse.

Mr. President, the Capitol is one of our greatest national possessions, an irreplaceable monument in our national heritage. Surely, any decision to change its design should be given the utmost consideration.

The proposed grandiose scheme of the Architect of the Capitol would add 4½ acres of floor space to the Capitol. It would provide additional offices for Members of the Congress, provide two auditoriums, two cafeterias, and four dining rooms. It would virtually make the Capitol of the United States into a gigantic king-sized Howard Johnson's. There is no pressing need for these additional facilities which cannot be readily met without the desecration of the Capitol.

If the old adage, "Experience keeps a dear school, but a fool will learn in no other," has any meaning, then it would be sheer folly to follow this most recent of Stewart's recommendations. One has only to look at the Rayburn House Office Building, in all probability the most stupendous architectural monstrosity of all time, to realize the ineptness of the so-called Architect of the Capitol. It is ugly. It is wasteful. Its Mussolini-style pomp and embellishment and its vulgarization of classical architecture make

it the outstanding example of the "corrupt classic" school of architecture.

It is quite possibly the worst building costing the most money in the history of the construction of public buildings anywhere in the world. It took more than 7 years to build, costing at least $22 million more to complete than originally estimated, largely as a result of expensive miscalculations. This functional monstrosity is nothing more than sheer mass and boring bulk.

Now, this same Architect, so-called, recommends the defacement of the west front of the Capitol. What are J. George Stewart's qualifications for the position in which he has supervised the spending of more than $200 million of taxpayers' money? The answer is, no qualifications.

He served in the House of Representatives from 1935 to 1937. This certainly does not qualify him as an architect. He attended the University of Delaware, class of 1911, and received his bachelor of science degree in civil engineering in 1958, 47 years later. In other words, as an alumnus, he was honored nearly half a century after he attended classes. He served as a member of the staff of the Senate District of Columbia Committee from 1947 to 1951. Immediately prior to his appointment in 1954 by President Eisenhower as Architect of the Capitol, he was head of the Speaker's Bureau of the Republican National Committee.

None of this experience—absolutely none—qualifies him for the important post which he has held for the past 12 years, and in which he has supervised the spending of millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. President, not one cent should be appropriated for this boondoggle until the most careful and detailed engineering study has been made to determine if this is the only manner in which the west front can be guaranteed against further deterioration. Frankly, I believe that qualified engineers and architects will report that the walls can be braced and strengthened without doing damage to the historic building. The architectural profession, represented by the American Institute of Architects, has traditionally been and is now opposed to changing the west front of the Capitol, and has stated that if reconstruction is strictly necessary it should be carried out in strict accordance with the present design. The Fine Arts Commission has called the proposed reconstruction a national tragedy and has stated that the old walls can be repaired in their present location. It would be a sacrilege, in fact well-nigh criminal, to permit J. George Stewart to perpetrate what he has in mind without the most searching investigation by qualified architects and engineers.

The Capitol is a national shrine. As a man does not live by bread alone, neither does a nation. We must preserve our cherished buildings and monuments as well as our God-given national heritage. It would be virtual sacrilege to destroy the noble west front of the Capitol with its classic walls and its cascading staircases without the most impelling reasons for doing so. The Capitol of our country is a stirring sight, no matter how many times viewed, and we must not desecrate this historic edifice.

Mr. President, I express the earnest hope that we will not permit the Architect of the Capitol to lead us into this monumental blunder. The appropriation of the $34 million requested during the last Congress for this purpose and renewed during this Congress would be not only an economic extravagance, but senseless vandalism on a national monument, and should be denied.

ACTION ON "TITLE V—REGULATION OF LOBBYING" SHOULD BE DEFERRED TO AWAIT TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF A MESSAGE AND RECOMMENDATION ON THIS SUBJECT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this body will shortly consider the Legislative Reorganization Act which is on the calendar.

Very briefly, I should like to advance the proposal that action on title V of that act be deferred to await the transmittal to Congress of a message by the President and his recommendations on this subject.

The state of the Union message included "tightening our laws regulating lobbying" in the list of which the President said:

> . . . I will propose these measures to the 90th Congress.

In the appropriate Department material is now being readied for presentation to the Congress in due time and at an early date.

It would be wise to await its arrival before undertaking to debate and act on amendments to the present Lobbying Act.

A REVISION IS NECESSARY

No doubt exists that a revision is necessary to impart real meaning and effectiveness to the present statute. Its litigated history indicates this.

It was held constitutional by the Supreme Court in the case of *United States v. Harriss*, 347 U.S. 612 (1953). However, the grounds for the decision were labored and somewhat strained. It was a 5 to 3 decision, one Justice not participating. Dissent was vigorous. Justice Douglas in his dissent commented on the view adopted by the Court:

> The difficulty is that the Act has to be rewritten and words actually added and subtracted to produce that result.

In his dissent, Justice Jackson stated on this point:

> . . . I recall few cases in which the Court has gone so far in rewriting an Act.

And in the closing sentences of that dissent is the following:

> . . . I think we should point out the defects and limitations which condemn this Act so clearly that the Court cannot sustain it as written, and leave its rewriting to Congress. After all, it is Congress that should know from experience both the good in the right of petition and the evils of professional lobbying.

This is not the time or place to judge the ultimate merits of the opinion or dissents. The purpose of setting out the foregoing quotations is to emphasize that to reach the real evils of lobbying without cutting into real and substantial constitutional rights is a difficult and delicate task; and one which was not executed very satisfactorily in the law's present form.

Congress should address itself to a rewriting. But it should await the President's recommendations before doing so.

AMENDMENTS IN S. 355 ARE NOT ADEQUATE

Some of the changes contained in S. 355 have undoubted merit and will very likely find their way into the final legislative product. They show a good appreciation for need of improvement in the existing statute. However, even a casual reading of the Harriss case discloses many troublesome and substantial points which are not included in the bill as it is now written. The greater likelihood is that the text and content of the President's proposal will be much more comprehensive than that which presently pends in Congress.

When the President's recommendations do arrive, it would be well to process them in a manner commensurate with the importance and difficulty they inherently possess. Not only are there serious constitutional implications, but they constitute a criminal measure with substantial penalties.

The opinion and the testimony of the Attorney General, the Comptroller General, and of other interested parties should be sought. The present record does not include such material now. Yet it is necessary to gain a clarity of the things and acts which will be prohibited, those which will be required, and which will not impinge upon constitutional rights of those involved.

FURTHER EDITORIALS IN SUPPORT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9—BIPARTISAN RESOLUTION TO REQUIRE THE ADMINISTRATION'S EMERGENCY STRIKE LAW RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, since the introduction on January 12, 1967 of Senate Joint Resolution 9—which would require the administration to make a complete study of the operations and adequacy of our emergency strike laws and to give the Congress a report including recommendations for improving such laws—a number of respected newspapers have printed editorials in support of this resolution. I have already inserted in the RECORD the editorials of the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Washington Evening Star.

All of these editorials emphasize the vacuum in our law, which in the opinion of all the editorial writers jeopardizes the health, security, and the position of our country.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge adoption of this resolution, which does nothing but request the administration to come forward with proposals now, as the President promised he would come forward a year ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the

editorials appearing in Newsday, the Tampa Tribune of January 16, 1967, as well as a column published on the front page of the Christian Science Monitor of January 19, 1967.

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

[From Newsday, Jan. 16, 1967]

A DANGEROUS OMISSION

This year, even more than last, the nation needs new laws dealing with strikes against the public interest. But President Johnson made no mention of any legislative program in this area in his State of the Union Message to the Congress last week. This was a dangerous omission.

It is not that the President is unaware of the need for new laws. In his State of the Union Message a year ago, the President took specific note of the problem and said he would present a legislative program that "will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten the public interest." He never made good on that statement. And his silence on the issue in his latest message to the Congress suggests that he has abandoned the matter.

Events, however, may well force him to reconsider. For this year there are urgent and compelling reasons why the President should be preparing to attack the problem rather than apparently retreating from it.

Unions representing more than 2,500,000 workers will be involved in contract negotiations this year. This is just about twice the number of workers covered by negotiations last year. The industries are ones in which strikes could quickly have an impact on the total economy. Contracts with 8,000 trucking lines are being negotiated by the Brotherhood of Teamsters on behalf of 450,000 union members. And 16 railroad unions, representing more than 600,000 workers, are talking contract with the carriers. In addition, there will be negotiations involving large groups of workers in auto manufacturing, construction, meat packing and heavy manufacturing.

These negotiations are coming at a time when inflation is putting pressure on union leaders to come up with fatter pay envelopes and on management to raise prices. The clouds on the horizon are thunderheads.

In the Senate, Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) and Wayne Morse (D-Ore.) have read the storm signals and are attempting, with 14 co-sponsors, to prod the administration into action through the passage of a resolution that would require the secretary of labor to make a study of the existing law and produce recommendations for changes within 120 days. Their action is timely and appropriate.

In approaching this complex and politically sensitive question, the President and the Congress should keep in mind the realities of contemporary collective bargaining, the true picture of what often happens today in encounters between big labor and big management.

Too often these two forces only appear to be at loggerheads. Their public protestations are generally followed by wage and price increases that pass those costs along to the consumer who has neither the political leverage nor the monopoly power of the labor-management interests.

The power of a major industry to ignore the national interest was demonstrated only last week when four major aluminum companies raised their prices despite strong objections voiced by the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Faced with such strong aggregations of labor and industry power, the nation must develop a way to assure equity for all parties in the movement of wages and prices. The best method would be the establishment of a national board that would set wages and prices on the basis of fairness and the national interest. This board, completely free of politics, would be composed of distinguished citizens representing the interests of industry, labor and the general public. It would be an effective curb on the immense power now wielded by big labor and big management. For today, that power is all too often exercised in cynical and short-sighted self interest.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Jan. 16, 1967]

CORRECTING AN OMISSION

To U.S. Senators Jacob K. Javits and Wayne Morse, one of the most important things about President Johnson's State of the Union address was an omission.

The omission, Senator Javits told the Senate, was "the need to remedy one of the most glaring deficiencies in our laws—the absence of means to protect the public interest when a national emergency strike—or a lockout—occurs after all 'cooling off' periods have been exhausted."

As a result, Javits and Morse, joined by 14 other Senators of both parties, have reintroduced a joint resolution to require the Department of Labor to make "appropriate recommendations" for such a law within 90 days.

The two Senators, both liberals, three times last year introduced a similar proposal. It got nowhere, even though the President's 1966 State of the Union message made this promise: "I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading state and local authority, will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which *threaten irreparable damage to the national interest.*"

The need existed in 1966, it is even greater in 1967. This year probably has more major labor contracts expiring than any single previous year in history—and recent inflation plus the President's talk of an income tax surtax virtually guarantee that union negotiators will make greater efforts toward larger pay increases than in recent years.

Based on the 1967 calendar of contract negotiations it is conceivable that strikes could knock out the nation's clothing manufacturing, truck transportation, telephone service, paper, rubber, processed food, machinery and automobile production and meat-packing some time during the year.

Some of these will threaten "irreparable damage to the national interest" more than others. But even those that do not pose a direct threat can do so indirectly—if they establish a wage pattern which leads union leaders in a key industry to make demands that over-reach the ability of that industry's management to meet.

And despite the certain opposition of organized labor, strike-curbing legislation probably would draw wide public support. Citizens' temper was shortened considerably last year by the airlines strike, and a Gallup Poll in August found the public favoring by a 3 to 2 ratio compulsory arbitration of any strike which lasted more than seven days.

The fact of such public support, the clear evidence last year of how crippling the airline strike was to the nation's economy, and the outlook for major labor contract negotiations this year all support the thesis that some method of protecting the public from strike-induced national emergency should be enacted soon.

Perhaps the President, in his forthcoming economic message, will correct his State of the Union omission. If he does not, Congress should proceed promptly to repair his omission by adopting the Javits-Morse resolution.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 19, 1967]

OMISSION: SENATORS CRITICIZE JOHNSON FOR SILENCE ON STRIKES

(By William C. Selover)

WASHINGTON.—Something President Johnson left out of his state-of-the-Union message is causing mild consternation among senators.

He didn't say how he would deal with strikes against the national interest.

"It is regrettable," Sen. Jacob Javits (R) of New York told his colleagues, "that the President neglected to include in his state-of-the-Union message the need to remedy one of the most glaring deficiencies in our laws—the absence of means to protect the public interest when a national-emergency strike or a lockout occurs. . . ."

Now a bipartisan group of senators wants to force Mr. Johnson to say something. "We want to prod the President into prodding the Congress to act," says a spokesman for the group.

Last year, in his message to Congress, Mr. Johnson promised he would submit some proposals. But as the months dragged on, he failed to produce anything at all.

And in this year's message, he didn't even mention it.

MATTER OF TIMING?

Informed sources say the President is trying to come up with a "consensus" of top opinion on what should be done. "But you never get a consensus on labor legislation" contends these sources. Thus, the delay, according to this version.

Still, White House sources insist Mr. Johnson hasn't dropped the idea. It's just a matter of timing, they say.

However, some 22 senators, from both parties and both wings of both parties, are tired of waiting. They want action.

Here is their proposal.

Senators Javits and Wayne Morse (D) of Oregon coauthored a joint resolution to force the Secretary of Labor to "commence immediately a complete study of the operations and adequacy" of labor law in this area. They want the secretary "to report to the Congress no later than 120 days . . . the findings of such a study together with appropriate recommendations. . . ."

Senators Morse and Javits, joined by such other sponsors as Senators Brewster, Dominick, Fong, Hatfield, Kuchel, Monroney, Percy, and Thurmond, are especially concerned that the months ahead will be filled with costly strikes.

MANY NEGOTIATIONS DUE

Senator Javits told the Senate that "the nation this year will face an unusually large number of difficult labor-management negotiations in industries crucial to the health and safety of the country."

These senators don't want to wait until the middle of a strike before coming up with solutions. They made that mistake last year during the airline strike, they say.

Yet, nobody seems much interested in legislation when the strike is over.

"The public gets upset only when there is a strike," explains a Senate source. "The President gets upset only when the public is upset; and you can't legislate during a strike."

But without the President pushing for such legislation, chances of its passage are considered slim.

"There are excellent chances of getting some antistrike legislation if the President asks Congress to act," explains the Senate source. "But if he doesn't, there is not much chance."

HOUSE DROPPED RIDER

Last year, a proposal identical to the Javits-Morse resolution passed the Senate as part of legislation to deal with the airline

strike. But it died there when the strike was settled.

Later, the same proposal was attached as a rider to the Senate version of the minimum wage bill. But it was dropped in conference at the insistence of House Democrats.

Senators Javits and Morse then wrote a strong letter to Lister Hill, chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, urging him to put discussion of the proposal on the committee agenda. This he finally did, listing it last of ten items on the agenda of the last committee meeting of the session.

After the other nine items were disposed of, the committee Democrats staged a walkout, depriving the committee of a working quorum. The proposal got shelved.

Now its sponsors are hoping Senator Hill will again move to take up the proposal. But the chairman is by no means sympathetic.

Senator Javits believes his proposal is "a fair way to proceed," because it "does not prejudice anything." He says: "We ask only for the administration's best judgment."

Of course, Senator Javits has some ideas of his own how such strikes should be handled.

For 15 years, he has called for a plan which he considers "fairest to labor."

According to his plan, if everything else fails, the government seizes the property to protect the public health and safety.

PROTECTION ASSURED

"This is the only proposal to protect the public interest without interfering with free, collective bargaining," says an advocate of this proposal. Senators Thomas H. Kuchel (R) of California and Fred R. Harris (D) are cosponsors.

It is being sponsored in the House by Rep. Ogden R. Reid (R) of New York and cosponsored by Richard D. McCarthy (D) and Richard L. Ottinger (D), both of New York, and James J. Howard (D) of New Jersey.

Still, they hope the President will come up with something of his own.

"We in the Congress," Senator Javits told the Senate, "owe it to the American people first, to demand that the administration take a stand, one way or the other; and second, to move deliberately to enact legislation to prevent a repetition of the sorry spectacle of last year, with Congress desperately seeking a solution to the airline dispute, and the administration absolutely powerless under existing law, and absolutely unwilling to ask for new laws, and equally unwilling to say that it did not want new laws."

PROGRAM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the President yesterday offered to Congress a program for brightening the lives of our senior citizens. This program reflects an understanding that the problems and opportunities of the elderly are many and varied, and that they must be approached from many angles. Accordingly, the President has not only proposed to meet the income needs of the elderly through increases in social security and public assistance benefits, he has also recognized the needs of senior citizens in the areas of health, housing, employment, and life enrichment, and has made recommendations in all these areas.

While I, together with every other Member of Congress, should reserve the right to withhold judgment on the details of the President's recommendations, I commend the President and those who advised him on this message. They have created a program which points the way to improving our national approach to the problems and opportunities of older Americans. We have an opportunity in considering the President's program to establish patterns of action in aging which will improve life in the United States not only for today's elderly but also for the future old age of today's youth and that of generations yet unborn.

Nevertheless, the factor of cost must be determined in any of these efforts.

It is for this reason that I prefer my own proposed social security amendments which would provide a 10-percent increase in benefits without requiring additional contributions by employer or employee.

I am sure that in the days ahead, however, we will give careful study to all of the President's message, in the awareness of the human needs toward which the President has extended a helping hand.

TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PASSES RESOLUTION SUPPORTING YARBOROUGH BILL TO CREATE BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK IN EAST TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 16, 1967, the Texas House of Representatives unanimously passed a resolution endorsing S. 4, my bill to create the Big Thicket National Park in east Texas. During my tenure in the Senate I have been fortunate enough to have been involved in the creation of two of Texas' three national parks. In 1962, Congress passed my bill to create the Padre Island National Seashore, and last year saw the enactment of my bill creating the Guadalupe Mountains National Park. This is the first time, however, that the House of Representatives of Texas has felt so strongly about the importance of a proposed national park that it has taken the unprecedented action of unanimously passing a special resolution endorsing the proposal. This action of the Texas Legislature is indicative of the interest which has been aroused since the original introduction of this bill in the 89th Congress.

The population of our country is increasing rapidly. As a result, each day sees the loss of more wilderness land which, once destroyed, is gone forever.

In the 75,000 acres of the Big Thicket proposed in this bill is to be found a profusion of wildlife unmatched anywhere in the country for its richness. Plant and animal life abound. At some places the growth is so luxuriant that one has to cut his way through with a machete.

I commend the Texas House of Representatives for their unanimous endorsement of my proposal to preserve the Big Thicket National Park for future generations of Americans, and I thank them for their kind words about the senior Senator from Texas.

This is the most encouraging support that I have ever received for any national park bill. I am hopeful that Congress will take action to establish the Big Thicket National Park in view of such strong statewide sentiment favoring it. This resolution indicates support is growing for this park.

I ask unanimous consent that H.S.R. 20, sponsored by Representative Glenn Vickery of Houston, and passed by the Texas House of Representatives be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

H.S.R. 20—RESOLUTION

Whereas, This body has come to know the many problems, frustrations and congestions engulfing our metropolitan areas, such as Harris County, and realize the importance and necessity of large green areas surrounding these heavily populated areas for recreation and outdoor enjoyment; and

Whereas, The members of this body appreciate and accept Senator Ralph Yarborough for his efforts and sacrifices in the behalf of our posterity, evidenced by the fact that he was instrumental in bringing about the establishment of Padre Island National Seashore and Guadalupe Mountains National Park; and

Whereas, The members of this body encourage Senator Yarborough in his effort to bring about a better life for all by the setting aside of these vast areas remaining of our rapidly diminishing enclaves of nature's unspoiled beauty, leaving them for the enjoyment of future generations; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Texas House of Representatives go on record commending the senior Senator from Texas, Ralph Yarborough, for his introducing a bill in the Senate of the United States to bring about the creation of a national park to be named the Big Thicket National Park consisting of some 75,000 acres of land located in the southeast portion of this great state; and be it further

Resolved, That this Resolution be printed in the House Journal and that copies of this Resolution be sent to Senator Ralph Yarborough with our deep personal respect and admiration.

Glenn Vickery, State Representative, District 23, Place 1; Abraham, Allen of Harris, Allen of Gregg, Allred, Archer, Armstrong, Atwell, Atwood, Barton, Bass of Bowie, Bass of Harris, Bass of Van Zandt, Beckham, Birkner, Blaine, Blanton, Braecklein, Braun, Bridges, Burgess, Cahoon, Cain, Caldwell, Calhoun, Carrillo, Cavness, Clark of Dallas, Clark of Harris, Clayton, Cole, Cory, Crews of Montgomery, Cruz of Harris, Cummings, Davis, Dickson, Doran, Dramberger.

Duggan, Field, Finck, Finnell, Finney, Floyd of Bexar, Floyd of Harris, Fondren, Foreman, Garwood, George, Gladden, Graves, Haines of Brazos, Hairgrove, Hale, Hand, Hannah, Harding, Harris, Hawkins, Haynes of Orange, Head, Heatly, Hendricks of Collin, Hendryx of Brewster, Hinson, Holland, Holmes, Howard, Hull, Jamison, Johnson of Bell, Johnson of Bexar, Johnson of Harris, Jones of Lubbock, Jones of Taylor, Jungmichel, Kilpatrick.

Knapp, Kohler, Ligarde, Lockridge, Lombardino, Longoria, Lovell, McDonald, McKissack, McLaughlin, Miller, Moore of Hill, Moore of Dallas, Moreno, Moyer, Muniz, Murphy, Murray, Musgrove, Mutscher, Neugent of Galveston, Newman, Nowlin, Nugent of Kerr, Ogg, Orr, Parker, Peeler, Pendleton, Pickens, Pickett, Pipkin, Price, Quilliam, Rapp, Ratcliff, Ray, Richardson, Rosson.

Salter, Santiesteban, Schiller, Schulle, Scoggins of Nueces, Scoggins of El Posa, Semos, Joe Shannon of Tarrant, Tommy Shannon of Tarrant, Sherman, Simpson, Slack, Slider, Smith, Solomon, Stewart, Stroud, Swanson, Tarbox, Thomas, Traeger, Vale, Vance, Vickery, Ward, Wayne, Weldon, Whatley, Wieting, Williams, Williamson, Wright, Ben Barnes, Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that H.S.R. No. 20 was adopted by the House on January 16, 1967.

DOROTHY HALLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

IN DEFENSE OF OUR ASIA POLICY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the view of Asia given us by Prof. Edwin O. Reischauer, former Ambassador to Japan, about which Columnist Richard Wilson wrote in the Evening Star yesterday. Wilson, using Reischauer's recent article to point the way, summarizes the educated view of what is happening in Asia and what can develop, particularly if we tread the middle course between dangerous escalation and disastrous withdrawal in Vietnam, as we are today doing.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wilson's column, entitled "Some Points in Defense of Our Asia Policy," be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOME POINTS IN DEFENSE OF OUR ASIA POLICY

(By Richard Wilson)

Since President Johnson's successful trip to Asia last fall the detractors have been having their day. It was an ill-conceived journey, they say, and better to be forgotten. The President's aims in Asia were windy and vacuous and unrelated to our true national interests.

So runs the steady drip-drip of criticism which is part of the general critique that we have no business in Asia, especially in Vietnam, that we should liquidate the military intervention there, and let China slowly but inexorably extend the influence of Mao communism throughout Asia and its Pacific environs.

This doctrine has been badly shaken by events in China itself where it is now being demonstrated that Mao communism is unable to manage its own internal affairs successfully, to say nothing of the remainder of the Asiatic world.

But the Asia-last group is unimpressed and remains bemused by its mystical conviction that because there are 700 million or 800 million people in China it is historically inevitable that some government will emerge some day to envelop all of Asia, or at least East Asia, and we had better relax and let it happen.

Therefore it is fortunate that Edwin O. Reischauer, former ambassador to Japan and now a professor at Harvard, chose the world's leading mass circulation magazine, Reader's Digest, for the expression of a truly educated view on the nature of our vital interests in Asia. Reischauer could as easily have written his views for Foreign Affairs Quarterly and thus limited his lesson to the academics and intellectuals who have prior convictions.

He wrote, however, so that many millions in many countries of the world can read and understand why "time is on our side in Asia." Professor Reischauer cannot be faulted as an intellectual nor as a successful diplomat. This makes what he has to say all the more confounding for the campus-bound, desk-tied and ideologically frozen theoreticians on Asia, and especially those with archaic ideas about our ties to the motherland of Europe.

Reischauer makes more points than can be briefed in this space, but here are a few of them:

1. Asia has so little power today as to pose no immediate menace to the rest of the world, but the modern, industrialized Asia of the future could be a very great threat if it were unified through communism, or even if it remained an unstable, disruptive half of humanity. That alone is why we should not abandon Asia but continue to help it develop in a healthy way.

2. Nationalism is the most powerful force in an Asia which wants no domination from Russia, China or its former Colonial masters, and this nationalism works in favor of America's interests.

3. We make a bad mistake in overemphasizing the importance of China because of its size. It is an extremely poor and backward country, on the whole. In spite of its nuclear development and because of its economic and political mess internally and internationally, "China's claim to represent the wave of the future is fast fading." It will continue to fade "unless we commit the folly of abandoning the field in Vietnam to Communist subversion."

4. We underestimate the promise of Japan which is more than ever before the "economic giant" of Asia, setting the pace and leading the way for the creation of an industrialized and politically coherent Asia with which we can live in peace and mutual profit.

5. Reischauer also makes the point that news reporting (and he might have added the domestic commentary on Asian news) emphasizes the pessimistic and unpleasant aspects of the Asian problem without noting the progress that is slowly being made.

Reischauer concludes that a complex of conditions combines in our favor in Asia, and if we were more optimistic we could find the courage to persevere in a middle course in Vietnam between dangerous escalation and disastrous withdrawal. He believes we are wise enough to learn to use our strength to help the countries of Asia move more rapidly toward becoming healthy and stable units in a peaceful and prosperous world.

This is what President Johnson and his speech writers have been trying to say. They have done so in the evangelical tone which is not too persuasive in the modern world. But this does not change the fact that there is a very strong case to be made for the Asian involvement and especially for persistence in pursuing it. Persistence is unquestionably the key to a successful outcome of President Johnson's policy in Asia.

OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the concept of ombudsman is gaining wide support here in the United States. At the State level some nine bills have already been introduced in State legislatures across the country calling for the creation of some form of citizens' defender. At the local municipal level, New York City—following the defeat of the Civilian Review Board—is seeking new approaches to the problem of raising the citizen to an equal footing with his city hall. On the national level, there is also considerable interest, as illustrated by Congressman HENRY REUSS' introduction of a congressional form of ombudsman.

This month's issue of the American Bar Association Journal carries an editorial entitled "Ombudsman: The People's Champion." I ask unanimous consent to have printed, at this point in the RECORD the article from the January 1967 issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

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

OMBUDSMAN: THE PEOPLE'S CHAMPION

It has been said that during the last year or so the Swedish vocabulary of most Americans has increased by 50 per cent. Whereas the words "skoal" and "smorgasbord" were previously familiar to almost everyone in this country, now the term "ombudsman" has been added.

Although the institution of Ombudsman originated in Sweden in the early nineteenth century and has there enjoyed great success, it has become generally recognized elsewhere and adopted in some other countries only within the past ten or fifteen years.

The Ombudsman, a term best translated "representative", is an official appointed by the Swedish parliament for a term of four years to represent the citizen in cases of arbitrary action or abuse of power on the part of government law enforcement officers and administrative agencies—in short, against abuses on the part of government itself. The protection afforded is over and above, and in addition to, redress afforded the citizen by his regular rights of appeal to higher governmental authority or through the courts.

The aggrieved citizen in Sweden has ready access directly to the Ombudsman. No lawyer or other intermediary is necessary to handle his complaint. The function of the Ombudsman is to investigate the facts in each case complained of. His jurisdiction extends to everything that may happen to a citizen in his dealings with governmental authorities. The Ombudsman may demand and is entitled to receive an explanation from any authority or official as to any action or decision. All governmental officials are bound to give him assistance in any investigation he wishes to make. He may hold hearings and call in the parties involved. All files and minutes are open to him. Documents on the basis of which decisions are reached in any case are open to inspection by the Ombudsman and by not only the aggrieved citizen but also any member of the public, including the press. If, for instance, a citizen feels he has been discriminated against, he has the right to see the documents in other cases to compare his case with others.

In Sweden the Ombudsman's position is completely independent. No one may instruct him as to what cases are or are not to be investigated by him, nor may he be influenced as to his actions in any case. When a legitimate issue is raised, neither the government nor parliament (which appoints him) can stop the Ombudsman from investigating. In his reports of investigation he has the power to comment on the performance of officials, even to the extent of reprimanding them. It is his independence that is largely responsible for giving the Ombudsman his power. Although he has no authority to change any decision of a court or administrative body, his reports are given great weight, sometimes even to the point of bringing about a change by an agency in its own ruling or decision. If a complaint filed with him is determined by the Ombudsman to be unfounded, it is his duty to report this and why it is unfounded, and it is his duty to notify the complainant in each case.

In the reports he makes annually of his stewardship he may include recommendations as to changes in practices and procedures followed by officials of government, and often these reports result in effectuating changes by the agencies or officials themselves. It frequently occurs that his criticism of incorrect procedures may have wide significance, not only in disclosing faulty procedures in the case it applies to, but also in preventing faulty procedures in other cases as well.

The Ombudsman is particularly effective in dealing with arrogance of public officials and with abuses of discretion and arbitrary action. The fact that his investigations and reports are publicized gives to the Ombudsman through the press the backing of public opinion.

In Sweden the Ombudsman investigates some 1,200 cases a year, in which perhaps 10 per cent of the complaints he has received are found to be justified.

The success of the institution of the ombudsman in the Scandinavian countries where it originated has resulted in the introduction of bills in Congress and even in the legislatures of five of our states for the establishment of a similar office in this country. Because of differences between the Swedish form of government and our own, there would have to be some corresponding differences in the functions of such an official in our country.

Questions have been raised as to the need for such an office in the United States. It occurs to us that in some cases agencies in making rulings state inadequately or not at all the reason back of them, or in some cases citizens fail to understand the rulings of such agencies. The rulings of Selective Service boards as to deferments or exemptions, for example, occasionally may appear to work injustices. It would be desirable to have an agency to make it clear to citizens why rulings that appear unfair on their face are justified. If, in fact, the rulings are unfair, it would be salutary to expose this to the public. This would undoubtedly lead to the exercise of more care in the future.

As columnist Clayton Fritchey pointed out some months ago, special interest in the institution of the ombudsman in this country was aroused with the introduction of companion bills in the United States Senate and in the House of Representatives by Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island and Representative Henry Reuss of Wisconsin to establish in this country a somewhat analogous office. In these bills the term "ombudsman" was not used, but instead the name "Administrative Counsel of the Congress" was applied to an official whose function would generally resemble that of the ombudsman.

At hearings before a Senate committee on this legislation Dr. Alfred Bexelius, the Ombudsman of Sweden, testified. He summed up his view that through the ombudsman "society thus keeps an institution with the task of protecting citizens against society's own shortcomings". But Mr. Fritchey wrote that the great interest aroused by the introduction of these bills and the testimony of Dr. Bexelius might have waned shortly thereafter had it not been for several cases that aroused public interest at about the same time.

He cited the case of a Central Intelligence Agency agent who was paid to spread the word that an Estonian *émigré* was a Communist spy. This resulted in a slander suit against the CIA agent; but he never had to answer the suit or defend his veracity, since the CIA simply intervened and claimed privilege for the agent. This denied the Estonian *émigré* any chance to clear his name of the charges of disloyalty. Such unfairness might well be investigated and reported on by an ombudsman.

Another case mentioned by Mr. Fritchey was that of one Bert Adams, who during World War II offered to the Army a battery he had invented. Although the experts advised the Army the battery would not work, the Government secretly had it copied and ordered at least a million of them to be made. In 1966, Adams, now $200,000 poorer, received a favorable ruling on his claim by the Supreme Court of the United States, but as yet he had not been paid for the pirating of his invention.

Other matters an ombudsman might look into would be cases of wire tapping carried on both officially and unofficially by government agents.

Although an ombudsman might in many cases serve as no more than a crying towel for citizens who felt they were unjustly treated, we believe it would be a healthy development to provide this independent official to investigate seeming injustices, even if, as in Sweden, no more than 10 per cent of the cases were found to justify investigation.

PROGRESS ON SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, with the recent attention to the need for developing all our agricultural potential, we in Missouri are proud of the progress these last 10 years by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in our State.

As presented in the 1966 progress report issued on December 26 by Howard C. Jackson, our U.S. soil conservationist, there are today 71 operating soil and water conservation districts—39 more than 10 years ago, 28 more than 5 years ago, six more than 1 year ago.

For many years our State was almost a desert on the USDA Soil Conservation Service maps. Thanks now, however, to the interest of farm people in many of our counties, and the cooperation of State and Federal agencies, Missouri is moving ahead in this important work.

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

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

THE 1966 PROGRESS REPORT

A significant milestone was passed by another Missouri Soil and Water Conservation District this year when the Clay County District Board celebrated the signing of their 1000th cooperating landowner, emphasizing that Soil and Water Conservation work in Missouri continues its upward swing, says Howard C. Jackson of Columbia, State Conservationist for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in Missouri.

Nine of Missouri's 71 Soil and Water Conservation Districts now have gained the distinct status of having signed over 1000 cooperators each. They are: Lafayette with 1,664 cooperators, Johnson with 1,351 cooperators, Harrison with 1,347 cooperators, New Madrid with 1,343 cooperators, DeKalb with 1,082 cooperators, Cape Girardeau with 1,029 cooperators, Nodaway with 1,019 cooperators, Pemiscott with 1,011 cooperators, Clay with 1,002 cooperators.

Six new Soil and Water Conservation Districts were organized this year by local landowners in Oregon, Polk, Taney, Sullivan, Cass and Bates counties, emphasizing that more and more, all people are realizing that our rapidly growing population is dependent on wise land and water use, says Mr. Jackson and that Missouri Soil and Water Conservation Districts are helping everyone—both rural and urban with this important job.

1966 saw Missouri's first Resource Conservation and Development project planned, approved and work started. The project covers nearly 3 million acres of the five south central Missouri counties of Dent, Howell, Shannon, Oregon, and Texas. This approximately 55 million dollar project is expected to yield nearly 400 million dollars over the next 20 years through resource use, development and conservation. Sponsors expect the project to create 15,000 new jobs for Missouri citizens. A second Resource Conservation and Development application from local sponsors in nine southwest Missouri districts covering 3.4 million acres is pending approval.

1966 progress in Missouri watersheds included completion of preliminary investigations on 800,000 acres. Twenty-three watershed structures were built which added 235 acres of new water area. The Missouri State Legislature raised their appropriations from $30,000 to $60,000 to supplement watershed planning funds of the Soil Conservation Service. River basin studies received additional emphasis and the studies are progressing well on the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, White, and Osage River Basins. The Meramec River Basin Study was completed.

Recreation land use planning was done with individual landowners and agencies in response to increased demand for outdoor recreation. The Missouri Department of Conservation joined with local district cooperators and the S.C.S. in developing a 73 acre lake in the Nodaway District and the Farmers Home Administration loaned money to purchase a 1,200 acre lake in the Putnam District which was planned with Soil Conservation Service help. We enjoyed the cooperation from other USDA, State, county, and local agencies in this field, says Mr. Jackson.

One hundred thousand acres of soil surveys for city planning was made for the Planning Commission of Kansas City. They contributed funds for the survey.

During the past year more than 4,000 landowners became cooperators with their local districts. Over 1,800 landowners were assisted in the preparation of complete conservation plans for their land. Districts provided SCS help to 17,250 people of which 9,500 applied one or more conservation practices. SCS serviced ACP cost sharing referrals on more than 7,000 farms for the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service.

Today in Missouri there are: 71 operating Soil & Water Conservation Districts—39 more than 10 years ago, 28 more than 5 years ago, 6 more than 1 year ago.

Soil surveys cover 14¾ million acres.

20,582 conservation plans developed and operating.

Conservation practices applied during fiscal year 1966:

Contour farming (acres)	30,000
Multipurpose dams	115
Diversions (miles)	200
Farm ponds	1,300
Grade stabilization structures	370
Grassed waterway or outlet (acres)	2,371
Irrigation systems	340
Land grading, smoothing, leveling (acres)	24,000
Drainage mains or laterals (miles)	230
Pasture and Hayland renovation and planting (acres)	15,000
Drainage field ditches (miles)	161
Terraces (miles)	950
Cropland converted to grassland (acres)	30,000

Thirty-eight new businesses and industries employing 191 people have located in Missouri Soil and Water Conservation Districts since 1960 as a result of Soil and Water Conservation improvement work. One hundred and thirty-nine other industries and businesses employing 370 additional people have expanded as a result of Soil and Water work. Forty-two thousand new visitor days of recreation have been provided by Missouri watershed projects since 1962.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS—1968 BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, education is increasingly vital to the welfare of the individual and of the society. The individual requires education and training to break into the labor force and to participate in the cultural life of his community. Employers need highly trained workers to maintain rising productivity and profits in a competitive economy. The American people place a high value on education. The remarkable record of the 89th Congress on education legislation testifies to the rising concern about education at the national level.

President Johnson's 1968 budget responds to these national needs and concerns for enlarging educational opportunity. It is the largest and most constructive Federal education budget in history. It provides $4,055 million in appropriations for the Office of Education for fiscal year 1968, $137 million more than in 1967; $526 million in appropriations for the education and basic research programs of the National Science Foundation, $46 million more than in 1967; a total of $5,245 million of appropriations for all the various programs classified in the "education" category of the budget; $622 million more than in 1967 and $930 million more than in 1966.

Many other programs which serve special agency missions and are not classified as "education," nevertheless finance education, training, and related activities. They include the Headstart program in OEO, the GI bill benefits of the VA, and technical civilian-type training of military personnel. A comprehensive special analysis issued with the 1968 budget shows that the President's recommendations for education, training, and related programs for 1968: total $12.3 billion, $1.2 billion over 1967, will devote $1 out of every $10 of Federal nondefense cash payments to education, training, and related purposes.

The far-reaching significance of the President's 1968 recommendations is indicated by the number of Americans who will be aided in fiscal 1968. They include: 737,000 Headstart children plus many additional thousands in the new Headstart follow-through program; 8.5 million children from low-income families in nearly 20,000 school districts to be aided by title I grants under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; about 400,000 youths who will receive work-training opportunities through the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps; 280,000 individuals who will be in training through the Manpower Development and Training program; the undergraduate college students who will receive 2.2 million grants and loans totaling $1.1 billion from Federal programs or federally insured programs; 137,000 graduate and professional students who will receive fellowships, traineeships, and research assistantships.

The 1968 budget is truly a major milestone in the advance of educational opportunities in the United States.

RATIFICATION OF CONSULAR CONVENTION AN IMPORTANT ISSUE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, editorials in last evening's Evening Star and this morning's Washington Post sum up the position I feel this body should take on an important issue before us. "The Consular Convention" is the title of the Post editorial. "Let's Ratify It," urges the Star. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 23, 1967]

LET'S RATIFY IT

It must be hoped that the new hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will result in ratification, at long last, of the Soviet-American consular treaty. Although signed in 1964 and overwhelmingly approved by the committee a year later, the treaty has remained inoperable for a simple reason: The administration has been reluctant to submit it to a test in the Senate, out of fear that it might be defeated.

That fear, however, now has been brushed aside. Secretary of State Rusk and others have taken the offensive, and Senator Fulbright's committee can be counted upon to back them up by once again approving the treaty. Still, the opposition continues to be strong. Outside of Congress, its hard core is a band of ultra-conservatives who seem to feel that FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover should have a veto of sorts over American foreign policy.

These extremists—John Birchers and members of the so-called Liberty Lobby—have waged a massive letter-writing campaign in the past, and they can be expected to do so again, on the basis of Hoover's March, 1965, testimony before a House appropriations subcommittee. In that testimony, the FBI chieftain suggested that he was opposed to the consular pact because it would open up Soviet consulates in a number of big American cities and thus complicate his counter-espionage task. But correspondence between him and Rusk indicates that he does not really presume to tell the Secretary of State, or the President of the United States, how to conduct diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

Actually, of course, regardless of Hoover's misgivings, the consular pact has a great deal to be said for it. The acquisition of a few consulates is not going to give Soviet espionage any great new weapon in our open society, which is already easy pickings for the snoopers of any nation. On the other hand, under the treaty's quid-pro-quo provisions, the United States might well have more to gain from the pact than the Kremlin—both in terms of gathering intelligence and protecting the rights of its citizens in the Soviet Union's closed society.

We trust that the Fulbright committee will expedite its hearings, reaffirm approval of the treaty and recommend that the Senate as a whole vote resoundingly to ratify. This seems to us to be the dictate of common sense in a world where Soviet-American relations are of transcendent importance.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 24, 1967]

THE CONSULAR CONVENTION

The Consular treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union, signed in 1964, and not yet ratified by the Senate, ought to be promptly approved.

Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have made it clear that the new treaty is needed to protect the rights and privileges of Americans who travel in the Soviet Union and who, in the absence of these protections, have been denied their rights. They have made it equally clear that the establishment of added consular offices in the United States does not constitute any added threat to our security with which the authorities are incapable of dealing. The Senate has it on the word of F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover that his establishment would incur no responsibilities with which it could not deal. All such agreements, of course, have mutual advantages—or they would not be signed by the contracting parties. In this case, the greater advantage surely lies with the United States which gains better access to information in the Soviet Union, without much altering the access of the Soviet Union, to the facts about our more open society.

The issue is plainly one of accepting this convention or rejecting it. Modification or amendment, obviously, would have the same effect as rejection. Far more than this treaty, of course, is at issue. If a proposition on which the advantages so largely lie with the United States cannot be approved, there is not much chance, in the Senate, for the other measures that look toward an East-West bridge and diminution of the cold war.

PROPOSED MERGER OF ABC AND I.T. & T.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the behavior of the Department of Justice toward the proposed merger of the American Broadcasting Co. and the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. raises the question of the proper relationship between an independent regulatory body and the executive branch of the Government.

The proposal to merge these two entities of the communications industry was not sprung on an unwitting public without warning. Indeed, the Department of Justice had an opportunity to present its views on the proposal at a hearing of the Federal Communications Commission last September. It chose not to avail itself of this opportunity, assertedly because the complexity of the case did not afford ample time to prepare a brief. When the Department finally took a position on the proposed merger, it announced it at the last minute on December 20, just before the Commission's vote on the proposal, and in the form of a letter from the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

The Commission approved the proposed merger by a vote of four to three. Although that is a narrow margin, it is a decision honestly and openly reached by a majority after open hearings and due deliberation.

Now the Department of Justice seeks to substitute its judgment for that of the Commission. Last week, Assistant Attorney General Turner petitioned the Commission for reconsideration of its decision and asked for an evidentiary hearing. In view of what appears to be a blatant effort to switch one vote by a last-minute blitz, the Acting Attorney General might well be asked: "How do you construe the word independence as applied to a regulatory agency created by Congress to exercise independent judgment in administering laws within its jurisdiction?"

One does not have to support the proposed merger in suggesting to the Acting Attorney General that if he has a case against it, he should go to court and argue it on its merits. Instead, in this instance, he has chosen by subterfuge to sway the judgment of an independent agency.

Mr. President, let the Acting Attorney General be advised that he ought not to use monopoly power to curb what he alleges to be monopoly power.

The Commission has acted. He should go to court if he is not happy with its decision.

RESTRICTIONS ON MOVEMENT OF DEFENDANTS FREED ON BAIL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, last week, I introduced a bill which would allow District of Columbia judges, under certain conditions, to place restrictions on the movement of highly dangerous criminal defendants freed on bail. My

bill would, in specified exceptional circumstances, allow pretrial detention of up to 30 days, for defendants who pose a high risk to the safety of the community.

On Saturday, a judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions complained bitterly about the present bail law, which required him to release on bail a man whom he felt posed a serious danger to society.

Judge DeWitt S. Hyde made this complaint, noting:

We could have a raving maniac who might go out and kill people on the streets, but we would have to turn him loose.

Since this incident—which has occurred on many occasions before—has considerable relevance to S. 484, my proposed amendment to the Bail Reform Act, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper account published in the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUSPECT'S RELEASE ON BAIL RILES JUDGE

(By Jim Hoagland)

A 38-year-old man charged with rape and robbery was released on personal recognizance yesterday by a General Sessions judge who said the Bail Reform Act forced him to let the defendant go.

Judge DeWitt S. Hyde was sharply critical of the Act as he released Arthur L. Daniels of 1311 L st. se. Daniels, who did not have to post any bond, promised to return for a preliminary hearing on the felony charges on Feb. 1.

"Under this Act, we could have a raving maniac who might go out and kill people in the streets, and we would have to turn him loose," Hyde said. "I don't know what in the world people were thinking about when they passed this Act."

The U.S. Attorney's Office had asked for a $5000 bond in the robbery case and urged Hyde to hold Daniels without bond on the rape charge, a capital offense.

Under the Bail Reform Act, which went into effect Sept. 20, only defendants likely to flee before trial can be held on bond. Danger to the community alone is not a decisive factor in the question of a defendant's release.

The exception is capital offenses, where a judge is not required to admit the defendant to bail.

Daniels' attorney, Bernard W. Kemp, said Daniels had lived in Washington all his life, was married and had held the same job for the past seven years.

"We have to hold people charged with hitting somebody over the head with a sponge, and release others on these charges," Hyde said.

The D.C. Bail Agency had recommended Daniels' release because of his community ties.

Hyde's comments added more fuel to a controversy that has been raging since the Act passed Congress last June. Many judges and prosecutors have publicly criticized the bill, which they feel frees persons who will be able to commit more crimes.

AIR TRANSPORTATION: ESSENTIALS AND EXPEDIENTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have just finished reading a speech, entitled "Air Transportation: Essentials and Expedients," which was given on January 19 by George E. Keck, president of United Airlines, before the International Aviation Club of Washington, D.C. As a member of the Commerce Committee who is intensely interested in all phases of transportation, and particularly with those of the commercial air transportation industry and all of its great problems as it prepares to move into the supersonic age, I found Mr. Keck's remarks extremely interesting.

Mr. Keck, who has a quarter of a century experience in the air transport industry with United Airlines, and who has been president of this fine company since 1963, has emerged as one of the most respected, knowledgeable new leaders in this industry.

Because I think that my colleagues will find Mr. Keck's remarks interesting and constructive, I request that his speech before the International Aviation Club be inserted in the RECORD at this point, and urge my colleagues to read it. I respectfully suggest that we in the Congress should be informed as to all points of view on the problems of commercial air transportation, and their proposed solutions, before we are called upon to make legislative decisions.

While I would not expect that every Senator would be in agreement with all that Mr. Keck said, I do think that his views were cogently and effectively presented. We should bive them most careful consideration, whether we fully agree with them or not.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Keck's statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AIR TRANSPORTATION: ESSENTIALS AND EXPEDIENTS

(An address by G. E. Keck, president, United Air Lines, International Aviation Club, Washington, D.C., Jan. 19, 1967)

Over the years dozens of inventors have come to this city in search of government support for their plans and projects. This strange parade has included starry-eyed incompetents, inspired mechanics, eccentric tinkers and brilliant scientists. Some have found support and some have been turned away, the good with the impossible, the feasible with the impractical.

At one time or other, as we know from history, Congress has been skeptical and slow to recognize the significance of such transportation advances as the steamboat, the locomotive and the airplane. In pointing this out, I don't wish to imply that the nation's lawmakers have been less progressive or less discerning than the general population. They've merely reflected the doubts and hesitancy we normally feel when confronted with something genuinely new.

Most of us apparently prefer to believe there just can't be anything new under the sun. Our first reaction is to recoil from things which have no antecedents in the store of human experience. Deep down, we're fearful and suspicious. And in the past, more so than now, the creators of new machines were often regarded as oddballs and crackpots.

When Samuel Morse demonstrated the telegraph at the city in 1842, a Senator who stood by later reported, "I watched his countenance closely to see if he was not deranged."

People often reassure themselves about a new and portentous element by pretending that it's little more than an extension of something already known and familiar. When this comforting attitude is adopted, a revolutionary advance can be neatly pigeonholed as just another addition to the established fixtures of the social order. The fact that a particular advance may radically change the social order can then be conveniently ignored.

This kind of self-deception is evident in some of the names that have been applied to major inventions. The locomotive was called the Iron Horse, and of course, it merely pulled a series of stagecoaches. And several generations later, when the automobile chugged onto the scene, it was known as the Horseless Carriage.

The Iron Horse galloped over the land as no other horse in history, pursued by lawmakers who belatedly realized that this unusual beast required special legislative harnessing. And in subsequent decades when the Horseless Carriage began kicking up its heels, the nation suddenly learned that more was involved than the decline of livery stables.

The pretense that something new is just an extension of the familiar often leads to a further bit of make-believe. This consists of assuming that existing customs and procedures can be satisfactorily applied to new developments. As a general illustration, some of the early railroadmen blew horns to dispatch trains, because a horn had always been used to signal the departure of stagecoaches. If this seems quaint, we have only to consider the handy application of the Railway Labor Act to the air transport industry.

The use of established forms to control and manage new forces generally requires patchwork, sooner or later. And it's often necessary to improvise, to adopt expedients and quick cures without due regard for long-range consequences.

Our times are particularly subject to improvisation because of the outpouring of technological advances, including, of course, jet aircraft. This remarkable means of transportation is a prime force in creating a new kind of world environment. In less than a decade the jet has enmeshed itself with world politics, commerce and economics to a far greater extent than any previous mode of transport. It has eliminated distance as a factor in the separation of peoples and that, alone, has startling implications. It has stimulated international travel as never before in man's history. I think it's reasonable to say that jets are serving as the greatest coalescent force ever introduced in world affairs.

To most people, however, both in and out of the industry, jets are just a faster way of going somewhere—more glamorous perhaps, but already taken for granted as an addition to the established conveniences. In a certain sense, that's what we've worked to achieve but viewed in another way it may have disadvantages. For one thing, it probably means the public will not regard our problems as special problems but merely as ordinary everyday problems which will be resolved somehow in the same old ordinary fashion.

It should be eminently clear to the most casual observer that something out of the ordinary is involved, if only in the matter of vigorous growth. Dr. Adolph Berle has pointed out, for example, that world air transport is expanding at a rate five times as fast as world motor transport and some twenty times as fast as marine transport. And, with a touch of understatement, he adds that this scale is not adequately realized.

Economic surveys disclose that since 1950 the strongest growing key industries in the Free World have slightly more than tripled their production. In comparison, world airline production—as measured in revenue ton miles—is seven times what it was in 1950. Here at home we've witnessed a tremendous upsurge in the last five years. The annual growth rate of passenger traffic has averaged

about 16 per cent. And the outlook for further expansion is very promising, with forecasts which range from a doubling to tripling of present traffic volume by 1975.

As a result of great growth, various facilities—airports, passenger and cargo terminals, traffic control—are becoming inadequate. The pressure of expansion has even begun to affect the air space over the North Atlantic. Last year a proposal was made to reduce the lateral separation of transatlantic flights from 120 miles to 90. Objections were raised, primarily by the pilot's union, if I remember correctly, and the proposal was shelved.

In contrast with the brisk rate of airline traffic growth, ground preparations to accommodate that growth are generally proceeding at an unhurried stately pace. All too often, imminent problems are being approached in a slow, leisurely manner suited to other times when problems developed at a slow, leisurely rate. This criticism isn't directed at the agencies and personnel involved but at the procedures they're obliged to follow. Financing of airport expansion, for example, can drag on for many months, even years, depending upon the mandatory procedures. They may have been excellent in an agricultural society but horse-and-buggy speed is out of place in the Jet Age.

I'm pleased to say that preparations to provide sufficient aircraft capacity for future growth are realistic. Capital outlays for new flight equipment in the ten years, 1966 through 1975, are estimated to exceed $11 billion. That's a huge investment by any standard and for any industry. Obviously, the airlines must maintain respectable profit levels to attract further infusions of capital. And in that regard, downward pressure on fares isn't exactly the kind of attraction that makes investors come running. It can, in fact, prompt them to run in a different direction.

Earlier I referred to the tendency to apply established forms and customs to essentially new and more complex forces. And, as I've indicated, some facets of air transportation are subject to this approach. In its regulatory agencies at the Federal level, however, the industry has fortunately escaped the clutch of tradition. Instead of being under the bumbling jurisdiction of some obscure bureau originally created for another purpose, the airlines, as we know, are regulated by agencies established for their specific guidance.

The Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency have excellent records and their work is of great value to the nation. Rather than have you accept my judgment alone, there's the fact that the U.S. air transport system is recognized as the best in the world. This is not to say, however, that I'm in complete accord with every single regulatory action.

A few minutes ago I mentioned that in our times there's considerable improvisation without due consideration of ultimate consequences. The CAB, no less than other decision-making bodies, is in my opinion occasionally affected by the prevailing atmosphere of expediency.

Some of the best legal minds in the industry are still bewildered by the Board's sudden venture into labor relations in last summer's strike. As you may recall, the nonstruck carriers were informed that, meeting certain conditions, they could operate over the routes of the strike-bound airlines. This unprecedented move accomplished two things, both of which I consider unfortunate. First, it shattered the protective qualities which route certification had always been assumed to guarantee. Second, it relieved some of the public pressure that had kept union and airline representatives hard at work, trying to settle the strike, which ultimately lasted 43 days.

Of course, it's possible to say an emergency existed and this justified a very unorthodox procedure. But later on, at least one government spokesman indicated there wasn't much of an emergency, after all—in fact, it was more like a passing inconvenience, a mere ripple on the national scene. The economic wastage of that "ripple", in terms of lost airline revenues, lost wages, lost taxes, lost business for shippers and others, has been estimated at more than a billion dollars.

There's another matter of concern—the proposed rule-making that would authorize local service carriers to operate nonstop flights in medium-haul, high-density markets. This would be done in hopes that the financial position of such carriers would improve to the point where subsidy payments could be reduced, if not eliminated.

I believe that the cure would be worse than the ailment. It could destroy logical division in the types of air service and eventually homogenize the industry.

When the possibility of granting permanent authority to local service carriers was investigated a generation ago, the CAB Examiner warned the Board that such carriers would be inclined to reach out for big city traffic. He said this inclination should be discouraged at the outset and that the discouragement should be in the nature of skip-stop and nonstop limitations.

This man clearly understood that small communities needed local service carriers that were local service carriers rather than potential trunklines. If he had to add anything today, in the light of subsequent events, he would perhaps recommend discouraging local service carriers from acquiring aircraft better suited for nonstop intermediate operations than for short hops.

In commenting on the investigation that led to permanent certification of local service carriers, our company made a prophetic statement in 1944, which I'll quote: "They will seek to expand into the type of operations now conducted by existing carriers and thereby depart from their avowed function of serving small-city short-haul traffic." End of quotation, except to repeat "and thereby depart from their avowed function of serving small-city short-haul traffic."

This confusing redefinition of local service carriers and the adverse effects on the industry's basic structure would be done, as I've said, in hopes of reducing subsidy payments. Let's put that subsidy into perspective. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, subsidy payments to local service carriers totaled $61,500,000. For the same period, subsidy granted by the Federal Maritime Administration was $209,000,000; by the Treasury Department, $269,000,000; by the Department of Labor, $620,000,000; and by the Department of Agriculture, $4,904,000,000.

What did $61,500,000 in subsidy to local service carriers accomplish? Well, over-all, it kept many small communities in the mainstream of American life. It provided air mail service; it brought sons home swiftly from military outposts; it served local businessmen and manufacturers; it gave small towns a boost toward future growth and prosperity. In short, it was worth it.

If reduction of subsidy is the goal, let me point out that non-stop operations in medium-haul high-density markets are no guarantee of profits. Some of these markets currently have trunkline competition and further leaning out of whatever profits there are would not benefit anyone. And some of the markets without trunkline competition are decidedly marginal and their contribution toward reducing local service subsidy would be unlikely.

I appreciate the fact that subsidy poses a problem for the CAB but I question its possible solution at the risk of disrupting the existing system of balance in the industry. The local service airlines were designed to complement the trunklines—not to engage in conflict with them. I'm sure the problem can be solved in a way that would end subsidy and still preserve the basic divisions which assure both large and small communities of scheduled air service.

The CAB's liberalized view on the operations of supplemental carriers is well merited in so far as it aids the military lift to Vietnam. But, here again, it is necessary to make sure that today's exigencies do not become tomorrow's problems. What happens when the war is finally over and the supplemental carriers, possessed of an over-abundance of aircraft, seek business elsewhere? Has the Board already forgotten its period of nonsked travail?

I raise these questions in a constructive spirit, hoping they have been fully explored by persons more knowledgeable than myself and found non-detrimental to the industry's future health. I refuse to believe that expediency has overridden the fundamental imperative of establishing and administering long-term plans, based on fixed classification of the carriers in relation to the various kinds of service required by the traveling and shipping public.

In discussing these areas of concern, I've perhaps over-simplified and there could be factors with which I'm unfamiliar. If so, I welcome enlightenment. On the surface, however, it seems that the prevailing philosophy, somewhat crudely stated, is this: the trunklines have become fat cats and they won't miss some of their cream. That's, of course, a narrow view which makes much of the moment and ignores the past and the future. Over the years, as the record will show, the trunklines have frequently been thin cats, subsisting on skimmed milk. And now, if cream has improved their diet, I suggest restraint in syphoning it off, because the demands of the Seventies—the new technology and the expansions to accommodate growth—will require great strength and ample resources.

Strength and resources of the various carriers should be fully considered in deliberation of the Transpacific Service Case. Obviously, the national interest is deeply involved in the Far East. Additional airline service to that area, in my opinion, should hinge on the ability of a carrier to provide the best possible lift, regardless of how meager the returns may be at the outset. Along with the capability, the carrier should have the experience, imagination and drive to develop markets to the point of producing satisfactory economic results in a reasonably brief time.

As a final word, I would say that air transportation is infinitely more than an aircraft proceeding from airport to airport. It is the sum of efforts by very dissimilar groups, ranging from manufacturers to municipal officials. It is the distillation of work by bakers, bankers and buffet builders—the list goes on and on. It is the essence of modern science and technology. And I would remind you that the element which brings together all the parts and details into a workable system is cooperation.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, many words are being said and printed this week about the Nation's budget which has now been released by the President for fiscal year 1968.

An examination of the record over the past years must lead to the conclusion that the President cannot be sure just what the fiscal position of this country will be in the next year and one-half.

As we look back at the record and look ahead, just one or two examples will make my point. Last year when the fiscal 1967 budget was presented, we were told the deficit for the year would be $1.8 billion, and the President estimated

that the Government's income for that year would be $145.5 billion. Now we know differently. Our economy is generating an estimated income to the Government for this fiscal year of $154.7 billion, which is $9.2 billion more than the President anticipated. However, even with this increased income we are now told that the deficit for this fiscal year will not be $1.8 billion as previously estimated but will be $9.7 billion. Spending for the year has been increased by $17.1 billion. Can we now be sure that the now predicted $9.7 billion deficit for this fiscal year of 1967 is accurate?

To mention one item upon which income estimates are based, the President had predicted several billions of dollars of income from the sale of Government-owned mortgages. We now know that only $1.1 billion in participation sales have been made to date. But the President's budget for fiscal year 1968 predicts income of $5 billion from sales of participation certificates. I suggest this may be overoptimistic.

The fiscal year 1968 budget also predicts an increase in Government income of $17.3 billion over fiscal year 1967. We can only hope that the national income will reach this increased level or even surpass it.

Lastly, I would call attention to the constant increase in the public debt which the President plans to increase by $8.1 billion in fiscal year 1968, to a total of $335.4 billion. Interest on the debt will exceed $14 billion for the fiscal year 1968.

In conclusion, I express the hope that the Congress, in cooperation with the President, will make a concerted effort to cut both Government expenditure and new obligational authority in the light of the fiscal pressures facing our Nation.

OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a letter from me to Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, dated January 24, 1967, in which I have asked for Mr. Shuman's comments regarding agricultural programs now in effect.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
January 24, 1967.

Mr. CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation,
Merchandise Mart Plaza,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. SHUMAN: It is the intention of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to have the Secretary of Agriculture appear before it in about ten days to two weeks to review the operation and administration of the many farm programs for which he is responsible.

As you know, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 covers most of the major commodities and will be effective through the crop year 1969. The Food for Peace Program enacted last year will be in effect through 1968. Both of these laws give the Secretary of Agriculture considerable flexibility in the development of individual programs. As a result, I do not anticipate any major changes before they expire. However, a complete review of administrative procedures does seem desirable.

The purpose of this letter is to secure your cooperation in providing the Committee with a list of any problems or complaints with which your organization is familiar regarding the programs now in effect. These will be brought to the attention of the Secretary for clarification and review when he appears before the Committee.

I would appreciate receiving an answer as expeditiously as possible.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

FUNDS FOR AIR FORCE OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, Congress has received today a request for some $12 billion for supplemental appropriations for the balance of fiscal year 1967.

These funds are designed almost entirely in support of our military operations in southeast Asia. These operations are on land and sea. These operations are also in the air, and it is on this part I wish to say a few words today.

Over one-quarter of the request is for the aircraft account alone. Of this, over $1.5 billion is for the important line item of "combat attrition." Let me recall the words of the President last Thursday when he presented the first Air Force Medal of Honor to Maj. Bernard F. Fisher. Said the President:

I would like through all these gallant men to honor the men of the United States Air Force who are serving us in Vietnam and in that area.

Those men in that Air Force are helping us to win a very difficult war.

They are helping us to defeat a very treacherous enemy.

They are helping a young nation to be free, to be born, and to be independent.

They are helping their own Nation, the United States of America, to honor a pledge, to keep a commitment, to make its word good, and to be treated, trusted, and respected in its alliances.

They deserve the best their Nation can offer them because they are the best of this Nation.

By prompt enactment of the fiscal year 1967 supplemental, Congress can do its part to see that our airmen truly do get the best.

SUFFER THE LITTLE CHILDREN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Martha Gellhorn, the well-known journalist and reporter, continues the job being done by a few outstanding writers in bringing to the attention of the American people the frightful burning and maiming of innocent people in the Vietnam war. Miss Gellhorn's account in the January 1967 issue of the Ladies' Home Journal is entitled "Suffer the Little Children." It is one of the most harrowing accounts of destruction visited on the children of Vietnam by our unjust and immoral war in that country.

To the question, Why do you make such a big thing out of injuries to children? Miss Gellhorn provides an appropriate answer:

Children are killed or wounded by napalm because of the nature of the bombings. Close air support for infantry in combat zones is one thing. The day and night bombing of hamlets, filled with women, children and the old, is another.

Bombs are mass destroyers. The military targets among the peasants—the Viet Cong—are small, fast moving individuals. Bombs cannot identify them. Impartially, they mangle children, who are numerous, and guerrilla fighters, who are few. The use of fire and steel on South Vietnamese hamlets, because Viet Cong are reported to be in them (and often are not), can sometimes be like destroying your friend's home and family because you have heard there is a snake in the cellar.

Of course, injuries are caused by Vietcong attacks. But does that justify the mutilation we inflict? We have already saturated Vietnam with a greater quantity of explosives than we dumped on Germany during all of World War II. This rain of death exceeds by a thousand-fold the explosive destruction which the Vietcong can bring to bear. We can no more escape responsibility for the consequences of our leveling the South Vietnamese countryside than we can for the bombing of civilian areas in North Vietnam, which honest and intrepid reporters visiting the North have now begun reporting to give lie to the Pentagon's assertion that we bomb only "concrete and steel."

Only the American forces possess napalm—the Vietcong not having yet developed the sophistication of more "civilized" countries to manufacture and deliver on target this deadly explosive. Here is how Miss Gellhorn describes one victim of our napalm attack:

In the children's ward of the Qui Nhon provincial hospital I saw for the first time what napalm does. A child of seven, the size of our four-year-olds, lay in the cot by the door. Napalm had burned his face and back and one hand. The burned skin looked like swollen, raw meat; the fingers of his hand were stretched out, burned rigid. A scrap of cheesecloth covered him, for weight is intolerable, but so is air. His grandfather, an emaciated old man half blind with cataract, was tending the child. A week ago, napalm bombs were dropped on their hamlet. The old man carried his grandson to the nearest town; from there they were flown by helicopter to the hospital. All week, the little boy cried with pain, but now he was better. He had stopped crying. He was only twisting his body, as if trying to dodge his incomprehensible torture.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Gellhorn's article in the January 1967 issue of the Ladies' Home Journal be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Ladies' Home Journal, January 1967]

SUFFER THE LITTLE CHILDREN

(By Martha Gellhorn)

We love our children. We are famous for loving our children, and many foreigners believe that we love them unwisely and too well. We plan, work and dream for our children; we are tirelessly determined to give them the best of life. "Security" is one of

our favorite words; children, we agree, must have security—by which we mean devoted parents, a pleasant, settled home, health, gaiety, education; a climate of hope and peace. Perhaps we are too busy, loving our own children, to think of children 10,000 miles away, or to understand that distant, small, brown-skinned people, who do not look or live like us, love their children just as deeply, but with anguish now and heartbreak and fear.

American families know the awful emptiness left by the young man who goes off to war and does not come home; but American families have been spared knowledge of the destroyed home, with the children dead in it. War happens someplace else, far away. Farther away than ever before, in South Vietnam, a war is being waged in our name, the collective, anonymous name of the American people. And American weapons are killing and wounding uncounted Vietnamese children. Not 10 or 20 children, which would be tragedy enough, but hundreds killed and many more hundreds wounded every month. This terrible fact is officially ignored; no Government agency keeps statistics on the civilians of all ages, from babies to the very old, killed and wounded in South Vietnam. I have witnessed modern war in nine countries, but I have never seen a war like the one in South Vietnam.

My Tho is a charming small town in the Mekong Delta, the green rice bowl of South Vietnam. A wide, brown river flows past it and cools the air. Unlike Saigon, the town is quiet because it is off-limits to troops and not yet flooded with a pitiful horde of refugees. Despite three wars, one after the other, the Delta peasants have stayed in their hamlets and produced food for the nation. Governments and armies come and go, but for 2,000 years peasants of this race have been working this land. The land and their families are what they love. Bombs and machine-gun bullets are changing the ancient pattern. The Delta is considered a Viet Cong stronghold, so death rains from the sky, fast and indiscriminate. Fifteen million South Vietnamese live on the ground; no one ever suggested that there were more than 279,000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese in all of South Vietnam.

The My Tho children's hospital is a gray cement box surrounded by high grass and weeds overgrowing the peacetime garden. Its 35 cots are generally filled by 55 little patients. One tall, sorrowing nun is the trained nurse; one Vietnamese woman doctor is the medical staff. Relatives bring their wounded children to this hospital however they can, walking for miles with the children in their arms, bumping in carts or the local buses. Organized transport for wounded civilians does not exist anywhere in South Vietnam. Once the relatives have managed to get their small war victims to the hospital, they stay to look after them. Someone must. The corridors and wards are crowded; the children are silent, as are the grown-ups. Yet shock and pain, in this still place, make a sound like screaming.

A man leaned against the wall in the corridor; his face was frozen and his eyes looked half-mad. He held, carefully, a six-month-old baby girl, his first child. At night, four bombs had been dropped without warning on his hamlet. Bomb fragments killed his young wife, sleeping next to her daughter; they tore the arm of the baby. As wounds go, in this war, it was mild—just deep cuts from shoulder to wrist, caked in blood. Yesterday he had a home, a wife, and a healthy, laughing daughter; today he had nothing left except a child dazed with pain and a tiny mutilated arm.

In the grimy wards, only plaster on child legs and arms, bandages on heads and thin bodies were fresh and clean. The children have learned not to move, because moving hurts them more, but their eyes, large and dark, follow you. We have not had to see, in our own children's eyes, this tragic resignation.

Apparently children are classified as adults nowadays if they are over 12 years old. During a short, appalled visit to the big My Tho provincial hospital, among hundreds of wounded peasants, men and women, I noted a 13-year-old girl who had lost her left foot (bomb), sharing a bed with an old woman whose knee was shattered; a 14-year-old girl with a head wound (mortar shell); a 15-year-old girl with bandages over a chest wound (machine-gun bullet). If you stop to ask questions, you discover frequently that someone nearby and loved was killed at the same time, and here is the survivor, mourning a mother or a little brother; loneliness added to pain. All these people suffer in silence. When the hurt is unbearable, they groan very softly, as if ashamed to disturb others. But their eyes talk for them. I take the anguish, grief, bewilderment in their eyes, rightly, as accusation.

The Red Cross Amputee Center in Saigon is a corrugated tin shed, crowded to capacity and as comfortable in that heavy, airless heat as an oven. Two hundred amputees in relays, have lived here. Now 40 Vietnamese peasants, male and female, ranging in age from six to 60, sit on chromium wheelchairs or their board beds or hobble about on crutches and, though you might not guess it, they are lucky. They did not die from their wounds, they are past the phase of physical agony, and in due course they will get artificial arms or legs.

The demand for artificial arms and legs in South Vietnam may be the greatest in the world, but the supply is limited; for civilians it had run out completely when I was there. These maimed people are content to wait; Saigon is safe from bombs, and they are fed by the Red Cross. To be certain of food is wonderful good luck in a country where hunger haunts most of the people.

A girl of six had received a new arm, ending in a small steel hook to replace her hand. Bomb fragments took off the lower half of her arm and also wounded her face. She has a lovely smile, and a sweet little body, and she is pitifully ugly, with that dented, twisted skin and a lopsided eye. She was too young to be distressed about her face, though she cannot have felt easy with her strange arm; she only wore it to have her picture taken.

An older girl, also a bomb victim, perhaps aged 12, had lost an eye, a leg and still had a raw wound on her shoulder. She understood what had happened to her. Since the Vietnamese are a beautiful people, it is natural that they should understand beauty. She hid her damaged face with her hand.

A cocky, merry small boy hopped around on miniature crutches, but could not move so easily when he strapped on his false, pink-tinted leg. Hopefully he will learn to walk with it, and meanwhile he is the luckiest person in that stifling shed, because the American soldiers who found him have not forgotten him. With their gifts of money he buys food from street vendors and is becoming a butterball. I remember no other plump child in South Vietnam.

A young Red Cross orderly spoke some French and served as interpreter while I asked these people how they were hurt. Six had been wounded by Viet Cong mines. One had been caught in machine-gun cross fire between Viet Cong and American soldiers, while working in the fields. One, a sad reminder of the endless misery and futility of war, had lost a leg from Japanese bombing in World War II. One, the most completely ruined of them all, with both legs cut off just below the hip, an arm gone, and two fingers lopped from the remaining hand, had been struck down by a hit-and-run U.S. military car. Thirty-one were crippled for life by bombs or artillery shells or bullets. I discussed these figures with doctors who operate on wounded civilians all day, and day after day. The percentage seems above average. "Most of the bits and pieces I take out of people," a doctor said, "are identified as American."

In part, it is almost impossible to keep up with the facts in this escalating war. In part, the facts about this war are buried under propaganda. I report statistics I have heard or read, but I regard them as indications of truth rather than absolute accuracy. So: there are 77 orphanages in South Vietnam and 80,000 registered orphans. (Another figure is 110,000.) No one can guess how many orphaned children have been adopted by relatives. They will need to build new orphanages or enlarge the old ones, because the estimated increase in orphans is 2,000 a month. This consequence of war is seldom mentioned. A child, orphaned by war, is a victim, wounded forever.

The Govap orphanage, in the miserable rickety outskirts of Saigon, is splendid by local standards. Foreign charities have helped the gentle Vietnamese nuns to construct an extra wing and to provide medical care such as intravenous feeding for shriveled babies, nearly dead from starvation. They also are war victims. "All the little ones come to us sick from hunger," a nun said, in another orphanage. "What can you expect? The people are too poor." The children sit on the floor of two big, open rooms. Here they are again, the tiny war wounded, hobbling on crutches, hiding the stump of an arm (because already they know they are odd): doubly wounded, crippled and alone. Some babble with awful merriment. Their bodies seem sound, but the shock of war was too much for their minds; they are the infant insane.

Each of the 43 provinces in South Vietnam has a free hospital for civilians, built long ago by the French when they ruled the country. The hospitals might have been adequate in peacetime; now they are all desperately overcrowded. The wounded lie on bare board beds, frequently two to a bed, on stretchers, in the corridors, anywhere. Three hundred major operations a month were the regular quota in the hospitals I saw; they were typical hospitals. Sometimes food is supplied for the patients; sometimes one meal; sometimes none. Their relatives, often by now homeless, must provide everything from the little cushion that eases pain to a change of tattered clothing. They nurse and cook and do the laundry and at night sleep on the floor beside their own wounded. The hospitals are littered with rubbish; there is no money to spend on keeping civilian hospitals clean. Yet the people who reach these dreadful places are fortunate; they did not die on the way.

In the children's ward, of the Qui Nhon provincial hospital I saw for the first time what napalm does. A child of seven, the size of our four-year-olds, lay in the cot by the door. Napalm had burned his face and back and one hand. The burned skin looked like swollen, raw meat; the fingers of his hand were stretched out, burned rigid. A scrap of cheesecloth covered him, for weight is intolerable, but so is air. His grandfather, an emaciated old man half blind with cataract, was tending the child. A week ago, napalm bombs were dropped on their hamlet. The old man carried his grandson to the nearest town; from there they were flown by helicopter to the hospital. All week, the little boy cried with pain, but now he was better. He had stopped crying. He was only twisting his body, as if trying to dodge his incomprehensible torture.

Farther down the ward, another child, also seven years old, moaned like a mourning dove; he was still crying. He had been burned by napalm, too, in the same village. His mother stood over his cot, fanning the little body, in a helpless effort to cool that

wet, red skin. Whatever she said, in Vietnamese, I did not understand, but her eyes and her voice revealed how gladly she would have taken for herself the child's suffering.

My interpreter questioned the old man, who said that many had been killed by the fire and many more burned, as well as their houses and orchards and livestock and the few possessions they had worked all their lives to collect. Destitute, homeless, sick with weariness and despair, he watched every move of the small, racked body of his grandson. Viet Cong guerrillas had passed through their hamlet in April the old man said, but were long since gone. Late in August, napalm bombs fell from the sky.

Napalm is jellied gasoline, contained in bombs about six feet long. The bomb, exploding on contact, hurls out gobs of this flaming stuff, and fierce fire consumes everything in its path. We alone possess and freely use this weapon in South Vietnam. Burns are deadly in relation to their depth and extent. If upwards of 30 percent of the entire thickness of the skin is burned, the victim will die within 24 to 48 hours, unless he receives skilled constant care. Tetanus and other infections are a longtime danger, until the big, open-wound surface has healed. Since transport for civilian wounded is pure chance and since the hospitals have neither staff nor facilities for special burn treatment, we can assume that the children who survive napalm and live to show the scars are those who were least burned and lucky enough to reach a hospital in time.

Children are killed or wounded by napalm because of the nature of the bombings. Close air support for infantry in combat zones is one thing. The day and night bombing of hamlets, filled with women, children and the old, is another. Bombs are mass destroyers. The military targets among the peasants—the Viet Cong—are small, fast-moving individuals. Bombs cannot identify them. Impartially, they mangle children, who are numerous, and guerrilla fighters, who are few. The use of fire and steel on South Vietnamese hamlets, because Viet Cong are reported to be in them (and often are not), can sometimes be like destroying your friend's home and family because you have heard there is a snake in the cellar.

South Vietnam is somewhat smaller than the state of Missouri. The disaster now sweeping over its people is so enormous that no single person has seen it all. But everyone in South Vietnam, native and foreign, including American soldiers, knows something of the harm done to Vietnamese peasants who never harmed us. We cannot all cross the Pacific to judge for ourselves what most affects our present and future, and America's honor in the world; but we can listen to eyewitnesses. Here is testimony from a few private citizens like you and me.

An American surgeon, who worked in the provincial hospital at Danang, a northern town now swollen with refugees and the personnel of an American port base: "The children over there are undernourished, poorly clothed, poorly housed and being hit every day by weapons that should have been aimed at somebody else. . . . Many children died from war injuries because there was nobody around to take care of them. Many died of terrible burns. Many of shell fragments." Since the young men are all drafted in the Vietnam Army or are part of the Viet Cong, "when a village is bombed, you get an abnormal picture of civilian casualties. If you were to bomb New York, you'd hit a lot of men, women and children, but in Vietnam you hit women and children almost exclusively, and a few old men. . . . The United States is grossly careless. It bombs villages, shoots up civilians for no recognizable military objective, and it's terrible."

An American photographer flew on a night mission in a "dragon ship"—an armed DC-3 plane—when Viet Cong were attacking a fortified government post in the southern Delta. The post was right next to a hamlet; 1,400 is the usual number of peasants in a hamlet. The dragon ship's three guns poured out 18,000 bullets a minute. This photographer said: "When you shot so many thousand rounds of ammo, you know you're gonna hit somebody with that stuff . . . you're hitting anybody when you shoot that way . . . a one-second burst puts down enough lead to cover a football field . . . . I was there in the hospital for many days and nights. . . . One night there were so many wounded I couldn't even walk across the room because they were so thick on the floor. . . . The main wounds came from bombs and bullets and indiscriminate machine-gunning."

A housewife from New Jersey, the mother of six, had adopted three Vietnamese children under the Foster Parents Plan, and visited South Vietnam to learn how Vietnamese children were living. Why? "I am a Christian. . . . These kids don't ask to come into the world—and what a world we give them. . . . Before I went to Saigon, I had heard and read that napalm melts the flesh, and I thought that's nonsense, because I can put a roast in the oven and the fat will melt but the meat stays there. Well, I went and saw these children burned by napalm, and it is absolutely true. The chemical reaction of this napalm does melt the flesh, and the flesh runs right down their faces onto their chests and it sits there and it grows there. . . . These children can't turn their heads, they were so thick with flesh. . . . And when gangrene sets in, they cut off their hands or fingers or their feet; the only thing they cannot cut off is their head. . . ."

An American physician, now serving as a health adviser to the Vietnamese Government: "The great problem in Vietnam is the shortage of doctors and the lack of minimum medical facilities. . . . We figure that there is about one Vietnamese doctor per 100,000 population, and in the Delta this figure goes up to one per 140,000. In the U.S., we think we have a doctor shortage with a ratio of one doctor to 685 persons."

The Vietnamese director of a southern provincial hospital: "We have had staffing problems because of the draft. We have a military hospital next door with 500 beds and 12 doctors. Some of them have nothing to do right now, while we in the civilian hospital need all the doctors we can get." (Compared to civilian hospitals, the military hospitals in Vietnam are havens of order and comfort. Those I saw in central Vietnam were nearly empty, wasting the invaluable time of frustrated doctors.) "We need better facilities to get people to the hospital. American wounded are treated within a matter of minutes or hours. With civilian casualties it is sometimes a matter of days—if at all. Patients come here by cart, bus, taxi, cycle, sampan, or perhaps on their relatives' backs. The longer it takes to get here, the more danger the patient will die."

There is no shortage of bureaucrats in South Vietnam, both Vietnamese and American. The U.S. Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) alone accounts for 922 of them. In the last 10 years, around a billion dollars have been allotted as direct aid to the people of South Vietnam. The results of all this bureaucracy and all this money are not impressive, though one is grateful that part of the money has bought modern surgical equipment for the civilian hospitals. But South Vietnam is gripped in a lunatic nightmare: the same official hand (white) that seeks to heal wounds inflicts more wounds. Civilian casualties far outweigh military casualties.

Foreign doctors and nurses who work as surgical teams in some provincial hospitals merit warm praise and admiration. So does anyone who serves these tormented people with compassion. Many foreign charitable organizations try to lighten misery. I mention only two because they concentrate on children. Both are volunteer organizations.

Terre des Hommes, a respected Swiss group, uses three different approaches to rescue Vietnamese children from the cruelties of this war: by sending sick and wounded children to Holland, Britain, France and Italy for long-term surgical and medical treatment; by arranging for the adoption of orphans; and by helping to support a children's hospital in Vietnam—220 beds for 660 children. This hospital might better be called an emergency medical center, since its sole purpose is to save children immediately from shock, infection and other traumas.

In England, the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief (OXFAM) has merged all its previous first-aid efforts into one: an OXFAM representative, a trained English nurse, is in Vietnam with the sole mission of channeling money, medicine, food, clothing and eventually toys (an unknown luxury) to the thousands of children in 10 Saigon orphanages.

Everything is needed for the wounded children of Vietnam, but everything cannot possibly be provided there. I believe that the least we can do—as citizens of Western Europe have done before us—is to bring badly burned children here. These children require months, perhaps years, of superior medical and surgical care in clean hospitals.

Here in America there are hopeful signs of alliance between various groups who feel a grave responsibility for wounded Vietnamese children. The U.S. branch of Terre des Hommes and a physicians' group called The Committee of Responsibility for Treatment in the U.S. of War-Burned Vietnamese Children are planning ways and means of caring for some of these hurt children in the United States. Three hundred doctors have offered their skills to repair what napalm and high explosives have ruined. American hospitals have promised free beds, American families are eager to share their homes during the children's convalescence, money has been pledged, U.S. military planes, which daily transport our young men to South Vietnam, would carry wounded Vietnamese children back to America—and a chance of recovery.

The American Government is curiously unresponsive to such proposals. A State Department spokesman explains the official U.S. position this way: Let's say we evacuate 50 children to Europe or the United States. We do not question that they would receive a higher degree of medical care, but it would really not make that much difference. On the other hand, the money spent getting those 50 children out could be better used to help 1,500 similarly wounded children in Vietnam. It seems more practical to put our energies and wherewithal into treating them on the scene in Vietnam." The spokesman did not explain why we have not made more "energies and wherewithal" available to treat the wounded children, whether here or in Vietnam. Officially, it is said that children can best be cured in their familiar home environment. True; except when the home environment has been destroyed and there is no place or personnel to do the curing.

We cannot give back life to the dead Vietnamese children. But we cannot fail to help the wounded children as we would help our own. More and more dead and wounded children will cry out to the conscience of the world unless we heal the children who survive the wounds. Someday our children, whom we love, may blame us for dishonoring America because we did not care enough about children 10,000 miles away.

THE BAHAMIAN ELECTION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a development of profound significance has

taken place in the Bahamas Islands, where the Honorable Lynden O. Pindling has been designated Premier and is thereby the first Negro chief executive in the history of the islands.

I recently had the opportunity to meet Mr. Pindling, and I must say that I was very favorably impressed by the new Premier. He is a young lawyer, just 36 years old, with a fine educational background in London and a man of apparent energy and broad outlook.

The continued friendship of the Bahamas to the United States is a matter that I view as essential.

It is for this reason that I have accepted an invitation by the Honorable Turner Blair Shelton, consul general of the United States for the Bahamas, to attend ceremonies honoring Premier Pindling this Saturday at the Governor's Club.

I believe that Mr. Pindling has a tremendous opportunity to improve life for the majority of the inhabitants of the Bahamas, as well as to continue the close and warm relationship of the islands to the United States.

I was encouraged to note that Mr. Pindling informed the press that he intended to explore the possibility of a future "association" with Britain, Canada, or the United States as an alternative to a fully independent course.

The direction that the new Bahamas Government takes henceforth should be of deep concern to us all.

The press has already taken note of Mr. Pindling's election, and many commentators have analyzed this event.

Television station WTVJ in Miami and its enterprising vice president in charge of news, Ralph Renick, have, I think, summed up the Bahamas developments forthrightly and accurately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two editorials by WTVJ, dated January 11, 1967, and January 12, 1967, appraising the Bahamian elections.

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

WHAT THE BAHAMIAN ELECTION MEANS

In the neighboring Bahamas a way of political and economic life has come to an end. The Negro Progressive Liberal Party, The PLP, seems assured of taking control of the government based on yesterday's election upset.

Negroes outnumber Whites by four to one in the Bahamas. But, in the past, by limiting suffrage to property owners the Whites were able to retain control.

This time each man had a vote.

The P.L.P. faces a great challenge. The Bahamian tourism business, the mainstay of the economy, must be preserved while at the same time a crumbling school system and absence of adequate public and social planning must be dealt with. The P.L.P. hopes that more tourist profits will trickle down to improve the lot of the Negroes in the Islands.

The Bahamas enters a new era. There's a lot to be done and undone. But unlike many emerging peoples in other parts of the world, the Bahamians have won their fight for internal control of government at the ballot box instead of by self-destructive violence and revolution.

BAHAMIAN SITUATION DRAWS WORLD ATTENTION

Nobody really knows for sure what's ahead for the Bahamas. In Nassau today I talked to ten people and got ten differing opinions, but generally I found deep concern among the White population that the Bahamian economy will be adversely affected, at least in the year ahead.

The new government, which will probably be formed tomorrow or Saturday, will be made up of legislators and ministers who will be fresh to their roles of new responsibility.

It will take time for confidence to be placed in the new regime. In the meantime, there is the possibility that outside investors, both in the United States and Europe will be cautious in making large-scale capital expenditures in the islands.

The new government would be wise to do everything possible to prove that it is stable, fair and responsible. Lynden Pindling, the PLP party leader and most certainly the man to be tapped as premier, has the opportunity to prove that peoples when lifted through the power of the right to vote from years of autocratic rule, can nonetheless effectively assume the reigns of government control.

The experiment which begins this week in the Bahamas can be an example to the world.

Pindling and his party now have the power they have sought through the ballot box.

The world will watch with interest to see if the Bahamian growth will continue unabated while, at the same time, the basic needs of the islands' people will be adequately met and their way of life improved. To accomplish both is the highest order a government can aspire to.

DETERMINED LADIES CRUSADE TO MAKE INDIANAPOLIS SAFE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I believe that it was Edmund Burke who once said:

The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.

In the past decade we have witnessed an alarming increase in the rate of crime; we have been shocked by the senseless and violent attacks on the unsuspecting citizen.

In Congress various committees have held hearings on many aspects of the subject. The Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization is probing the variety of problems festering in the cities. The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, of which I am a member, is studying alternatives for the destructive youth in the Nation; and in the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, of which I am Chairman, we continue to weigh and measure the rights of the general public. In his State of the Union Message, President Johnson noted the forthcoming report being prepared by the National Crime Commission.

However, the people in the country have not waited for national investigations and Federal directives. Today I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an extraordinary, spontaneous crusade in my home State of Indiana, where a group of concerned citizens are making a personal effort not only to curb the rate of crime, but to weed out the causes.

On March 22, 1962, indignant women were gathered together by Margaret Moore of the Indianapolis News to respond to a cruel event which had occurred the preceding night, when a teenager mugged an 80-year-old woman on her way home from church. As the luncheon progressed, this small nucleus of 30 women vowed themselves to a personal fight against the elements which produce an environment conducive for criminal activity. They did not take time to write bylaws, collect dues, or establish membership requirements—they simply armed themselves with brooms and determination and began to clean up the streets.

Their action plan required do-it-yourself persistence in three areas: lighting the streets, clearing the slums, and reaching the teenager who was headed for juvenile court.

By January 1, 1967, the original 30 women had exploded into 50,000 "crime-stoppers" who have the vigorous support of 102 local civic organizations. The results of their unique action have been impressive and commendable.

The city of Indianapolis has spent one and a half million dollars on new street lights; the clean-up campaign, organized by block committees from the neighborhood, netted 42,000 tons of trash; and "the Directory for Teenage Volunteer Service" published by a group of young people has recruited over 3,000 teenagers to work in community clinics, social organizations, et cetera. As for the overall purpose, crime dropped 2.2 percent in 1966 in Indianapolis while it climbed another 6 percent in the Nation. The organization has only printing expenses and these are absorbed by the Indianapolis News. Their homemade methods for successfully demanding action from the city to help stop crime are being spread across the country by a United Press International wire story, by the magazine Nation's Business, the National Association of Manufacturers, and Kiwanis International.

With great admiration for the work of these truly responsible citizens, who refused to nurture crime by being "good men doing nothing," I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the wire service story of January 8, 1967, entitled "Determined Ladies Crusade To Make Indianapolis Safe," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

DETERMINED LADIES CRUSADE TO MAKE INDIANAPOLIS SAFE

INDIANAPOLIS (UPI).—The day after a little old lady of 80 got whacked on the head by a teenager, 30 indignant ladies of Indianapolis met for lunch. Their aim: make the streets safe for women.

They literally picked up their brooms to start the fight.

Today, four years later, the anti-crime crusaders number 50,000. And the crime rate of Indianapolis took a dive of 2.2 per cent, in a year when the national crime rate rose 6 per cent.

This most unorthodox of all women's clubs (no membership cards, no dues, no minutes, no by-laws) did it without a penny of tax money, in the typical do-it-yourself fashion of Indiana.

POLLED TABLE

They spent their first few minutes electing a housewife, Mrs. Marshall Lincoln, as chairman. Then they polled the table for nonsense, housewifely practical suggestions.

One: More light on the streets. Right away the ladies began to ride police cars at night, then surveyed the city to spot high-crime areas, high nighttime accident spots, centers of nighttime activity.

Charts in hand, they got themselves appointed to the lighting advisory committee

of the board of public works. During 1966 the city's 1,700 miles of streets got $1½ million worth of new lights. Their advice to the more than 200 cities which have consulted them: "Get the facts. Then keep harping until everybody sees you as a lamppost."

FREE HOTDOGS

Two; simple housekeeping in the slum areas. The ladies went to one of the dirtiest blocks, knocked on doors, swept up enthusiasm. Then they called city hall and got trucks and tree-trimmers; brought in a station wagon loaded with rakes and brooms, and began sweeping. Sixty teenagers, lured by free hotdogs, joined them, sweeping down the block while housewives, doing their spring cleaning dumped junk in front of them. When the city sprinkler drove by, they had collected six truckloads of debris.

The past year 500 citizens' forum block clubs, organized by Mrs. Mattie Coney, a Negro schoolteacher, swept up 42,000 tons of debris. "People make slums," said Mrs. Coney when she received the Freedoms Foundation Award for her work. "Bad neighborhoods develop because individuals fail."

EYES ON COURTS

Another suggestion that first day: watch the courts. The first "court watchers" had to go to the Indiana Supreme Court to prove their right to sit. Now more than a thousand women take turns watching the courts, just sitting there making notes charting what they see.

Patterns soon showed up. Too often arresting officers didn't appear to press charges; or judges were late. The ladies took their charts to five judges and asked questions. Court procedures were tightened up.

As they birddogged the juvenile courts, they kept hearing, "I don't know why I did it—I just didn't have anything else to do."

YOUTH CRUSADE

So the women drafted a youth crusade. The teenagers put together a "Directory for Teenage Volunteer Service." To date 3,000 teenagers have been recruited to work in agencies, clinics and social organizations.

The women noted many young offenders did not know they had broken laws. So they mimeographed the laws, asked police to visit the schools. Youth crusaders edited a booklet, "What is the Law?" This year it will be distributed across the nation by the Optimist Club International.

As the ladies sat in courts, they noted many juvenile offenders were high school dropouts. They began a pilot project of 28 women who took 28 dropouts on a person-to-person basis, furnishing tutoring help, encouragement, books, even clothes and carfare. When 26 of the first 28 went back to school, they expanded their stay-in-school project. By now 2,000 dropouts have been helped back to school.

CLOTHING CENTER

They set up a clothing center at the YWCA; drafted men's service clubs and community groups to find part-time jobs; coaxed scores of clubs, church groups, sororities to stage chili suppers, book review benefits and apron sales to raise the $7 to $12 per pupil cost that provides lunch money, glasses, books, even alarm clocks.

Like good housekeepers, the crusaders poke their brooms into every cranny of the city. If they see smutty literature on a newstand, they talk to the newsdealer. They lobby for legislation, assist prison programs, work with juvenile court judges on individual cases, agitate for police pay raises, drive for a new home for girls now sent to the reformatory.

ONLY EXPENSES

"They didn't know what to think of us at first," admits Mrs. Margaret Moore, Indiana's "Mother of the Year" in 1965, and the one who, at the request of Eugene S. Pulliam of the Indianapolis News, called that first luncheon (The News still picks up their only expenses—their printing bills.)

"Everybody thought we were a bunch of old fuddy duddies, with our brooms and our knitting in the courts. We started out in little ways, with little things that made sense to women. And we've accomplished a lot with just our brains and hands."

Today the Indianapolis women's crusade to "make streets safe for women" is sweeping the country. The National Association of Manufacturers has distributed their stay-in-school program nationally; the General Federation of Women's Clubs adopted their lighting program for its 11 million membership; Buffalo, N.Y., copied the entire crusade; Dallas, Tex., copied the "Turn Lights on Crime" program; and volunteer women's groups in 400 cities and towns are using parts of their crusade.

POVERTY PROGRAMS: 1968 BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, poverty is a blight the United States can neither afford nor tolerate. This country is rich enough to wipe out poverty.

The President's 1968 budget has good news for 32.7 million poverty-stricken Americans. In spite of meeting present national defense requirements, the budget provides for major growth in the war on poverty. More than $1 out of every $4 for Federal nondefense programs in 1968 will be for help to the poor people.

The programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity are the key to a successful effort against poverty. The 1968 budget recommends a 28-percent increase in appropriations for the OEO. This increase of $448 million will raise the fiscal year 1968 budget of OEO to $2,060 million, which includes increases of $247 million for all community action programs. The CAP programs in 1968 will total $1,022 million, including $472 million for Headstart and Headstart followup, and $550 million for all other CAP activities. Both rural and urban areas will benefit; $210 million for work and training programs, which will total $944 million in 1968. Included is a major increase for adult work training and special impact programs, which will rise from $98 million in 1967 to $258 million in 1968 to provide intensive manpower services for severely disabled jobseekers.

The increased 1968 budget for OEO will support 1,100 local community action agencies in 1968, which will render services to 6½ million people; Headstart services to 737,000 children plus Headstart followup services for many additional thousands; NYC work training opportunities for 355,000 youths; 38,000 youths on the average in the Job Corps; an increase in VISTA enrollment to 4,200 volunteers.

Poverty is a many-sided problem. The 1968 budget mobilizes the programs of 10 different Federal agencies to assist poor people. Federal benefits and services for the poor will total $25.6 billion in 1968, an increase of $3.6 billion, or 16 percent, over the funds provided in 1967, and 2½ times the level in 1960. The total increase of $3.6 billion in 1968 specifically for the poor includes increases of $0.7 billion for education, $0.5 billion for health, $1.8 billion for income maintenance, and $0.6 billion for all other community and economic development activities. Many of these programs will provide payoffs by helping children, youths, and adults to become self-sufficient. The 20-percent increase in social security benefits which the President has proposed will remove immediately an estimated 1.4 million individuals from poverty in 1958.

SENATE RULES—AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII, RELATING TO CLOTURE

The Senate resumed the 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, under the previous unanimous-consent agreement the time between now and 1:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the majority leader and the minority leader or whomsoever they may designate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield time from the majority?

Mr. McGOVERN. I wish to yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator yielding time for the quorum?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be taken equally out of both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McGOVERN. 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. McGOVERN. Mr. President, all 100 Senators are involved today in a luncheon honoring the participants in the Senate youth program, and it is regrettable that we must proceed on the pending matter under those circumstances. It is my hope that, at about a quarter to one, I shall be able to yield to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] to speak on the pending cloture matter, but I ask unanimous consent that in the meantime I be permitted to speak very briefly on another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOLD MINES ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BARTLETT, BIBLE, CANNON, DOMINICK, FANNIN, METCALF, MONTOYA, and MUNDT, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold.

This measure is very similar to one

which I introduced during the 89th Congress, S. 2562. It provides for financial assistance payments to present and potential domestic gold producers based upon cost of production experience. Its purpose is to stabilize and increase the life of existing gold properties, provide financial inducement sufficiently attractive to reopen our dormant gold mines, and stimulate an agressive search for new gold ore reserves.

As I have stated on numerous occasions in the past, I believe the time has arrived for the Congress to recognize the fact that due to almost constant escalating costs of production our once thriving domestic gold industry is facing extinction.

I earnestly hope that we will take early and affirmative action on the remedial legislation which I am introducing today.

Mr. President, I send the measure to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 615) to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE RULES—AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII, RELATING TO CLOTURE

The Senate resumed the 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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the same conditions that the Senator previously indicated?

Mr. McGOVERN. Under the condition that the time be counted equally against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McGOVERN. 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. McGOVERN. I now yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. MANSFIELD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at 1:30 the Senate will vote whether there has been sufficient debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 6. An affirmative vote simply will mean that the Senate will at last get on with the business of debating the merits of Senate Resolution 6. This procedural question totally lacks any complication. I strongly feel that the question of a rules change must be faced; to do so requires it be made the pending business of the Senate. An affirmative vote for cloture today should not necessarily reflect the attitude of any Senator on the merits of the resolution itself. His vote today will demonstrate whether he will acquiesce in a germane discussion of Senate Resolution 6 on the Senate floor.

It so happens that I strongly favor the substance of Senate Resolution 6. I believe that a decision by three-fifths of this body—when the debate on any issue has been sufficient, when a debate has become dilatory, when the Senate should come to grips with the merits of an issue which involves conflicting and deeply felt convictions—affords ample protection to any minority and to the deliberate character of the Senate.

There is nothing magical about the choice of three-fifths. I am well aware that the three-fifths formula can be found nowhere in the Constitution or in the rules of this body. But in my opinion that fact makes it no less desirable. I simply believe that by adopting three-fifths, a proper balance would be struck between the competing interests and attitudes on an issue while still protecting the rights of a minority and the unique character of the Senate as an institution.

But the question before us is not Senate Resolution 6; it is not a proposal to change rule XXII; it is simply whether the Senate shall ever permit germane discussion on such a proposal. The question before us is the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 6. It is difficult for me to appreciate deep feeling or strong conviction on the simple procedural question of whether we should debate Senate Resolution 6.

However strongly emotions and convictions may run on the merits of the present rule XXII, or on how that rule would be changed by Senate Resolution 6, they are certainly misplaced at this time; we are one step removed from Senate Resolution 6.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the Senate has never been given an opportunity to pass upon this issue on its merits. The Senate has instead engaged and is still engaging in a nongermane debate, which most favorably can be described as premature and probably more accurately should be described as dilatory.

This biennial dispute for a change in the rules has plagued us for nearly 20 years. The Senate has never been willing to face up to its merits. I believe we have an obligation and a responsibility to do so now. On occasion in the past the Senate has been accused of not acting wisely; it should never be accused of not acting responsibly.

We decided last week by an overwhelming vote that the uniqueness of this body should be maintained; that reflection and deliberation should be assured on all proposals from whatever quarter. The choice last week was in my opinion a wise choice. A majority of the Senate could have decided otherwise. A majority failed to adjudge abuses under the present rules sufficient to justify an extraordinary method to effect a change in the rules. Our vote last Wednesday implied that the Senate was capable of coming to grips with significant issues.

Today's vote on this simple procedural issue will reflect greatly on the genuineness of those arguments and the validity of that judgment. Today's vote will be significant evidence to future majorities in future Congresses.

Already nearly 2 weeks of this Congress have been used up on this very simple procedural question. Over the years, countless weeks have been consumed on virtually the same question. I feel certain that if the Senate reaches this issue this year and decides the issue on its merits, whether there is a change in the rules or not, we will not be plagued by any serious effort to change the rules in the foreseeable future.

I add only that debate will not be choked off by voting for cloture today. Unlimited debate will then be available on the question of changing rule XXII. A vote for cloture today means only that at long last the Senate has shown a willingness to discuss openly and properly the merits of a rules change. I know the Senate is capable of handling such a debate; I hope its vote today will permit it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has stated, probably, the most broadly appealing "consensus" answer to the question we have today when he said that this motion is not a restriction of debate on the proposed change in rule XXII.

The motion is a motion to take up. It is not amendable, and it is, indeed, somewhat unusual that such a motion should be contested.

There are two things which I think are critically important in the consideration of this matter.

We who are on the side of changing this rule are generally referred to as the so-called liberal side. Whether that is true or not, those words are becoming rather outworn now. We have made our case that at the opening of every Congress a majority has the right to act to change a rule.

The Senate has turned us down. That is a historic decision.

We must say in fairness to the Vice President that he was the first Vice President who was able to put the matter to the Senate in a way which would give a decision on the basic constitutional issue.

We know enough about the operation of the Senate to know that when one loses, he loses. We are bound by the rule that debate can be stopped only by a two-thirds vote. That decision is ex cathedra, from the Chair. There we are, and we have to live with it.

The leadership has told us in unequivocal terms—and especially the majority leader—that when the majority of the Senate wants something it can get it.

Even if we cannot get two-thirds majority on this vote today—and I hope that we can—if there is a decisive ma-

jority, as I believe there will be, that wants to go into the matter of changing rule XXII, we may perhaps be able to see a demonstration of this idea of action. If a determined majority really wants to get something done here, if they have a case—and that is about the only way we know they have a case, is if a real majority wants it, it can be done.

I hope, therefore, that my friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], will persist in his effort, should that prove to be the vote, and that we will really try.

No other business is really pressing right now, anyway.

I am hopeful that we will really try to ascertain here if, when a decided majority wants something to be done here, it will be done.

My office has analyzed the cloture votes since rule XXII was adopted, to ascertain whether any of them would have been changed by a three-fifths rule. As far as we can determine, none of them would have been changed.

If the votes would not have been changed, what then is the significance of the three-fifths rule? The significance is that it is not as big a gun to be held at the head of the majority as is the two-thirds rule. It is more susceptible of being conditioned to allow this Chamber an opportunity to express itself.

To that extent, it is an improvement, and any inching up on this situation is an improvement.

I hope very much by the confluence of those two factors—first, that the three-fifths rule would not have affected any previous vote, and that it is not therefore an earth-shattering matter; and second that we will have an opportunity to determine whether, if a majority wants something done, it can be done—many Senators who may have some question about the matter itself will at least let us take it up or determine whether to take it up.

Senators may be convinced that the rule should be amended. Even though we do not have the necessary two-thirds majority but do have a decided majority of the Senate expressing itself favorably on that matter, I hope that we may determine whether a decided majority which expresses itself affirmatively on a matter can work its will.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the last week or so of debate on the proposals to amend rule XXII, I have not been an active participant. This has not stemmed from any weakening of my belief in the absolute necessity of modifying what to many of us is a severe rule. My belief in the need for change in rule XXII is no less today than it was in 1953 when I first took a significant role in the effort to reform the cloture procedure. I have been gratified over the years since then to see an increase in the ranks of Senators who favor a more liberal cloture rule.

I know that some opponents of a change in the rule come from the less populous States; their position is rooted in a concern that the rights of small States might be overrun without the protection of unlimited debate.

Mr. President, I come from a State that has only a little over 1 million people, and I do not fear that their rights will be any less secure if we modify rule XXII. Apparently a number of other Senators from States with smaller populations share my feeling. The Senator from South Dakota is a cosponsor of the three-fifths proposal—a reform which the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana, has said he favored. I am happy to see a substantial group of western Senators supporting reform in the cloture procedure.

I believe we are involved in an important effort to improve procedures by which the Senate conducts its business, while protecting the right of Senators to fully debate all issues.

Soon we will have before us the plan of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for reorganizing the operation of Congress. The Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress has put in long months of effort in order to help make the Congress a smoother functioning and better equipped instrument of government. But as we all know, the Monroney-Madden committee was specifically precluded from doing anything about the rules. That responsibility thus falls directly on the full Senate. Rule XXII, as it presently stands, is a barrier to efficient representative government. It is a device for abusing free and full debate. We today must take the vital step to make our rules more effective servants of democratic government.

I intend to vote to invoke cloture so that the Senate can exercise its constitutional right to change its rules.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McGOVERN. 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. McGOVERN. I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, last week I opposed, with considerable vigor and deep conviction, the odd hypothesis, by way of advisory ruling, of the President of the Senate. I would again oppose, with whatever rules of the Senate were available to me, such stricture upon parliamentary procedure in the U.S. Senate.

Also, Mr. President, I am opposed to cloture being imposed upon the Senate by less than a two-thirds majority. Ample precedents are contained in the Constitution for action requiring two-thirds majority.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I am willing that a majority of the Senate eventually, after deliberate consideration, work its will with respect to the rules of procedure of the Senate.

With these views in mind, I shall today vote for cloture. I hold that the subject has been amply debated. I feel that eventually the Senate, by majority action, should be free to work its will with respect to its rules of procedure. I am prepared, and I believe other Senators have sufficiently considered the matter to be adequately prepared, to face that issue.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. In view of the convictions that I entertain with respect to this issue, I have taken this brief period to state the reasons for the action which I shall take later today.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, at this late hour, I take this action to appeal to many of my colleagues who voted in good conscience last week, when those of us who want to see some moderate change in the rules were defeated. I do not consider this a defeat for our position, because many Senators who voted as they did, did so because of what they, in their conscience, felt would be the establishment of a dangerous precedent in the Senate. The situation today is quite different.

For the past 8 years, I have either been sponsor or cosponsor of a measure to change the rules so that three-fifths, in effect, could terminate debate, after the necessary preliminary steps. I have always maintained that moderate changes are best in a legislative system.

Certainly, as one who has served in the minority during all but 2 years of my 18 years in Congress, I desire to see the minority position protected. I also feel that a majority has certain rights; and I trust that those who voted as they did last week will recognize the fact that entirely different issues are involved with respect to the vote we are about to take today.

I would trust that this issue, for which the Senator from New Mexico and I have fought for years, and which is now sponsored by the Senator from South Dakota, can be brought to a vote. I intend to vote for cloture. If cloture is obtained and a substitute motion is offered for the 51 percent aspect, I shall vote against it; because I do not believe that we should take extreme steps in establishing rules for our great legislative body, the Senate of the United States.

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

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator realize that if cloture

were voted, we would surely then be faced with the proposal to substitute cloture by a mere majority for the cloture by 60 percent, which the Senator advocates?

Mr. MORTON. I realize that fully, and I am confident that we have the votes to defeat the 51 percent.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it was not my intention even to ask for this amount of time, but I wish to leave one point in the RECORD.

All through the debates that have taken place on this subject, both since the opening of this session and, to a great extent, in other sessions, the emphasis has been entirely on the matter of limiting or closing off debate. In my opinion, one point has not been emphasized sufficiently, and that is that whatever rule the Senate decides in its wisdom to adopt, when you provide the means of terminating debate, you are at the same time terminating the consideration of a measure by amendment, other than those amendments that have already been offered and have been read and have been frozen into consideration by the Senate.

I am well aware of the answer to this statement: Senators can file their amendments. I am also aware that if amendments are allowed after cloture has been invoked, although the 1-hour rule for each Senator would prevail, there could be rollcalls that would consume some time on amendments.

However, I well remember, when I voted for cloture in 1965, that I had an amendment which had been read before the Senate, and the distinguished majority leader, in his kindness and courtesy, made sure that the amendment could be considered. I discovered, however, that the amendment, which to me was most important, by a slight modification might well have been adopted. But the majority leader, in performing his duty—and he had to do it—objected when I asked for unanimous consent.

Consequently, amendments which Senators file, perhaps days and weeks in advance, are frozen; and when the gavel falls and cloture is invoked, the Senate has its hands tied, not only in the matter of making speeches—which is not, in my opinion, quite so important—but also in the matter of improving and amending and working the will of the Senate on legislation. It is a straitjacket.

It will be recalled that at the close of the last session, for reasons which were amply justified—I certainly am not criticizing the Senator—the majority leader laid a question before the Senate, and also a cloture motion the same day. It occurred at the end of the week. Many Senators were out of town; and, as I recall, only one or two Senators were present and were able to get their amendments filed and read to the Senate in time to be considered.

I almost made up my mind in 1965 that I would never vote for cloture again, because of what it did to the power of improving and amending a bill. However, that is not my determination. I stand ready to vote for cloture when the time comes that I am convinced it is necessary. But I do not intend to vote to relax the rules and make cloture easier, and my main reason is that it freezes the real consideration of legislation and the amending and the improving of measures before the Senate.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I question whether the Senate has a constitutional right to require two-thirds vote on cloture to end debate on a matter which, under the Constitution, can be settled by a majority vote.

Mr. President, I also question whether this resolution is in order since I question whether rule XXII is in effect. This rule has been challenged by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], and, consequently, there has been no positive act of acquiescence so far as I read the proceedings of the Senate.

If the majority leader and the minority leader introduce de novo a resolution providing for the same procedure that is provided under rule XXII, this would then properly be before the Senate.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. But, Mr. President, since this resolution was introduced under rule XXII I believe the case can be made that it is out of order and that there ought not be a vote either for or against cloture under the resolution, at least until the Senate does give acquiescence to rule XXII. We really should refrain from voting on this resolution on the ground that it is out of order and should not be before the Senate, and I will support it only reluctantly.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, today is the 24th day of January. The Senate has been in session for 2 weeks. During most of that time the pending matter has been a simple motion made by the junior Senator from South Dakota that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 6.

That resolution, which we are asking the Senate to consider, was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and me on the opening legislative day of the session. It provides that after a reasonable period, debate could eventually be terminated by the votes of three-fifths of the Senate instead of the present requirement of two-thirds.

There is nothing revolutionary or radical or even very liberal about this proposal. Indeed, its chief characteristic is its caution and its conservatism. As the editor of the Washington Post put it in an editorial on January 13:

> The most striking aspect of the antifilibuster fight in the Senate is the extreme conservatism of the reforms offered.

Mr. President, on last Wednesday, the Vice President, while fully respecting the dignity, the constitutional rights, and the regular procedures of the Senate, made it clear that in his judgment there is a parliamentary method under which the Senate can work its will to terminate extended debate if a majority wishes to do so at the beginning of a new Senate.

The Vice President cannot be faulted by either liberals or conservatives for the manner in which he presided over our deliberations last week. The day may come when Senators are sufficiently fed up by some long and empty filibuster so that they will take advantage of the procedure outlined by the Vice President.

I ask unanimous consent that the conclusion of my remarks, an editorial in the Sunday Washington Post of January 22 relative to the exemplary conduct of the Vice President as presiding officer be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McGOVERN. But for whatever reason, the Senate decided last week that it did not want to use the procedure which was suggested at that time, so we now have no other recourse except to try to terminate debate under rule XXII, which requires the votes of two-thirds of those Senators present and voting.

I do hope that those who argued last week that they were interested only in the right of the minority to be heard and were not attempting to block orderly procedures in the Senate will recognize that the time has now come to terminate debate. After all, the present move for cloture seeks only to permit us to make the resolution of the Senator from Kentucky and me the pending business. We are asking only for the right that our proposal be considered.

Even if this cloture motion carries, there will be additional debate on the substance of the three-fifths resolution.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not understand how those who believe in democracy can insist on forever blocking the right of a majority of the Senate to work its will. I was amazed by the bluntness with which some Senators attacked and ridiculed the concept of majority rule in their remarks on this floor last week. There seemed to be more reverence and loving care lavished on the rights of the minority than on the rights of the majority. I believe, too, that the minority should have a right to be heard. But the whole theory of democracy is that after the minority has spoken and all sides have been heard that we then abide by what the majority decides.

Webster's unified dictionary says of democracy:

> It is government with the consent of the governed, limited only by the fact that the laws and circumstances of the governed must accord with the wishes of the majority as expressed through the vote.

Frankly, I believe that the prestige and public respect for the Senate has been damaged more by the filibuster than any other single practice of the Senate. It makes us frequently the laughing stock of the country. How much better it would be for democracy, for the public interest, and for the dignity of this body if, after a reasonable period of debate, there were a procedure whereby three-fifths of the Senators, as proposed by Senator MORTON and me, or a constitu-

tional majority of 51, as proposed by Senator KUCHEL and his cosponsors, were able to bring debate at long last to a close so that the Senate could work its will.

When Senators talk about this procedure for terminating debate as a gag rule, I would suggest that the real gag on the Senate is the power of a small number of Senators to paralyze this body with a filibuster. The real gag on the Senate is not majority rule, but the lack of it and the power of a handful of the Senate to frustrate the wishes of the majority.

The present rule requiring two-thirds of the Senators to terminate a filibuster was adopted in 1917. In a brief on the history of the limitation of debate in the U.S. Senate, prepared by Dr. George B. Galloway, senior specialist in American Government at the Library of Congress, we read these words:

The cloture rule of 1917 was drafted by a conference committee of 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans named by their respective party organizations. This committee stated that its purpose was to formulate a rule that would "terminate successful filibustering."

Dr. Galloway continues:

If the purpose of the cloture rule is to terminate successful filibustering, experience shows that it has failed to achieve its purpose in 23 out of 28 times.

The distinguished minority leader in his usual effective way reminded us that Columbus had been jeered by the majority. I would only like to point out that if a filibuster had prevailed in the court of Queen Isabella, Columbus would never have been given the opporpunity to present his petition in the first place.

Both major political parties have endorsed reform of rule XXII. The 1960 Republican platform reads in part:

We pledge our best efforts to change present rule XXII of the Senate and other appropriate congressional procedures that often make unattainable proper legislative implementation of constitutional guarantees.

The Democratic Party platform for 1964 reads:

The Congress of the United States should revise its rules and procedures to assure majority rule after reasonable debate and to guarantee that major legislative proposals of the President can be brought to a vote after reasonable consideration in committee.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of cloture so that the modest proposal which Senator MORTON and I are offering may be made the pending business of the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

OPEN DOOR: BALKY HORSE

The failure of the Senate to end minority rule within its walls is the more deplorable because the way to this long-awaited reform was so clearly marked out for it. The procedure followed was, as Senator Javits described it, an "historic break-through." It was firmly rooted in a sound constitutional argument. Yet it failed for want of majority support.

Credit for the strategy which led to the vote goes largely to Vice President Humphrey. This was recognized by Senator Javits in the debate on the floor when he said:

"It is the Vice President's procedure. He has given the Senate an opportunity, in a very astute manner . . . to get out from under an impossible situation. He has given us the opportunity to debate. On the other hand, he has given the majority the right to reach a decision at last. That fact appears to have been overlooked this afternoon."

In criticizing the Vice President for his failure to speak out clearly on the unconstitutionality of Rule 22 this newspaper did not sufficiently acclaim the notable contribution his ruling made. Our comment was directed solely at the absence of any explicit statement by the Vice President on the principles involved. This he left to others, feeling that, as the presiding officer of the Senate, it was not his function to expound upon the convictions underlying his action. The absence of a clear statement by the Vice President about the principle at stake was magnified, of course, by the inexcusable hostility of Majority Leader Mansfield to the concept of majority rule.

We persist in thinking that if the issue is properly defined and emphasized before the country Rule 22 must go. Senator Morse forcefully stated one reason why this is so. "With all that is going on in the world and in our country," he said, "we cannot, as Senators, justify continuing a rule that permits a willful minority in the Senate to block the welfare of the country, according to their minority sights."

The other reason why unlimited filibustering is no longer tolerable is that it offends the basic principles of American constitutional government. In effect the Senate has amended the Constitution so as to require a two-thirds vote for the passage of highly controversial legislation.

The fight for removal of this cancerous growth in our political system must go on. If the Senate can invoke Rule 22 on Tuesday to cut off debate on Senator McGovern's proposal for three-fifths cloture in future contests, that compromise will be a step in the right direction. But it will not, of course, be a final answer.

Every citizen who believes in the elementary principles of democracy will need to keep bearing down upon the Senate until it is ready to listen to reason. Fortunately, the Vice President's ruling will stand as a precedent. It means that the antifilibuster forces are free to press a motion for majority cloture at the beginning of any Senate session, that when a point of order is made against such a motion it can be voted down by a simple majority, and that the motion for cloture reform would then become the pending question. This is more than an invitation to continue the struggle. It is an open door to victory as soon as a majority in the Senate can find the courage to stand for the constitutional principle of government by the majority.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I be made aware of the time that is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in all of the conferences we had last week when this matter was before the Senate I did offer to sign a cloture motion if there was comfort to be had from the prestige that the names of the two leaders might bring to the motion. However, I made no commitment and I felt that I made it abundantly clear that I did not intend to vote for the cloture motion, and I shall resist it today. I do so for the very simple reason that I am opposed to cloture by a majority, I am opposed to cloture by 60 percent, and I am opposed to cloture by any other means than that which exists in rule XXII at the present time. Now I take that position for a reason. In the first place it is not necessary to change this rule because nearly everything over the years that the Senate had to accomplish was finally accomplished despite the requirement of two-thirds.

There have been 7 times out of 36 endeavors since 1919 when an effort has been made to get cloture. They were successful on seven occasions but that did not mean that the subject matter and the legislation involved did not ultimately succeed because the footnotes that legislative counsel have prepared in getting up this little brochure on the subject of the cloture rule indicates that in all except three cases there was ultimately favorable action upon that legislation whether there was a single bill or a group of measures relating to a single part of the subject matter. So no one can say that the will of the Senate or the Congress was finally denied simply because of that cloture rule.

Mr. President, what happened was that the appropriate modifications were made, and rightly so. It then committed itself to the good thinking of the Senate and was finally engrossed on the statute books of the country.

If there is needed a classic example, the distinguished Senator from Florida sits in the Chamber now. Four times when I was in the House of Representatives I voted for outlawing the poll tax. I did it in the Senate notwithstanding the fact that the great leader, Bob Taft, of Ohio, who used to sit in this chair, said, "You have to do it by constitutional amendment." But the distinguished Senator from Florida undertook to pursue that course. What happened? In a jiffy, as constitutional amendments go, it went to the country. It was ratified by the necessary legislatures and that took care of the poll tax. Do not let anybody say that under the procedures today in this body that these things cannot be accomplished. The trouble is that too often it depends on whose ox is being gored.

There are on the cloture motion now two names of those in this body who participated in a filibuster on the satellite communications bill. We were at it for some 33 days, strangely enough. They did not want to be shut off at that time, but when it does not serve their purpose they would like to see that somebody else be shut off. On this side of the aisle 34 out of 36 Senators voted for cloture on that bill. Why? Because that bill had the endorsement of the President and three departments of Government. It had the endorsement of four senatorial committees. On this side there were only two who opposed cloture in order to get favorable action. On that side of the aisle the vote was 29 to 25. There is a clear example of whether you can get cloture when you have a case. But we have to have a case and very rightly so.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question or two?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have two questions I should like to ask the Senator. First, since the Senator said "when it commends itself to the Senate," does that not in effect mean when it commends itself to two-thirds of the Senate present and voting, rather than to any other size

or number of Senators to whom it commends itself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true.

Mr. JAVITS. Is that, in the Senator's view, compatible with the Constitution which states that a quorum of each House shall be adequate for the conduct of business——

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is.

Mr. JAVITS. Including a declaration of war?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a ruling to that effect. As a practical matter, I point out to my good friend from New York that had we not had the rule which is on the books today, repeal of section 14(b) would have been jammed through the Senate as it was through the House by twisting the arms of those tender, young Representatives, 47 in number.

What happened? Those Representatives either did not run again, they were defeated in the primaries, or they were defeated in the general election.

The repeal of section 14(b) could not be rammed through the Senate. The reason they could not do so was that we kept it alive until the country became aware of what was involved in the bill. That is when the mail by the millions began to hit the Senate, and where as many nonunion members as union members participated in that great flow of mail, to let the Senate know how they felt about repealing section 14(b).

If we had not had the two-thirds rule, it would have been a different story. Thus, it is a protective device not merely for the Senate but also for the people of the United States of America. That is the only way the people can be informed on an issue which is recondite or so obscure that sometimes even Senators do not quite know what the score is. It is only by belaboring it day after day after day that we protect the national interest. That is precisely what rule XXII does in its present form.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have one more question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I had two questions. I have one more I wish to ask and I will be only a few seconds.

Is it not a fact that this thing is as broad as it comes, that the communications satellite filibusterers would be shut off just as fast as other filibusterers? Is it not also a fact that the Senator presents us with a paradox that will never be resolved, because of the two-thirds rule, whether a majority was or was not for repeal of section 14(b); and therefore, that this is merely suspending the Constitution in favor of a Senate rule, which is not a feasible argument?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is a rule of feasibility if I ever read one because, after all, this is still the people's country and it is in proportion as they become informed and we abide by their judgment that we preserve the nature of our Government. That is our great legacy today.

Mr. JAVITS. Many people believe that the Senator's viewpoint takes something away from them by the two-thirds rule instead of a majority which the Constitution says it should be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A lot of people. But, let me remind the Senator, he classifies them as to economic groups who come in here and want something out of the Federal Treasury. That is quite a different matter.

Mr. JAVITS. It still can be less than a majority, I can assure the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am happy now to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I thank my leader.

Mr. President, at the time Senate Joint Resolutions 6 and 7 were introduced, I stated that I would offer an amendment to each of them which would provide that cloture could be invoked by a three-fifths vote, provided—and this proviso is essential—a majority of the Senators from each of the two political parties present and voting also were included in the three-fifths vote.

I pointed out at the time these amendments were filed—and they are now on the desk of my colleagues—I felt that the present two-thirds rule was defective in that it provides a foundation whereby members of the majority party can, under conditions such as existed during the 89th Congress, put a time limitation on members of the minority party. Accordingly, the present rule is not satisfactory. It seems to me that progress can be made by slightly relaxing the number required to vote for cloture; namely, a reduction from two-thirds to three-fifths, while at the same time protecting the rights of the minority and insuring bipartisanship in the support of any issue underlying a Senate filibuster.

I would point out to my colleagues that in the seven instances that cloture has been invoked, a majority of Senators from the two major political parties present and voting did, in fact, vote for cloture. All my amendment would do would insure continuation of this bipartisanship.

I regret that there has been no firm indication from the proponents of Senate Resolution 6 that if cloture is now invoked they would accept my amendment. If this indication were forthcoming, so that we could be assured of voting for Senate Resolution 6, with the added proviso that a majority of the Senators from the two major parties present and voting also join in the vote, then I would be inclined to vote for cloture today.

In the absence of this assurance, I regret that I cannot do otherwise than vote against cloture.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the clock on the wall gives me a few moments to make my final observations.

This is the 90th Congress. As a parliamentary and legislative body, it is the oldest on the face of the earth which has undergone no significant change in that time. It has endured in peacetime and in wartime.

In this hemisphere, in one of the large countries in Latin America, the Government was also patterned on the Government of this country. But one thing they forgot to do. They forgot to safeguard their own proceedings, so that today when the President of that country does not like any delay on the part of the congress of that country, he can by fiat or by decree put into effect even a thing like censorship, so that no newspapers in that country can even discuss an issue such as inflation.

It is only because we have protected our procedures, particularly in this day and age, that this Congress has functioned as effectively as it has, and has served all the people.

We hear no great outcry from the people of this country to change the two-thirds rule. We hear it from the groups who want it made much easier to ram through the Senate panaceas and laws, bills and resolutions, which are usually self-serving rather than serving the public interest.

The pending motion should be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes remain. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes any more time, I suggest the absence of a quorum to be called until 1:30 o'clock p.m., when it will be automatically terminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The hour of 1:30 p.m. having arrived, under the previous unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will now vote on the pending cloture motion. The pending question is: Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 6, amending the Standing Rules of the Senate, shall be brought to a close?

Under rule XXII, the clerk will call the role to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A "nay" vote is in effect a vote against Resolution 6. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A "nay" vote is a vote against cloture.

The clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 6 Leg.]

Aiken	Dirksen	Inouye
Allott	Dodd	Jackson
Anderson	Dominick	Javits
Baker	Eastland	Jordan, N.C.
Bartlett	Ellender	Jordan, Idaho
Bayh	Ervin	Kennedy, Mass.
Bennett	Fannin	Kennedy, N.Y.
Bible	Fong	Kuchel
Boggs	Fulbright	Lausche
Brewster	Gore	Long, Mo.
Brooke	Griffin	Long, La.
Burdick	Gruening	Magnuson
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Mansfield
Byrd, W. Va.	Hart	McCarthy
Cannon	Hartke	McClellan
Carlson	Hatfield	McGee
Case	Hayden	McGovern
Church	Hickenlooper	McIntyre
Clark	Hill	Metcalf
Cooper	Holland	Miller
Cotton	Hollings	Mondale
Curtis	Hruska	Monroney

Montoya	Percy	Stennis
Morse	Prouty	Symington
Morton	Proxmire	Talmadge
Moss	Randolph	Thurmond
Mundt	Ribicoff	Tower
Murphy	Russell	Tydings
Muskie	Scott	Williams, N.J.
Nelson	Smathers	Williams, Del.
Pastore	Smith	Yarborough
Pearson	Sparkman	Young, N. Dak.
Pell	Spong	Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] is absent because of the death of his grandmother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Under rule XXII, a yea-and-nay vote is required.

The pending question is: Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to take up Senate Resolution 6, amending the Standing Rules of the Senate, shall be brought to a close?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] is absent because of the death of his grandmother.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 7 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Aiken	Hartke	Moss
Allott	Hatfield	Muskie
Anderson	Jackson	Nelson
Bayh	Javits	Pastore
Boggs	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Brewster	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Brooke	Kuchel	Percy
Burdick	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Case	Magnuson	Randolph
Church	Mansfield	Ribicoff
Clark	McCarthy	Scott
Cooper	McGovern	Smith
Dodd	McIntyre	Symington
Dominick	Metcalf	Tydings
Fong	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Montoya	Yarborough
Griffin	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morton	

NAYS—46

Baker	Gruening	Monroney
Bartlett	Hansen	Mundt
Bennett	Hayden	Murphy
Bible	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Smathers
Cannon	Hollings	Sparkman
Carlson	Hruska	Spong
Cotton	Inouye	Stennis
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Dirksen	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Eastland	Lausche	Tower
Ellender	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Ervin	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	McGee	
Fulbright	Miller	

NOT VOTING—1

Harris

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the provisions of rule XXII, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my intention to move to adjourn the Senate upon the completion of its business today. An adjournment of the Senate will automatically dispose of the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 6. That resolution would thus remain on the Senate Calendar.

The size of today's cloture vote reveals the futility as well as the frustration of proceeding any further with this matter at this time. The Senate has made its judgment, and the leadership will abide by it.

Our next order of business is the reorganization plan. No discussion of that bill will take place by its manager, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], until tomorrow at the earliest. In that regard, and to put all Senators on notice of this next order of business, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2 (S. 355), the legislative reorganization plan.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the majority leader this question? We have had a vote on a constitutional issue, and we have had a vote on cloture, which a majority has voted for now. I ask the majority leader whether it is not more fair to the Senate, because of the fact that we have said here time and again that if a majority really wants something it can get it done, to persevere in this matter. The Senate is not that busy. The only other piece of legislation on the calendar is that of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. Rather than to pass immediately from this matter, considering that a majority wants it considered, to some other, because we are frustrated by the fact that two-thirds have not voted for it—serving to confirm what so many of us feel, that the Constitution has now been amended to provide for two-thirds rule—may I ask the Senator whether he would not permit us to try the cloture route once more, say next Thursday, and then dispose of this whole question this week, so that we may really see what the vote might be on reconsideration by Senators who have seen that a majority wants to consider this matter, and may therefore feel that perhaps the Senate can be more vindicated on that basis, by its perseverance in deciding the constitutional question, if we do allow debate to go forward at least on the merits?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before I yield, on his request, to the distinguished minority leader, I know that the distinguished senior Senator from New York is well aware of the fact that what he proposes would be an exercise in futility and continued frustration. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate, unless there is a possibility of success.

I had been prepared, had the vote been reasonably close, to submit a second cloture motion today. But I think it would be a sham, a fake, and a phony thing to do, in view of the vote just taken.

I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not know, and I do not believe that that is true. I think this is a serious enough matter—I am only affirming my own bona fides—that the Senate ought to have a right to choose. Therefore, I ask the majority leader, would he mind, if we are to lay this aside and proceed to another matter, making such a motion, so that the Senate may vote whether it wishes to do that, rather than seeking unanimous consent?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I think that we are following the regular procedure, if the Senator does not mind, and if he does not know the futility of submitting another cloture motion today and voting on Thursday, then I must say respectfully that he is the only Member of this body who does not know it, because the facts speak for themselves.

I know of no Senator on this side who is prepared to change his mind, and I know of no Senator on the other side who is prepared to do so, either.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, here is an answer to my good friend the Senator from New York. This morning there came from the bill clerk's office 26 amendments to the Reorganization Act.

These amendments were all submitted by the very distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Here is one to amend rule XXII.

Here is one to amend rule XIX.

Here is one to amend rule IX.

Here is an amendment to amend rule XXIV.

Here is another amendment to amend rule XXIV.

Here is one to amend rule XXXII.

Why, we will have rules discussions running out of our ears if we are going to exhaust all of these amendments submitted by my lovable friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, the author of Senate Resolution 6.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I asked the distinguished majority leader to yield so that I might make one observation. When the distinguished majority leader says that it would be a sham and a fake and a phony to try to continue this effort under the existing rules, it would certainly——

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I said in view of the vote.

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes. When the majority leader said that in view of the vote it would be a sham and a fake and a phony to try to continue this effort under the existing rules, it would be equally true to say that it would be a sham and a fake and a phony to suggest that the majority of the Senate is now working its will.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In a sense, the Senator is correct because a majority of the Senate has voted to limit debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 6, but, under the rules, we do not have the required two-thirds. Consequently, because of the wide disparity between those in favor and those necessary to cut off further debate, I cannot see by any stretch of

the imagination anywhere near a sufficient change in votes to make it palatable to submit another cloture motion at this time.

Mr. McGOVERN. It does simply point up the frustration and paralysis that exist under the two-thirds rule that we are apparently consigned to operate under.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does, to a degree.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I point out that even if the resolution of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota had been in effect, he would not have invoked cloture on this vote. He would have missed it by seven votes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, only six votes would have to be changed in order to prevail on another cloture motion, and knowing the Senators who voted as they did, I know that those six votes are potential votes; they are there.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there you have the confession.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let there be order in the Chamber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, they are just bargaining for time to carry on a campaign. What is involved here is whether we will do that at the expense of the time of all other Senators.

We have not put on a campaign. We let it stand for what it was.

If we had a three-fifths rule, they still would not have had enough votes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call attention to the poor mathematics of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, because it would take a change of 13 votes at the very best to diminish the 46 votes against cloture to 33, which is the maximum that could be voted without cloture being obtained.

Mr. President, I have heard just about as much concerning this so-called failure of majority rule as I am able to stand without commenting that the Senate, without a rule at all, but by long precedent, extending back to the earliest days of the Senate, has obeyed the two-thirds rule required for waiver of the rules, which is deeply imbedded in the precedents of the Senate.

Nobody has claimed that a majority should prevail in such a matter.

I think that the distinguished Senators have become involved so much in this matter that they have made it a kind of fetish.

The Senate has from its earliest days had the two-thirds requirement, for the waiver of the rules, not by rule, but by precedent of the Senate, adopted in the first instance by the consent of the body which wanted to get things done.

I wanted this statement to be in the RECORD before we terminated this debate.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I was in error in my computation. Thirteen votes need to be changed, not six. I still feel that I was right, in that there are 13 potential votes, after further debate, in favor of cloture, and that the Senate should continue to consider the matter.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I must say that all of these arguments are being made by those who oppose the rule change, and they are begging the question that the majority of the Senate apparently wants to consider the matter.

Talk about frustration and an abdication of constitutional process, that is it if I ever saw it.

I have always cooperated with the majority leader insofar as any human being could, and I shall always do so.

I must say, however, with all due respect, that I just felt in deep conscience that I could not sit here and let a unanimous-consent request go through in that way and throw the majority—53 Senators of the United States—out of the window. What are we? We are thrown out of the window by unanimous consent to go on to something else.

So, Mr. President, I object.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 25, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maurice Cecil Mackey, Jr., of Alabama, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation (new position).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Rest in the Lord and wait patiently for Him; fret not thyself.—Psalm 37: 7.

Eternal God, our Father, who hast made us for Thyself so that our hearts are restless until they find rest in Thee, we pause in silence before Thee as we begin the duties of another day. We would quiet our spirits in Thy presence and find rest in the support of Thy sustaining strength.

Forgive our folly and our excuses, our coldness to human suffering, our indifference to those treasures of the spirit which are light and life, and our neglect of Thy wise and gracious laws. So change our minds and turn our thoughts unto Thee that we may walk in the way of Thy commandments and with courage serve our Nation, with compassion help our brethren, and with confidence keep our lives committed to Thee.

In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86–420, appointed Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. GRUENING (alternate), Mr. AIKEN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. HANSEN (alternate) to be members of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group to attend the meeting to be held in Oaxaco, Mexico, February 8–15, 1967.

CARROLLTON'S MAN OF THE YEAR FOR 1966—ROBERT D. TISINGER

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Honorable Robert D. Tisinger, of Carrollton, Ga., was elected Carrollton's Man of the Year for 1966 at that city's annual chamber of commerce meeting.

This award is significant at this time because Bob Tisinger, as much as any single person, has devoted his time, talents, and abilities to continuing the development and improvement of west central Georgia. He has been a tireless worker in behalf of soil and water conservation and a national pioneer in the development of legislation for the betterment of rural life in the United States as is shown in his activities in behalf of the rural electrification program.

Bob Tisinger has lived in Carroll County, Ga., most of his life on land acquired by members of his family over a hundred years ago. He is well known and highly respected by those who know him best.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert an editorial from the January 19, 1967, edition of the Carroll County Georgian which expresses the feelings of the people who have bestowed this high honor on an outstanding citizen of their community:

A SALUTE TO CARROLLTON'S MAN OF THE YEAR

R. D. (Bob) Tisinger has received the honor of Carrollton's Man of The Year for 1966 and most of this editorial will be devoted to a salute to this worthy citizen of this county.

But before the focus is turned upon the

one who was chosen, this newspaper would like to point the spotlight upon all six who were nominated.

One finds it hard to resist the observation that Georgia should have had as esteemed a group from which to elect a Governor.

The six nominees were: W. L. Lomason, F. M. Chalker, Rev. R. O. Flinn, Roy Richards, Howard Rinn and R. D. Tisinger. Now if you don't think it was difficult to make a choice from this group you just don't know the men. The choice was made in a secret, democratic, vote in the civic clubs of Carrollton.

It is assumed that every reader of this newspaper knows something about each of these men, but just a sentence or two about each must be included here.

Rev. R. O. Flinn—Probably the best known and the most loved Presbyterian pastor in Georgia; a guiding light of the Service Council, Oak Mountain Academy and Oak Mountain Chapel; a friend to every soul who needs a friend.

Roy Richards—Industrialist, business leader, a native of this county who has developed the county's largest payroll at Southwire; the only chairman Tanner Memorial Hospital has ever had; a man dedicated to progress of the people with whom he associates.

W. K. Lomason—Head of Douglas & Lomason Co., one of Carrollton's finest industries; contributor of over $100,000 in 1966 to provide the local funds for construction of a regional library.

F. M. Chalker—Superintendent of Carrollton's School System for 22 years; a leading layman in the First Methodist Church; past president of the Lions Club.

Howard Rinn—The only chairman Carrollton's Recreation Commission has ever had; past president of the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, Service Council and a leader in most civic undertakings in this community.

Now we come to the winner, R. D. Tisinger, a man who makes his home in the Victory community on land that was purchased by his family before the Civil War.

The others will likely be nominated again and will be honored. All of them know it is a distinct tribute to their service to be nominated. We congratulate them all.

Educated in the Bowdon schools, the A & M College and Atlanta Law School, he has spent most of his 57 years in humble service to Carroll County.

Mr. Tisinger was one of the founders of the Rural Electric program for the county and for the nation. He still serves as national attorney for this organization. He was the architect of the Soil and Water Conservation programs of this county and continues to serve on these committees.

It was largely through his legal guidance and efforts that Tanner Memorial Hospital became the first hospital in Georgia to be constructed with the help of the Hill-Burton Act, and has been enlarged twice. He has always been a member of the Hospital Authority.

A staunch supporter of education at all levels, he has been in the front ranks of those who wanted to build better educational systems. He is attorney for the County School Board.

In business and industry, Bob Tisinger has always been ready and able to represent his county in any audience and before any group with a desire to provide more and better jobs in Carroll County.

Here is a man who is highly capable, brilliant in the law, with an enviable record behind him but still so humble and modest that he was actually amazed that his people should so honor him.

Bob Tisinger is the kind of man who would argue all day that any of the other nominees should have received the honor. The people of this city and county know that all the nominees were most worthy of the honor but in 1966 Bob Tisinger is our Man of The Year.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE OF RICH'S DEPARTMENT STORE, ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, today Rich's Department Store in Atlanta, Ga., will celebrate its 100th anniversary of service to the consumers of Atlanta and the State of Georgia.

In commemoration of this occasion, Miss Celestine Sibley, a well-known columnist of the Atlanta Constitution and an accomplished author, has written a new book which will be released tomorrow, entitled "Dear Store—An Affectionate Portrait of Rich's." The publishers say:

To celebrate the 100th anniversary of Rich's, Celestine Sibley, an Atlanta institution herself, has written a heart-warming, informative, and at times, very amusing account of the store that married a city and their century of happy life together.

Mr. Speaker, the successful growth of Rich's has been an exciting story. Currently one of the largest department stores in the United States, Rich's was founded in 1867 with a $500 borrowed investment.

This week, Richard H. Rich, grandson of the store's founder and present chairman of the board, announced a $115 million expansion plan to be carried out over the next 10 years. The plan is based on projections that the store's volume will grow from $150 million annually in 1967 to $200 million annually by 1977.

Mr. Speaker, the announced expansion and celebration of 100 years of service by a great Georgia institution are a tribute to Rich's management and further attest to the faith that all Georgians have in the continued growth prosperity, and development of our State.

There is a statue in our Nation's Capital which bears the inscription, "What Is Past Is Prologue." A taxi driver was asked by a visitor to Washington what that meant, and he quite appropriately replied, "It means, 'you ain't seen nothing yet.'"

The first century of Rich's has been great, and I predict, with my taxi driver friend, that the second century will prove that "you ain't seen nothing yet."

I join in congratulating the management and the employees of Rich's on a job well done.

HON. SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to have this opportunity to join my Illinois colleagues in paying tribute to our beloved Lt. Gov. Samuel H. Shapiro. That the Jewish National Fund has selected him as its man of the year comes as no surprise. The "Mr. Sam" of Illinois government, Lieutenant Governor Shapiro has distinguished himself in the legal profession, the State legislature, and the executive branch. His humanitarian efforts in the field of mental health have rightfully earned him the title "Mr. Mental Health."

I am proud to count Sam Shapiro as my good friend. Those of us who do so consider him a man of rare qualities. A devoted public servant who has great talent and proven abilities "Mr. Sam" has played a vital role in the tremendous strides that Illinois State government has made during the two administrations of Gov. Otto Kerner and Lt. Gov. Sam Shapiro. Those of us know him and have had the opportunity to work with him consider it a privilege.

It is appropriate that Sam Shapiro should receive the coveted Keter Shem Tov—the Crown of Good Name Award—at the January 31 dinner. His unselfish deeds on behalf of his fellow man deserve recognition. The symbolic religious citation which the Keter Shem Tov represents is a fitting honor for this great man.

To Sam and his lovely family I wish them every success and continued good fortune for the future.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ATTEMPT TO BLOCK FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION APPROVAL OF THE ABC–ITT MERGER

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the 11th-hour attempt by the Department of Justice to block the Federal Communications Commission's approval of the ABC–ITT merger should cause serious concern to all Members of the House of Representatives.

I am convinced the entire regulatory process is endangered by this late action. The FCC was established by the Congress and operates under its strict surveillance. After a year's study the merger was approved. And it was only approved after the Department of Justice indicated that it had failed to turn up evidence conclusive enough to warrant the filing of an antitrust suit.

I believe the FCC by its exhaustive study of the merger is in the best position to judge whether the merger is in the public interest and this it has done. What the Department of Justice is in effect saying to the FCC is that we do not have a case but we think you should reverse your decision. There is positively no basis for this action and I believe that the duties, responsibilities, and integrity of the members of the FCC must be upheld.

I would also like to include in my remarks the editorial from the January 23 issue of Broadcasting:

A WORD FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF—WHAT?

"It is hard to believe that the Department of Justice was acting wholly on its own initiative when it asked the FCC last week to reopen the ABC–ITT case. That the department would wait so long to apply for entry as a participant suggests that it was pushed into an action that it had been unwilling to take when earlier invitations were extended.

For the time being, however, the motivation of the department may only be conjectured, and indeed it is secondary in importance to the effects that could flow from the kind of procedure that the department has proposed. What Justice is attempting here is a short-cut to enforcement of its current antitrust philosophy, without going through the difficult course of prosecution in the courts under the antitrust laws. If this short-cut leads to Justice's desired ends, it could easily become the road to nowhere for any large company that seeks to enter broadcasting through the acquisition of existing properties.

The Justice Department has based its petition to the FCC entirely upon what it regards as potential injuries to competition in broadcasting. It implies that if admitted to the case, it will attempt to persuade the FCC to deny the merger on the grounds that the anticompetitive effects would be against the public interest.

Undeniably, the FCC has broad powers to grant or refuse broadcast licenses according to its appraisal of the public's interest in the outcome. It may even have the legal power to do what Justice asks. But in this case it is being urged to reverse its own decision that the public interest would be served by a union of ABC and ITT. And it is being urged to change directions on a very narrow interpretation of the nation's antitrust policy.

Now antitrust law is very complicated—so complicated that the Justice Department itself, the government agency that is most expert in the subject, loses a good many cases that it prosecutes. Neither by design nor practice is the FCC competent to sit as a court in the trial of an antitrust matter. And that may be the very reason for the Justice Department's selection of the FCC as the forum for attacking the merger of ABC & ITT.

By Justice's own admission, the department has been investigating the merger for more than a year. By now it ought to know whether it has a case that would stand up in the orderly procedure of a federal court trial. If it thought it had one, it could have filed in federal court an appropriate suit to enjoin their merger.

There is every indication, however, that Justice would prefer to queer this deal without risking embarrassment in court. Last Nov. 3 Donald Turner, the antitrust chief, asked the FCC to defer action on their merger until the department could complete investigation. Mr. Turner said the investigation "indicates a sufficient possibility of significant anticompetitive effects to indicate that substantial antitrust questions are presented." On Dec. 20, Mr. Turner advised the FCC that there were anticompetitive problems that the FCC ought to consider, but he said his department had failed to turn up evidence conclusive enough to justify the filing of an antitrust suit. Last week's petition to the FCC suggests no accumulation of new evidence.

It will take uncommon courage for the four-man majority of the FCC that approved the merger last month to stick by its position, but stick by it it must. The essentials of the case before the FCC have in no way been changed by the Justice Department's earlier letters or its petition of last week. Justice's own actions have been only a hindrance to the commission's disposition of the matter.

If Justice truly believes that the merger violates the antitrust laws, it can test its belief in the forum that the law provides, the federal court system.

MODERNIZING CUSTOMS CHARGES FOR AIRCRAFT AND MARINE VESSELS

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to largely eliminate user charges assessed to airplane pilots and boat operators when they require customs service after regular hours.

Under the present system, there exists confusion and inequitable treatment. Operators of small aircraft and maritime vessels entering the United States at times other than weekday business hours are caught in a strange game of chance that frequently proves more costly than entertaining. This element of chance involves who will check them across the border: a customs officer, or an immigration officer. The winners of this game are those inspected by immigration officers. They are charged no extra fee. But those inspected by customs officers are the losers, as they are charged for the officers' overtime wages. This cost can run as high as $60.

Aside from the confusion and understandable resentment that exists because of this inconsistency, the overtime charges, themselves, are—in my judgment—discriminatory in that such charges are not made of people crossing the border by land.

I believe it is in the best interests of the growing number of pilots and marine vessel operators, as well as in the best interests of the economies of the comunities located along our national borders to revise this present system.

Much mail has commented on the detrimental economic effect of these customs charges. The statement of the Bellingham, Wash., Chamber of Commerce said:

Because of the necessity for paying this overtime Customs service, those utilizing Bellingham Airport claim the airport usage has been reduced and held back. This, in turn, has served to affect the economy and progress of Whatcom County and Bellingham.

The Snohomish County, Wash., Airport Commission passed a resolution stating, in part:

Whereas, the Snohomish County Airport Commission is vitally concerned with the continuing development of aviation and aviation commerce to the betterment of the community, and whereas, the Commission believes United States' overtime charges are detrimental to aviation development and aviation commerce [we believe] the abolition of these overtime charges will assist the Snohomish County Airport Commission in encouraging and promoting aviation and the aviation industry in Snohomish County and surrounding areas.

George C. Petrie, has written, saying:

As Manager of the Snohomish County Airport, I feel the present overtime charges by the United States Customs Service has a detrimental effect on general aviation. This airport is located only 67 nautical miles from the Canadian border, and I feel the inequities of the overtime charges restrict flying activity between the United States and Canada. Snohomish County is attempting the further development of aviation in our area.

I have also received letters supporting this bill from the Anacortes Chamber of Commerce and the port of Bellingham, among others in my district.

Further, outcry against the present regulations from throughout the Nation demonstrates this is not a problem restricted to the Pacific Northwest.

With this bill I am introducing today, we are recognizing that off-hour border crossings are no longer a strange exception. In 1911, there were few aircraft, and fewer still engaged in international flights. Today, there are more than 100,000 private aircraft and hundreds of thousands of individuals who are licensed to fly them.

The growth of boating throughout the Nation has been astounding. The Puget Sound area is the "Pleasure-Boating Capital of the World." The vast area of navigable waters open to boaters lies on both sides of the international border. But present regulations hamper convenient international boating on weekends when boating activity is at its peak. And boaters in areas of the country other than the Northwest are hampered by present regulations.

It is not unreasonable for boaters and private pilots to require service on Sundays, holidays, and during the early evening hours. These are, in fact, the very times that private boaters and pilots would most reasonably be expected to need the service: the times when they are on weekend and holiday outings.

The basic reason so many people are concerned about present policy is that it requires exorbitant charges for service at "eminently reasonable" times; namely, on their "days off." Commerce and travel in the United States today are not simply an 8-to-5, week day proposition, and administration of services required by the Government should reflect that fact.

The present regulations were established in 1911—when such boat and aircraft travel was very limited. This is 1967, and I believe it is obvious that the present regulations are unreasonable. They need to be revised.

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION ACT OF 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a piece of legislation that

I believe will be of significant value to the whole structure of our economy. The Federal Savings and Loan Association Act of 1967 is similar to legislation that I sponsored in the 89th Congress, and I am hopeful that the 90th Congress will give this bill the full and clear hearing it deserves.

The legislation I am introducing today amends section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 by providing that in addition to withdrawable savings accounts, a Federal savings and loan association can raise capital by issuing guarantee stock to its savers representing the total value of the reserve of the institution. The association would also be permitted to sell an additional amount of stock to its shareholders or the general public. This nonwithdrawable stock will constitute additional reserves for losses, and its owners will be the last to participate in the event of losses.

In addition the legislation will allow associations complete conversion privileges providing for conversion from State to Federal charters, or Federal to State, and conversion from mutual to capital stock or vice versa.

The need for such legislation was prompted by Congress when in 1962 it passed the Revenue Act that in effect imposed a tax levy on the savings industry which has materially affected the operations of Federal associations and will continue to do so in the years ahead.

Presently, federally chartered associations are organized exclusively as mutual institutions and must rely on current earnings to meet the cost of increased reserve and tax requirements. Since reserve allocations are based on the growth of the association there is a practical limit on the expansion of a Federal association since the institution must for all practical purposes rely on current earnings to finance its growth. This practical inequity would be relieved in that an association would have an additional method to increase its capital.

A number of major benefits would accrue from the passage of this legislation. First, Federal associations would be given a rightful opportunity to take advantage of growth prospects. This bill would provide the needed flexibility to allow a Federal association to raise capital enough to make it possible to grow rapidly when the time is right.

Second, the machinery outlined in the bill will help in providing associations with incentives for better management and more efficient employees. Those officers connected with the association and own stock are in a position to increase their own worth if the quality of their service results in the association's increased growth and profits.

Third, stock corporations are more easily explained and understood by the American public than the type of mutual institutions that we now operate through. It is doubly difficult since mutual associations are really not "mutual," and the dividends we pay are really not dividends.

Fourth, it will enable associations to increase their reserves. A stock association can better accommodate to regulations related to growth and asset quality. They are also more flexible in meeting the capital needs of the communities they serve.

These are just a few of the major advantages that would become reality if this legislation is passed. As I pointed out last year when I introduced a similar version of this bill, holders of more than 20 million savings accounts with Federal associations throughout the United States could receive the benefit of a cash dividend if this legislation were to be adopted and all existing institutions put the plan into effect. The obvious benefit to the Nation's economy would be far reaching.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON OLDER AMERICANS

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson enunciated a vital proposition in his message yesterday on older Americans which I would like to support wholeheartedly. He told us of his concern for those aged who are now destined to spend the final years of their lives under constant care and attention in hospitals and nursing homes. He pointed out that we can lighten the burden of these people through more forceful community action to provide services, not in institutions, but in their neighborhoods, in their own communities.

Institutions are necessary, important, and vital for the care of those too sick or feeble to help themselves. And they should not be burdened with citizens who, with a little supporting service from the community, could be happy and well cared for in their own homes.

Every community in the country that can afford to build and support nursing home beds can support alternative community services. It costs no more. In hundreds of communities over the country, home care services are operating to keep old people out of hospitals at a cost that is a fifth or a tenth of hospital costs. How much better would it be to invest that money that would go into bricks and mortar into people?

Imaginative leadership in every community could provide meals to the sick or old at home, hot meals once or twice a day, and the friendly visitor who brings the meal and sits and chats for a few minutes will make the difference between the old person at home and an old person in an institution.

Homemaker services can provide shopping, baby sitting, cooking, even some home nursing service, and keep old people in their homes.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the dignity of the old people, to lighten and cheer their last years, to keep them comfortable and happy, we must do everything possible to keep them out of institutions and in the community. We can have day hospitals for those who need some medical care or physical therapy, and transportation to take them back and forth to clinics. We can provide nursing care at home, homemaker, and meal services.

The benefits will be for all of us. We will rejoice that our old people—fathers, mothers, aunts, and uncles—will not be lost in the shadows of institutional neglect. We will provide increased opportunities for employment to workers in the health occupations in these relatively unskilled services for community care. We will be sharing the heavy load of scarce professional workers caught up in institutional work, freeing them for more important duties. And we will be using the communities' moneys effectively, efficiently, and economically.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the major social security benefits increases the President has recommended will go a long way toward underpinning the security and dignity of our older citizens. Too many of them are poor, or almost poor. These increases are a great step toward bringing them up to a realistic and decent standard of living.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics be allowed to meet this afternoon in connection with its scientific panel now in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MEETING WITH SPACE OFFICIALS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the coming year will be a year of significant achievement in our Nation's space program. It will also be the year in which we shall reach the peak of our efforts in many of the important projects being carried out by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Consequently, I have arranged for a meeting for the new Members of this 90th Congress to talk to NASA Administrator James E. Webb, Dr. Wernher von Braun, one of our astronauts, and other senior officials of NASA to help them get acquainted with the space program. This meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 1, at 10 o'clock in the committee hearing room in the Rayburn Building.

We have an interesting program planned. Also there will be an opportunity to ask any questions of concern about the space program. I am sure that those new Members who have not had an opportunity to get a first-hand appraisal of the program and have not had a chance to meet these distinguished men will find this to be an enlightening and

memorable session. I urge all of our new Members to attend.

Invitations are being sent to the new Members with an agenda for the meeting. I hope all of them will come.

THE LATE HONORABLE BRADY GENTRY

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, Brady Gentry, passed away on November 9, 1966. He served with distinction in this body from January 1953 to January of 1957, and voluntarily retired from Congress after the two terms.

Even though he was in the House for a relatively brief period, during that time he established an enviable record as a man of strong convictions, sound thinking, and courageous action. He was a man of great ability, and while here made a valuable contribution to the cause of good government.

Born March 25, 1896, in Van Zandt County, Tex., Brady Gentry was educated at East Texas State College and at Cumberland University. He served in Europe during World War I, was made captain of infantry, and was gassed during combat. Gentry served as county attorney of Smith County, Tex., then as county judge, as chairman of the Texas Highway Commission for a period of 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, Brady Gentry was one of the most sincere and devoted statesmen who has ever served in this body. He left his mark here. A bighearted man, he concerned himself with the well-being of the rank and file. The poor and the unfortunate always found a friend in Brady Gentry. Many of us were proud to be considered among his host of personal friends.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the November 11, 1966, issue of the Tyler, Tex., Courier-Times:

BRADY GENTRY, PUBLIC SERVANT

In the death of Brady Gentry, Tyler has lost one of its most distinguished public servants. His achievements for the public good were numerous and on many levels, from local to national.

He was notably successful in leading the way to systems of improved highways, first in Smith County and then in Texas. He was recognized as a national authority on highway administration and in 1943 was chosen as president of the American Association of Highway Officials. During his two terms in Congress he was a member of the Committee on Highways and Roads.

The highway network he developed in Smith County has been described as a model that served in helping create the Texas system. And it was under his direction as chairman of the State Highway Commission that the farm-to-market road system came into being.

As a member of the House in Washington, he became known as a well informed congressman on legislative matters and one who dared vote his convictions regardless of party lines.

Shortly Mr. Gentry retired from Congress, Rep. Clark Fisher of San Angelo described him as "the most interesting person I have met in Congress during the 14 years I have served."

Fisher added: "Never a party hack or narrow party-liner, Brady Gentry always put the good of the country ahead of political considerations as he cast his votes. What greater tribute can be paid any man? His stature rises high above the run of party politics and back-scratching techniques."

Such qualities marked the career of Brady Gentry in all levels of his public service. They earned for him the high respect of the people over the many years, including the many friends who now mourn his passing from the human scene.

HON. BRADY GENTRY

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, in 1935, as a part of the National Youth Administration I moved to Tyler, Tex., and first became friends with the then County Judge Brady Preston Gentry. Judge Gentry later became Congressman Gentry from the Third Congressional District of Texas. He was one of the most unusual men ever to serve in Congress. Though a quiet man by nature, when he spoke people listened, and they learned. He was a man of high ideals and would not hesitate to place principle above party when in his opinion the situation called for it.

His election to the 83d Congress in 1952 was the crowning moment in an already brilliant public career. He was a combat veteran of the First World War, rising to the rank of captain of infantry. After serving a term as county attorney of Smith County, Tex., he became county judge, serving from 1931 to 1939. As chairman of Texas State Highway Commission from 1939 to 1945, he distinguished himself as one of the Nation's foremost authorities on highways and public roads.

In 1954, the people of the Third District reelected him to the 84th Congress over strong and dedicated opposition, thereby giving him a much deserved vote of confidence.

He did not seek reelection at the end of his second term of Congress, but returned to his native Tyler and resumed the practice of law.

In private life, Congressman Gentry never married. However, the number of boys and girls he helped to educate and give a start in life is untold and perhaps even unknown, except by those who were the beneficiaries of his benevolence.

On November 9, 1966, he lost the battle of this life and won the battle for eternal life. East Texas, Texas, and the Nation will long mourn and forever remember Brady Preston Gentry.

TALK OF CUTTING THE NONDEFENSE SPENDING IN THE 1968 BUDGET

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk of cutting the nondefense spending in the 1968 budget. Some say, if we do this we can avoid a tax increase.

With all due respect to the advocates of this idea, I believe it warrants a few minutes of examination. First, $4.7 billion, the amount estimated to be obtained by the President's tax proposal is a very large sum to cut from nondefense expenditures. Where can we get that much? Obviously, most of it will have to come from places where the big money is. Places like—

Agriculture with its rural electrification loans, soil and water conservation, loans and grants for farmers to improve their homes and to buy needed farm machinery, and other programs designed to raise the income level of the farmer;

Health, education, and welfare programs, which means cutting back on health research, aids to schools and students, help for the needy, the aged, and the infirm;

Housing and urban development programs, while our communities are crying out for help to stem the urban blight where crimes festers because of poor living conditions;

Antipollution programs designed to diminish the filth in our streams and rivers, to abate smog, and build modern sanitation facilities;

Antipoverty programs to improve the lot of the unemployed and the underemployed;

And from a lot of other programs which the Congress has authorized over the years which have helped to make us the great Nation we are.

I have heard it said that our space program and the foreign aid programs could be sharply slashed. Perhaps that is so, but, and it is a mighty big but, you just cannot cut enough out of those programs to make up $4.7 billion.

So let us not delude ourselves into thinking it will be easy to achieve a $4.7 billion reduction. And when we make speeches about cutting that much out of nondefense spending we should be honest enough to identify where, what, and by how much we would cut specific programs.

NEEDED—AN UNDERSTANDABLE POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, an understandable American policy in Vietnam is urgently needed. We do not have one—or at least if we do it is perhaps the No. 1 best kept secret both at home and abroad. Many people believe that our participation in an undeclared war, 10,000 miles away in Vietnam, is the wrong kind of war, at the wrong time and in the wrong place. Certainly a land war on the continent of Asia in a hostile environment with a supply line reaching halfway around the world is the wrong place in the judgment of every trained military man, be he five-star general or buck sergeant.

But—and it is a big "but"—we are now heavily committed by the Johnson administration in Vietnam, rightly or wrongly, to the extent of nearly half a million American lives. We cannot now simply walk out on these men. We cannot now pull back to enclaves on the beachheads. We cannot now, having gone this far, say to the Communist aggressor, we will go no farther; we will sit here until you negotiate or we are destroyed.

Such indecisiveness is not a policy worthy of the name. It is chaotic and confused, as well as a virtual betrayal of every man in uniform in Vietnam. It invites attrition, guarantees eventual defeat, and exhibits to the world a weakness in American government which is the proper relationship of civilian political control over the military in time of war. Surely the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not responsible for, and want no part of, the sometimes inadequate military tactics that have characterized much of the American performance in Vietnam to date. Examples are legion, but only two need be mentioned. First, leaving the port of Haiphong unmolested while supplies used in killing Americans are received and handled on a daily basis in huge quantities; and second, sending the cream of America's pilots to battle will-o'-the-wisps and jungle swamps to a point where they are publicly begging to be given "half a chance to win."

Even if we could get our entire 450,000 men back home without a further casualty we could not abandon the courageous South Vietnamese to the tender mercies of the Vietcong. Eighty percent of these brave people voted for freedom at the risk of life and limb. We promised them that we would underwrite their independence when we should instead have helped the French to defend Vietnam against the Communist Ho Chi Minh on condition that a timetable spell the end of colonialism and assure the eventuality of independence for all of Vietnam. Then it was France in the frontline, asking for our help and we said no. Now it is us in the frontline, virtually alone, asking not only the help of France but of the entire remaining free world and they say no.

Something must be radically wrong with our position in Vietnam when we continue to fight on almost alone. What is it?

With every passing day of this sorry war we go further into monstrous debt, lose more and more frontline planes, wear out more and more carrier decks, lose more and more combat pilots, sap the reserve strength of more and more home based divisions—all while the Soviet Union grows relatively stronger, and the free world is appalled that the mighty America cannot even win a war in an area no larger comparatively in terms of world affairs than a football field.

So, Mr. Speaker, since we cannot now withdraw with honor, and we must not condemn our loyal troops to slow attrition in the swamps by a mere holding operation, there is but one policy that has validity at this hour, a policy which transcends political considerations and ought to be supported by Republicans and Democrats alike in the interests of getting this abominable war over with as soon as possible.

This policy is for our President to announce to the Vietcong and to North Vietnam that their continuing aggression against South Vietnam must be stopped. That to do this means to effectively cut off their supplies, and that the United States is first declaring a blockade of Haiphong and if this fails will block the entranceway to Haiphong, and if this fails will, as a last resort, destroy the port facilities at Haiphong.

That the United States will proceed to destroy the airstrips and Sam sites of North Vietnam and that if the North Vietnamese deliberately locate these in the middle of civilian populations, they must realize that this will not shield them.

That the United States will not use atomic weapons, or bugs or chemicals, but that the independence of South Vietnam will be attained and a beachhead of freedom established and maintained in southeast Asia.

And, finally, that they and the world should now know that unless the Communist aggression is ended it will mean such destruction of North Vietnam as is necessary to win and end this war.

Mr. Speaker, here is a policy our Armed Forces and the world can understand. Here is a policy that will mean independence for South Vietnam. Here with such a policy will be marked the resurgence of America's declining leadership in a deteriorating situation. Here is a policy that will unite, inspire and highly motivate the South Vietnamese who know so bitterly that the source of their scourge is North Vietnam.

Actually, there is no other choice. The demand to negotiate now falls on deaf ears. And why not? For it is we who are losing in Vietnam, blood and billions and staggering commitments of reserves.

The Communists know this. It is to their advantage to keep us thus committed—indefinitely if they can.

Our present indecision means just this. It is playing into the enemy's hands. It is unfair to our troops and downright deceitful to the concerned families back home.

Let us lead in Vietnam. Let us get this war over with. Let us for once do something because it is right and necessary and not because it might or might not mean some votes on some future election day.

After all, we are on God's side, and there can be no greater cause than freedom and independence and eventual genuine peace, everywhere in the world.

This can never happen in our lifetime if Communist aggression succeeds in South Vietnam.

WHICH WAY SOCIAL SECURITY, MR. PRESIDENT?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, later this week I expect to introduce legislation to improve benefits under social security and to provide automatic cost-of-living increases whenever there are increases in the cost of living.

But in view of the fact that the President has submitted his message on this general subject, there are some statements in the President's message that ought not go unchallenged.

Much of the President's remarks were directed at the problems of the aging in general, but even then the President used a broad brush treatment leaving an implication that all our aging suffer from such things as "poor health facilities, inferior recreation, and rehabilitation services," and poor income.

The President says social security benefits today are grossly inadequate but by failing to define what he regards as inadequate he leaves the impression that the social security system was designed, of and by itself, to provide an "adequate" income, when in fact it is intended to be a floor and not to relieve individuals of their obligation to plan, to save, and to supplement.

He proposes including as eligible for social security, new classes of people who have never made any contribution to the system, and who therefore would be drawing benefits rightfully belonging to others who have contributed to the system.

He proposes a substantial three-step increase in the wage base and the tax base in spite of indications that this is unfair to millions of younger Americans who under this schedule will receive far less in their retirement years than they contribute to the system. Also I wonder whether he has perceived that this sharp increase in the wage base, is a penalty imposed on those employers who pay higher wages for it is they who will have to pay a higher employer's contribution, while employers whose wage rates are low will be rewarded, tax wise, for so doing.

The President suggests more rigid Federal standards for the various States to comply with, ignoring complaints from many Governors—including the Democrat Governor of Missouri—that States should not be forced into any program through Federal legislation that imposes upon its citizens additional State taxes, to which they or their elected representatives have not consented—see attachment.

The President makes the bland statement that before medicare, many older Americans needlessly suffered and died because they could not afford proper health care. Such a statement is patently false and I doubt that it can be supported by any responsible studies. It is indeed an old "bromide."

The President says that opportunities must be opened to many Americans over 45 who are qualified and willing to work, and says we must end arbitrary age limits on hiring. If the President is to practice what he preaches, he should look first at the present hiring policies of the Federal Government, for surely it is more arbitrary in this respect than most private agencies. If anyone does not believe this, let them reach the age of, say 50, and then apply for normal civil service employment.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican proposal for an 8-percent increase in benefits falls within the framework of available financing without increases in taxes. Let us look at some of the changes which show what a problem this has become.

When the program was started a quarter of a century ago, projections were made for a payout of $2 billion for the year 1967. The payout this year will total $26.3 billion.

When the program started, the original plans called for a 6-percent annual tax on the first $3,000 of income for the year 1967. Workers and employers this year will pay 8.8 percent on the first $6,600 of earnings.

It was originally projected that the fund would take in $2.8 billion during 1967. It will actually take in $25.9 billion this year, $400 million behind the payout.

It was originally planned for the trust fund to hit $54 billion this year. It is now at $23 billion, less than 1 year's payout.

Already, social security has left the present wage earner behind. The Tax Foundation points out that a 21-year-old man putting in 44 years of work, at today's tax levels, will have paid in $32,496 including taxes and simple interest, to the fund. Based on a life expectancy of 13 years after he reaches 65, he will collect only $19,704 in benefits. This difference will increase if the President's proposals are adopted in their present form.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress has two choices before it:

It can pass responsible legislation, to raise the floor to the new level which Johnson inflation has made necessary, and maintain that level by incorporating "cost-of-living" increases thereafter, which require no tax increase.

Or, it can destroy the very system it created by creating new stresses, by attempting to do too much for too few now and challenging the credibility of the whole system in the eyes of those who now work and contribute to the fund.

I hope Congress will have the wisdom and the willpower to do the former and not the latter. Otherwise we will fail in our obligations not only to the older citizen, but to all citizens who have such a vital stake in a sound social security program.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader & Press, Jan. 21, 1967]

NEW CLASH WITH LBJ—HEARNES WARY OF "MEDICAID"

ST. JOSEPH, MO.—Gov. Warren E. Hearnes said Friday night he is wary and concerned about the so-called "Medicaid" provisions under Title 19 of the Medicare law.

He said he has written all members of Congress from Missouri and all governors about the dangers of the costs to the states of the mandatory requirements in the bill for care of the medically indigent.

Hearnes has been critical of the Johnson administration before. He was one of two governors who refused to endorse the President's original request for approval of his Viet Nam policies.

Hearnes, a West Pointer, said he didn't know enough about the foreign situation to express an opinion.

Johnson carried Missouri in 1964 but many Democratic leaders, Hearnes included, say that as of now they doubt whether he could carry it again.

In a speech prepared for the Northwest Missouri Press Association, the governor noted that he has recommended expanded medical care for welfare recipients costing more than $33 million the first year.

"I know this legislature will respond as the 73rd General Assembly did—with intelligent benefits for more people," he said.

"But the legislature and I also must remember and always keep in mind the financial stability of the state and the ability of Missouri taxpayers to meet the cost of improved medical services—including those directed by Title 19 to persons as capable of paying for hospital insurance and for medical bills as the average citizen.

"I also believe, and I repeat again tonight, that Missouri—or any other state—should not be forced into any program through federal legislation which would impose upon its citizens additional State taxes to which they, or their elected representatives, have not consented.

"I decry the idea, and I deny the theory, that a state and its citizens are not capable of determination as to what is most beneficial and most practical for the neighbors they see every day of each week and every month of every year.

"I also do not believe this effort on the part of the federal government to dominate vital programs is truly 'creative federalism'. I furthermore do not believe such efforts push outward the horizons of a 'Great Society'."

He cited the federal government's demands for highway beautification bills as "an increasingly common threat of federal penalties which eventually wear thin the expected cooperation between state governnors, state legislatures, the federal agencies and the Congress."

Once again he urged a cautious approach to embracing the requirements of the Medicaid law. Under present conditions, he said, the "medically indigent" or "near needy" could include a third of Missouri's population at an astronomical and unestimated cost.

"I favor medical aid for those unable to pay for it," he said. "I view dimly the provision of state funds to pay for medical aid for those able to face this inevitable fact of life with difficulty—and this includes most of us here tonight."

He said the record shows "that the legislature and I are not immune, callous or innocent of the needs of those requiring medical aid, but who lack funds.

"But I also do not intend to recommend unalterable entrance into full-scale participation in a program which may be altered drastically by Congress tomorrow, next week or next month."

AMENDMENT TO THE UNIFORM TIME ACT OF 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the dimension of time has long been a great mystery to man. He has discovered that he can allot it, beat it, change it, devote it, do it, gain it, have it, keep it, kill it, make it, mark it, occupy it, prescribe it, race it, serve it, spare it, take it, tell it, waste it, and watch it. However it was in the area of saving time that the 89th Congress concentrated its attention when it passed the Uniform Time Act of 1966.

This act was passed only after heated debate. There can be little doubt that the State's prerogatives in this area were greatly curtailed. Be that as it may, the act is now the law of the land. What must be done now, is to amend the act so as to make it fair and equitable to all segments of the population.

In this regard and toward improving the Uniform Time Act, Mr. Speaker, I am today submitting a bill whereby daylight saving time would not commence until the Sunday following Memorial Day, and then would cease the Sunday following Labor Day. Why should not daylight saving time begin when summer—unofficial—begins for the overwhelming majority of our population, around Memorial Day, and therefore end following the last holiday of the summer season, which is Labor Day? Is there any logical reason why daylight saving time should begin so early in the spring and end so late in the fall? I know of none.

Under the present act in many "climes" and time zones, children are forced to go to bed during the school year while the light of day still shines through their bedroom windows. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you, as well as most Members of this body, are quite aware of how difficult this task is. Probably the only way to remedy this situation is by the use of a ball-bat or by the use of tranquilizers, depending on the degree of frustration. This problem is then compounded in that during certain parts of the school year these same children must get up in the morning greeted by a pitch black and dark world. Surely, there is enough confusion facing our schoolchildren in our troubled world without adding anymore.

Not only have our children been placed under the adverse and confusing pressure of this expanded daylight saving time, but so have the remainder of the population. I have received copies of resolutions from the City Council of Carthage, Mo., the City Council of Joplin, Mo., and the City Council of Carl Junction, Mo., requesting that daylight saving time be confined to the summer season between Memorial Day and Labor Day.

I cannot overemphasize the urgency of this problem since the fourth Sunday in April is rapidly approaching. A just and equitable amendment, like the one I have introduced, must be acted upon at once,

so that our citizens may truly enjoy our impending summer holiday season.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, let us take time, to devote time, to truly save time.

PROVIDING TAX INCENTIVES TO ENCOURAGE INDUSTRY TO INSTALL POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill providing tax incentives to encourage industry to install pollution control facilities. Our modern industrial society has produced great advantages for all of our citizens, but unfortunately air and water pollution has sometimes been a byproduct of this tremendous progress.

Private industry is making an attempt to meet its responsibilities in this area. Their preventative self-help measures must be an important part of any national program to attack pollution of our water and atmosphere. These industries are familiar with the specialized nature of their various operations and the problems involved in installing antipollution devices in their plants. By providing tax incentives to reduce the tremendous costs involved in installing industrial antipollution devices, the Government is enlisting the cooperative efforts of those individuals and concerns most able to abate pollution of our environment caused by industrial production.

In the last Congress, a multi-billion-dollar governmental program was enacted in the field of antipollution. It would indeed be incongruous to enact a governmental program of this magnitude while failing to enlist the vast resources of private industry in an attack on this problem.

Last fall, Republicans led a successful effort to exempt pollution control facilities from the suspension of the 7-percent investment credit. My bill provides that this 7-percent credit will be doubled to a total of 14 percent on the date of enactment.

My bill also provides that depreciable air and water pollution control facilities may be written off currently or over a period of 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of pollution in our environment is becoming of increasing concern to all our citizens. Clear air and pure water are of vital concern to our young and the old alike, the rich and the poor together. The hour is late and the need is great. I urge all Members of Congress to support my bill. I am hopeful that it will be enacted as expeditiously as possible.

DR. CLARK KERR HAS RESPECT AND CONFIDENCE OF HOMETOWN CITIZENS

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues who yesterday paid tribute to Dr. Clark Kerr, an outstanding educator who was fired from his position as president of the University of California through the efforts of Gov. Ronald Reagan.

Dr. Kerr is a native of my home city of Reading, the Sixth District of Pennsylvania, where he is held in the highest esteem.

We were shocked to learn that this attack on Dr. Kerr and free education could happen in the once progressive State of California.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a column by John F. Walsh published in the Reading Eagle of January 22:

DR. CLARK KERR

(By John F. Walsh)

It will be "old home week" for Dr. Clark Kerr, president of the University of California, until his ouster by university regents on Friday, when he delivers commencement addresses at Reading High School, June 8 and at Exeter High School June 9.

On these occasions the controversial ex-president of America's largest university may recall the last commencement address he made in this area—at Albright College in June 1960.

The Albright commencement address turned out to be both a triumph and a disappointment to Dr. Kerr, a native of Berks County, who spent his boyhood in this area.

The disappointment was in the size of the audience. But this was beyond his control. The heavy rain of the preceding day plus the hot, humid weather of Sunday, June 5, 1960, conspired to hold down the attendance in the Albright College Field House.

The triumph was in receiving an honorary doctor of laws degree from Albright and in seeing many old friends, including a beloved elementary teacher, sitting in the audience.

In introducing the hometown boy who made good, Dr. Harry V. Masters, then president of Albright and now president emeritus, asserted: "For seven years we have made an effort to secure Dr. Kerr as our commencement speaker . . . Dr. Kerr is a graduate of Reading High School . . . He is an outstanding educator . . ."

There was happiness, pride and humility in the clear, ringing voice of Dr. Kerr that hot Sunday afternoon as he told the audience: "I see before me some former graduates of Reading High School, a number of relatives and some friends. One of the friends I see is 'Miss Elba'—a model of a devoted teacher.

" 'Miss Elba' (the former Elba Greenawald, who in 1960 as Mrs. John L. Babb was residing at 316 S. 17th St.) taught me for five years in a little, one-room schoolhouse at the end of Spook lane. She taught me how to read, but never how to write."

After pausing for a moment, he continued, with an affectionate chuckle: " 'Miss Elba' told me that if I did not learn to write, I would never amount to anything."

But the commencement speaker did not tell the audience of his kindness to his old school teacher—that he not only had visited her in the Babb home before the graduation exercises, but that "Miss Elba" had attended, at Dr. Kerr's invitation, his elevation to the presidency of the University of California at Berkeley almost two years before.

This part was filled in for Walsh shortly after the commencement address by "Miss Elba," who taught the young Clark Kerr many years ago in the Seitz elementary school, located on Friedensburg road at Spook lane in Pennside, which in 1960 was the administration building for the Mount Penn-Lower Alsace Joint School System.

In September 1958, she journeyed to California for the inauguration with the new university president's sister, Charlotte Kerr, R.N., then director of the Reading School District's practical nurses training program.

"Charlotte Kerr and I had a wonderful time at Berkeley," she said. "He (Dr. Kerr) treated me like I was somebody. It was wonderful to know he hadn't forgotten his old home, his friends and his old teacher."

In his early school years, "Miss Elba" remembered Clark Kerr as "a brilliant boy with a capacity for comprehension even at an early age. He had a wonderful home background. His parents were wonderful people. His father (the late Samuel W. Kerr of Jacksonwald) taught for many years at Reading High School."

She also remembered that Dr. Kerr had attended Northeast Junior High School before going on to Reading High, where he not only was editor of the school newspaper, "The Red and Black," but he was graduated with honors in 1928. As for his writing. "It was legible," she said.

As a former honor student at Reading High, it warmed the heart of Dr. Kerr to learn that graduates from his old alma mater, who comprised only a small percentage of the Albright student body, had practically swept the "honor-roll sweepstakes" at the 1960 commencement.

Eight out of the 11 Albright seniors graduating with honors, who filed past Dr. Kerr in black caps and gowns to pick up diplomas, were graduates of Reading High—seven from the class of 1956 and one of 1948.

Several months after Dr. Kerr delivered the commencement address at Albright, has face graced the front of Time Magazine, which said of him in part: ". . . Scholar Kerr first reached Berkeley in 1934 as a doctoral student. He had grown up on a Pennsylvania farm near Reading, gone to a one-room school. Clark's farmer-father had an academic bent himself. First of his Scots-Irish line to go to college (Franklin and Marshall), Samuel Kerr spoke Latin, Greek, German, French and owned a master's degree from the University of Berlin. He spent his life raising apples, and his after hours stimulating and rolling young minds. Recalls Clark: 'He believed that nothing should be unanimous. If he found everybody else for something he'd be against it on principle.' "

There will be some sad and some happy memories facing Dr. Clark Kerr when he returns to Berks in June to deliver commencement addresses. His sister, Charlotte, who died in May 1965, is now gone, but "Miss Elba," who now lives with her husband at 117 E. Main St., Fleetwood, hopes to be on hand to greet her star pupil once again.

PAY REFORM IN H.R. 3383

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, when Public Law 68 was enacted in 1955, it was the first attempt at a complete reclassification of postal positions. Since it was necessary to place the law into effect in a short time, many inequities were created. In addition, many factors are now present that were not forseeable in 1955. This is especially true of such items as automation and mechanization, as well

as a new concept in employee management relations.

It is also true that, in 1955, the principle of comparability was not considered. An example of this is the fact that the top salary for foreman—level 7—was more than $1,000 less than the average salary for first-line supervisors in industry. It was not until 1962 when Public Law 87-793 was enacted that the principle of comparability became law.

This bill is an attempt to bring about comparability through reclassification. All levels are raised except levels 1, 2, and 20. Since the studies show that levels 1 and 2 have attained comparability, they are retained in the same levels. Level 20 employees, who are now the regional directors in the 15 regions, are retained in that level since the ceiling of the postal field service schedule has just about reached the floor of executive levels.

This bill would increase all other positions by one salary level. In addition, there is a new salary chart increasing the salaries by 5 percent. This combination will bring about actual comparability in most positions.

In addition, the bill provides that in cases where revenue units are important in evaluating a position, credit should be given for mail received without postage from Government agencies and the military services.

The bill also provides for 1-year step increases through all steps instead of being limited to the first seven steps. Under the present conditions with 3-year intervals above step 7, many employees, especially those promoted, can never reach the top step.

This bill would also make it mandatory to pay higher level pay for employees detailed to higher level positions, beginning with the first day of such detail. The Post Office Department has signed agreements with the rank and file organizations under which many positions are listed where the higher level salaries are paid immediately upon such detail. This should be extended to all positions since it was never intended that employees should work in higher level positions for the lower level pay.

This bill is not basically a salary increase, but is intended to comply with Public Law 87-793 which states that salaries should be comparable with similar salaries in industry and does not state that such adjustments should not be brought nearer than the present 1, 2, or 3 years behind actual comparability.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we in this House who have had the honor of serving with JOHN McCORMACK know and appreciate the magnificent accomplishments he has made not only on behalf of the House but of our beloved country. Those who do not actually serve from day to day with our beloved Speaker can have no conception of the affection in which he is held by Members of the House or the extent to which he has earned our gratitude and admiration. It was heartening for me to learn from the January 19 issue of the South Boston Gazette that his lifelong neighbors, his hometown, if you please, share our love and admiration for him. Those who know JOHN McCORMACK best appreciate him most.

Under unanimous consent heretofore obtained, I insert the South Boston Gazette's article. The tribute to our beloved Speaker, written by William H. Flanagan, follows:

SOUTH BOSTON'S SPIRIT OF 75

(By William H. Flanagan)

In the process of writing a book tentatively titled "Everything is Politics", mounds of material have been gathered relative to the sterling qualities imbedded in the character of our town's most outstanding holders of high office.

It is the author's desire to have the foreword in that history written by the one whom he most admires as our town's leader of leaders in our nation's capital.

Our number one statesman could have been Mayor, Governor, United States Senator, Cabinet Member and Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Passing up all these opportunities for advancement, he unselfishly chose to continue his career by rendering outstanding service in the office to which his immediate neighbors had elected him almost four decades ago.

The advisor to five of our Presidents, and confidante of four, is but two of the high honors that he has justifiably attained. He had first earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues in both parties.

He soon became the northern protege of the southern Speaker of the House, an unheard of, improbable, and, up to that time impossible alliance of trust between two of the same party whose members' togetherness had been in name only.

He became Chairman of Committees that successfully launched legislation too numerous to mention, benefiting many, and far in advance of all others.

As another great American once said "Lets look at the record":

A truly Self-made man, U.S. Army Veteran, member of Mass. and Federal Bars when but a youth, elected to the Constitutional Convention on May 1, 1917, served through 1918; elected to the Mass. House of Representatives on Nov. 2 1920; elected to the Mass. Senate on Nov. 7, 1922, served through 1926, the last two years as his party's floor leader.

On Nov. 6, 1928, he was elected a Member of Congress. On that same day he was chosen to fill the unexpired term of his deceased predecessor, and at the same time he was elected to serve a full term beginning the following January. His constituents, in their wisdom, have kept him there ever since.

In 1956, without lifting a finger, he easily won his party's nomination as his Commonwealth's favorite son for President of the United States. Yet, once again he disclaimed any ambition to aspire for, what to others, would be higher office.

Time has proved him right. He has been able to accomplish more, for the people, as Whip, Majority Leader and Speaker of the National House of Representatives than any previous holder of those offices.

He has been, and continues to be a workhorse for his country. At 75 years of age he has more vigor than most men twenty-five years younger. All his waking hours are working hours. He is the "Man of the Century" to the youth, the aged, the sick, the veterans, the poor and the workers.

The first Catholic Speaker of the House, a tower of strength in 1963 and 1964 when but one heartbeat away from the presidency of the United States, and now, second in line for that world's most powerful office.

This writer has no doubt that if a vacancy occurred in the office of Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, the first man to whom our President would offer the position would be he who has FAME in his name, our own Honorable John W. McCormack.

INSURANCE AND OTHER PROGRAMS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO FLOOD VICTIMS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 3244 to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance.

In my district, basically an agricultural area, while we are blessed by the good Lord in terms of climate and usually excellent crop growing conditions, we are also, on the other hand, prone to lose much by national disasters. Last year during the latter part of the 89th Congress, my congressional district was barely missed by Hurricane Inez. While the brunt of the damage was borne by Mexico, it is not always thus. Had Inez swept a little farther north through Brownsville, Tex., there would be the same devastation, the same wake of ruin, as has hit my district during other hurricanes that did not miss—as has hit many other areas throughout our great country. Many of us here in the Congress, especially those of us who represent particularly vulnerable districts, are keenly aware of the need of legislation to provide for a national program of flood insurance to help these areas get back on their feet. Indeed, I believe all of us in the Congress realize adoption of such legislation would be a step toward relief to flood victims presently unable to secure adequate insurance, and as such is desperately needed.

It is my hope that the recommendations contained in my bill will provide a base for reasonable and responsible corrective measures which may be looked upon favorably by my distinguished colleagues and will ultimately provide an adequate flood disaster insurance program on a nationwide scale.

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER (1895–1966)

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, very recently this country lost one of its eminent servants—a man of great wisdom, a man of great sweetness, and of deep understanding, not only of us here in America, but of people in other countries.

I was associated with him for a great many years, particularly in the School for Advanced International Studies, which he started.

Chris Herter was a man we all loved and whom we can ill spare. He was a great sufferer so that even though we miss him tragically, we are so glad that he is relieved of the anguish and pain and the horror that he was really going through, with a smile on his face—always kind, always gentle—but firm.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks, the remarks made by Dean Francis O. Wilcox before the faculty and students of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies in Washington on January 5, 1967:

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER (1895–1966)

(Remarks made by Dean Francis O. Wilcox before the Faculty and students of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, in Washington on January 5, 1967)

We have come together today to honor the memory of a great American whose life and works constructively and helpfully affected the lives of millions of people both at home and abroad. Most of you are aware of the splendid contribution Christian A. Herter made to the public service, to his state and his nation, and to the cause of world order. Some of you may not know about his indispensable role in the creation and the development of the School of Advanced International Studies.

Chris Herter's record of public service is almost without parallel in our time. It includes a short period with the Foreign Service, duty under Herbert Hoover with the European Refugee Council, service in the Massachusetts Legislature, ten years as Representative from that state to the Congress of the United States, four years as Governor, five years as Under Secretary and then Secretary of State, and more recently as Special Assistant to the President in charge of our trade negotiations.

Rare qualities of courage, imagination, human understanding and integrity were brought by Christian Herter to all these tasks. In Europe he earned the respect and affection of thousands of refugees whom he helped and befriended. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives he was among those primarily responsible for the successful launching and implementation of the Marshall Plan. As Governor of Massachusetts he earned a reputation for good government and for leadership based upon high moral principles. During his terms as Under Secretary and Secretary of State, as one of the leaders of the free world, he made many important decisions which advanced human liberty and promoted the cause of world peace.

Chris Herter had the rare good fortune to live during one of the most exciting eras of our nation's history. As President Johnson has said: his career "spanned a period which saw this Nation emerge from a century of isolation to take a place in the leadership on the world scene.

"From the day in 1916 when he took up a post as attache in the American Embassy in Berlin, to the leadership of the Kennedy Round negotiations to expand and liberalize world trade—which he was exercising to the day of his death—he participated in the events of our time and shaped them."

His vision and his imagination led him to recognize early in World War II the vital role the United States would inevitably play in world affairs. To enable coming generations of Americans to help meet these vast new responsibilities, he took the lead in establishing the School of Advanced International Studies here in the Nation's capital. With this new and exciting idea he went from one corporation to another seeking the funds necessary to achieve his objective. He was successful in raising $500,000 in pledges to be paid over a five-year period, and in 1944 the doors of the new School were opened for business. Incidentally, I believe it is accurate to say that he was one of the first people in this country to secure substantial corporation support for an institution of higher learning.

In those early days the School's Advisory Council, under Mr. Herter's able chairmanship, met every week. They approved the budget of the School, watched over faculty appointments, and were in almost daily touch with the School's activities. When the furnace blew up the staff immediately called Mr. Herter for help. His prestige and influence had to be put on the line in order to secure the high priority materials needed to repair the furnace in a war-time economy.

This keen interest in the work of the School—although interrupted by his periods of service as Governor of Massachusetts and later as Secretary of State—continued until last Friday afternoon when he signed a number of letters on behalf of the Advisory Council. During the last two months he visited three potential donors in the Washington area seeking funds for the completion of our library on the seventh floor and for two endowed chairs. I am hopeful that these three visits will bring the School at least a million dollars in endowment funds—support that we sorely need to meet the ever-increasing costs of graduate education.

I recall vividly one incident, in which I was personally involved, that demonstrated Mr. Herter's continuing interest in our program. Early in 1960, while I was serving as Assistant Secretary of State, Milton Eisenhower invited me to become the Dean of the School. I went to Mr. Herter who was then Secretary of State to seek his advice about leaving the State Department. Since I am a rather vain person, I assumed, of course, that he would insist that I remain in the Department in order to help him discharge his heavy responsibilities there. Quite the contrary! When I told him what was on my mind he threw up his hands and exclaimed: "Wonderful! That's a great school and I'm delighted you're going to be associated with it." My chagrin subsided somewhat when I discovered the long-range interest he had in the School and its work.

Certainly there can be no doubt about Mr. Herter's deep dedication to the task of training young people in the vital field of diplomacy and international relations. During his career on Capitol Hill and in the Department of State he was instrumental in bringing about a number of important reforms in the Foreign Service. Later he served as Chairman of at least two important national commissions created for the purpose of analyzing our Foreign Service and prescribing training programs for young people interested in careers in the field of international relations.

Those of us who knew him well had tremendous admiration for his will to carry on and serve his country despite the painful arthritis that constantly assailed him. His crutches were his ever-present companion during his later years, but he accepted them as gracefully as any person possibly could. When he made speeches he delivered them sitting down, and he consumed more Bufferin tablets in one day than most of us find it necessary to take in a year. Never once did I hear him complain. His thoughts always seemed to be centered on more important matters.

One of the finest tributes I could pay to any man is to say that he is a gentleman. Chris Herter was certainly a gentleman in every sense of that word. He was thoughtful and considerate of others and he was deeply interested in doing what he could to promote the welfare of the common man. His kindly smile and his warm and friendly manner endeared him to all those who knew him well. He was always willing to listen with patience and respect to points of view that differed from his own. He approached life with a humility that was refreshing, an interest in human-kind that was inspiring, and a cooperative spirit that was reassuring. With the help of a charming and devoted wife he carved an enviable place in the hearts and minds of his countrymen.

In one of his most beautiful poems, William Cullen Bryant has reminded us that we should—

"So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death
Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

There can be no doubt that Christian Herter has lived the kind of life that will enable him to approach his God with the serenity of spirit and the unfaltering trust about which William Cullen Bryant and the psalmists of the Old Testament have written so beautifully.

When one for whom we have great admiration and affection is taken from our midst it is only natural that we should give way to sorrow. Yet when that individual has lived a rich and full life, when he has, by his thoughtfulness and his good deeds, helped to make the world a better place for us all, then we should rejoice that we have been privileged to share his friendship. We should express our gratitude for the splendid contribution he has made to the well-being of his fellow man and to the cause of peace among the nations. There can be no finer achievements than these.

Despite his many contributions to our national life, I am convinced that in the long run the School of Advanced International Studies will stand as the greatest monument to the imagination, the idealism and the ability to Christian A. Herter. Inspired by his friendship and his devotion we shall do our utmost here at SAIS to meet the high standards he would want us to maintain and to move towards the goals he helped us establish. Certainly the thousands of young people who will graduate from this institution in the future—and who will move into the vital field of international relations—could do no better than to try to emulate those splendid qualities which characterized his life and works.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] in the tribute of an admiring heart to the memory of the late Honorable Christian Herter. I was enriched by his personal friendship and our association in the Congress. No Secretary of State was ever closer to the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. A former member of our committee we felt, when he was Secretary of State and came before us, that he was still one of us. When he came to the high office of Secretary of State he was

not in the best of health, and in the later months of his administration he was painfully crippled up, but he performed his duties with the same high order of ability, mental grasp and dedication that had marked his long and brilliant public career. Christian Herter followed Secretary of State Dulles, whose influence in foreign policy was all powerful, and his tenure of the office was relatively brief and his health was not good; toward the end the pain must have been unbearable. Under other circumstances Christian Herter well may have gone down in history as one of our greatest Secretaries of State.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to one of the finest public servants of this or any century. Christian Herter brought humility, courage, intelligence, and distinction to every office he held—from the State legislature in Massachusetts to Secretary of State. When lesser men would have chosen to let the arduous duties of public service pass him by, Christian Herter without fail rose to the challenge of political and administrative duty.

It was my great privilege to be associated with Chris Herter from time to time during his public career. I was chairman of the Republican City Committee of Lowell, Mass., when he ran for Governor and had the honor to introduce him to my friends in that community.

I always admired his statesmanship, never more so than when after a difficult term as Secretary of State under President Eisenhower, he once again responded to his President's call and took up the post of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Christian Herter exemplified what is best in a public man; he was a warm and humble private man as well. We all join his fine family in mourning his passing.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, in addition to what I have already said about our late beloved colleague, the Honorable Christian A. Herter, I wish to present the following newspaper account:

[From the Gloucester (Mass.) Daily Times, Jan. 3, 1967]

HERTER JOINED MANCHESTER IN MANY SUMMER EVENTS

MANCHESTER.—Former Secretary of State and Massachusetts Governor Christian A. Herter, 71, who died Friday evening at his home in Washington, D.C., was a longtime summer resident of this town. He had a house on Proctor St.

Before he became Secretary of State he took part in community activities in the summer, and many residents had a nodding acquaintance with him.

One year he was the speaker at the 50th anniversary celebration of the Manchester Club. He has ridden in parades and appeared at many events.

A five-term congressman before he upset the Democrat Paul A. Dever in the 1952 gubernatorial race, Herter was a special aide to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson on trade negotiations since 1962.

The son of ex-patriate artists, he was born in Paris and graduated from Harvard College. He later helped Herbert Hoover with the American Relief Administration following World War I.

Widely recognized for his organizational skill while in Congress, Herter was noted for combining "the organizational and investigational ability of Hoover with the humane international outlook of Wendell Wilkie."

He was among those who influenced Gen. Eisenhower to run for the presidency in 1952 and four years later turned aside a movement led by Harold Stassen to make him vice president. Herter nominated Richard M. Nixon at the 1956 Republican convention.

After Herter turned down a chance to run for a third term as governor in 1956, he became undersecretary of state to John Foster Dulles, succeeding Dulles upon his death.

Herter served as Secretary of State for 21 of the stormiest months in post-World War II history. There was the U-2 incident, the emergence of Communism in Cuba, Nikita Khrushchev's visit to the United Nations and riots in Japan which forced President Eisenhower to cancel a proposed visit.

In 1962, he accepted the special trade negotiations post from President Kennedy and had stayed at the post until his death.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the life, character, and services of our late beloved colleague, Christian Herter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON TRICONTINENTAL CONFERENCE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, at the recent Republican conference for new House Members, held at Airlie House in Warrenton, one of the specialists who addressed us was Mr. Richard V. Allen, senior staff member and editor of the Yearbook on International Communist Affairs.

A few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Allen, pursuing further the topic of the increasing Communist activity in Latin America. He enclosed a pertinent report on the significance of the Tricontinental Conference, a report which has received all too scant publicity in our country. This report, which is of interest to all of us, follows:

SPECIAL OAS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS MEASURES AGAINST COMMUNISM

WASHINGTON, D.C. (PAU).—The Council of the Organization of American States (OAS) approved a resolution expressing its thanks for the report submitted by its Special Committee responsible for study of the First Tricontinental Conference and its projections, and resolved to transmit the report to the member states and to authorize the Secretary General of the OAS to send it to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

The resolution also urges the member states, on the basis of the Committee's recommendations and in accordance with their respective national constitutions and laws, to take the measures necessary to counteract the policy of intervention and aggression emanating from the Havana conference.

The Special Committee of the OAS Council concluded that the Tricontinental Conference marks a new stage in communist world strategy, with the creation of permanent organizations aimed primarily at providing support to armed subversive movements, in order to bring about the overthrow of existing governments and establish communist governments dependent upon extracontinental communist powers.

The Special Committee, presided over by Ambassador Juan Bautista de Lavalle of Peru, was established in accordance with Resolution I of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation, held in Punta del Este, Uruguay, in January 1962. That resolution requested the Council "to maintain all necessary vigilance, for the purpose of warning against any acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security, or the preparation of such acts, resulting from the continued intervention of Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere, and to make recommendations to the governments of the member states with respect thereto.'" Other Committee members are the representatives of Argentina, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Panama, and the United States.

The study states that the Conference was "inspired, organized, and directed at the initiative and with the active support of the governments of the Soviet Union, Communist China, and Cuba, together with other communist governments and certain noncommunist governments cooperating with this movement."

The interest of these governments in the Conference, the study adds, "was demonstrated by the composition of their delegations, which was made up of government officials, representatives of official parties, and other persons intimately connected with these governments . . ." Of the 82 delegations attending the Conference, the most numerous and active were those of Cuba (41 members), the Soviet Union (40), Communist China (34), and the United Arab Republic (21).

The permanent organizations cited by the study are the Afro-Asian-Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AALAPSO), with its Executive Secretariat and a planned "Liberation Committee," and the Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO), with its Organizing Committee, all based in Havana, which were created for the purpose of fomenting, assisting, and coordinating subversive movements, with the participation of "national committees" in each country. The report also mentions the Second Tricontinental Conference, scheduled to meet in Cairo in 1968, in order to formalize the definitive structure of the AALAPSO.

The study states that aid provided by the Soviet Union, Communist China, and other communist countries to these subversive movements, with Cuba as the principal base in this hemisphere, is nothing new; what is new is "the declaration of this interventionist policy, so openly expressed; the identification of major targets and final objectives, so clearly stated; and even more important, the creation of an organization to give this effort an aspect of tricontinental support and to serve as a coordinating body, not only for the assistance provided, but also for directing the various subversive movements in the form of a united struggle on the three continents." It describes this movement and the Conference as "a new instrument of communist imperialism. . . ."

The aggressive and interventionist character of the Conference, the study continues, is revealed by the "strong attacks against numerous free countries on all continents and against many international organizations," such as the Organization of American

States (OAS), the United Nations (UN), the "Organisation Commune Africaine et Malagache" (OCAM), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), the European Common Market the Alliance for Progress, the World Bank (IBRD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The study also cites 24 countries in the Western Hemisphere 19 in Africa, 16 in Asia and the Pacific, and 12 in Europe, a total of 71 independent countries attacked and condemned by resolutions of the Tricontinental Conference.

The study adds that the interventionist character of the Conference is also manifested by the "open incitation to rebellion and the exhortation that all types of support—moral, political, financial and material, including the supplying of arms and munitions—be provided to armed and subversive movements on the three continents, with special emphasis on . . . Latin America . . ."

The participation in the Tricontinental Conference of official or officially sponsored delegations from member countries of the United Nations, it continues, "constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter, and especially of the principle of nonintervention reaffirmed in Resolution 2131 (XX) of the United Nations General Assembly . . ." Likewise, the continued official or semi-official participation of these countries in AALAPSO and of Cuba in LASO constitute violations of the same principle.

With regard to Cuba, the study observes that the Government of Cuba "has officially assumed its responsibility in the activities carried on from that capital by the new organization of the international communist movement to overthrow independent governments of member states of the Organization of American States and of the United Nations," and that that nation "continues to be the principal focus and agent in the subversive and interventionist campaign sponsored by the communist powers against member states of the OAS," thus acting to promote intervention and aggression.

In its study the Committee makes a number of recommendations regarding the Tricontinental Conference, such as careful vigilance over the activities of AALAPSO, LASO, and their respective executive committees, and over the formation of the "national committees" of the two organizations in each country, in order to counteract their actions.

It further recommends that the member governments of the OAS should consider possible additional representations they could make with respect to those countries that had official or officially sponsored delegations at the Tricontinental Conference, in order to insist that "they do not persist in violation of Resolution 2131 (XX) of the United Nations General Assembly"—referring to the principle of nonintervention—through their participation in the activities of the Tricontinental Organization, including the Executive Secretariat and the planned "Liberation Committee" of AALAPSO, as well as the Second Tricontinental Conference, which will meet in Cairo.

It recommends that the governments should renew their efforts to secure the cooperation of friendly non-member states in the application of the measures against the Government of Cuba concerning the suspension of trade with and sea transportation to Cuba, approved at the Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs; it encourages the governments of member states of the OAS to strengthen their internal security in order to confront communist-inspired subversion and insurgency, and recommends that they should continue to be vigilant in the application of the measures directed against aggression and subversion arising from the continuing interventions in the hemisphere by the Soviet Union. Communist China, and their allies, and especially the measures directed against the Government of Cuba, approved at the Eighth and Ninth Meetings of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

In additions to the foregoing recommendations, the study suggests that the governments of member states that face serious problems of actual or potential communist-inspired insurrection should undertake programs of subregional cooperation with neighboring countries that share their problems, particularly for the exchange of information and experience and the coordination of activities in border areas, taking into account the existing system of cooperation among the Central American countries and Panama.

It also recommends measures to prevent the movement of subversives between member countries and Cuba and other communist countries, including those persons traveling through third countries, and that the governments take measures to prevent the movement to their respective countries of funds, propaganda, and arms coming from Cuba and other communist countries.

It adds that the governments should insist that the communist countries cease their broadcasts inciting the peoples of this hemisphere to subversion and insurrection. These broadcasts originate in the Soviet Union, Cuba, and other communist countries, and include programs in Spanish, Portuguese and Quechua.

Finally, it recommends that in view of the aims enunciated at the Tricontinental Conference, the governments adopt strict measures of reciprocity with respect to the presence and activities in their territories of diplomatic agents, as well as technicians, experts and other persons from the communist countries.

In addition to its conclusions and recommendations, the study contains chapters on the background, the Conference itself, and subsequent developments and activities, emphasizing the establishment of the permanent organizations mentioned. As an example of these subsequent developments, it refers to a news release from the Executive Secretariat of AALAPSO dated November 18, 1966, announcing the receipt of favorable replies from the governments of North Korea and Cuba with respect to the establishment in their territories of schools for training political cadres for revolutionary movements in three continents.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN AFRICAN COUNTRIES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, occasionally the press reports on Communist activities in African countries. There is evidence that Communist policy is to expand operation wherever they can. In view of the administration's recent overtures to increase trade and other relations with Communist East Europe and Soviet Russia, I should like to make two reports on African developments available to my colleagues. The reports which follow are, first from Welt, January 4, 1967, "A Conflict Zone Against White Africa Is Established"—a translation from the German; and, second from the Evening Star, January 12, 1967, "Major Cuba Effort Seen To Stir Trouble in Africa":

A CONFLICT ZONE AGAINST WHITE AFRICA IS ESTABLISHED

(A political concept is hidden behind the attack on the Benguela railway)

For the first time since 1961 the continual guerrilla war on the borders of Portuguese Africa has taken on the form of a regular battle. It was reported that almost an entire regiment of rebel troops from the Congo pushed ten kilometers deep into Portuguese territory and overran the posts along the Benguela railway. Portuguese units from Teixeira de Sousa repulsed the rebel attack. An Army bulletin said that 200 of the invaders and 6 Portuguese civilians were killed in the attack.

Actual Portuguese casualties may have been higher; but what is important is that for the first time the rebels attacked a well-fortified military station. They dynamited a section of the Benguela Railway, causing the Portuguese Foreign Minister to issue a threat to close the border [between Angola and the Congo]. But, most important, the rebels damaged the Congo and Zambia, both of whom make their ore shipments to the Atlantic port of Lobito by means of the Benguela Railway.

An authoritative Portuguese source said that Holden Roberto, the native Angolan political leader in exile who announced the attack in a press conference, must have acted senselessly on his own initiative and without the knowledge of Congolese and Zambian authorities. Both countries have given him asylum, and it has been in the Congo that his troops have received the bulk of their military training.

Now, it can be assumed that the responsible economic officials of the Congo and Zambia will condemn the dynamiting of the railway, but it cannot be assumed that Holden Roberto (or whoever is really responsible for the attack) acted "senselessly." The new activity along the borders of Angola must certainly be considered in light of a meeting of Angolan politicians in exile which took place last summer.

At this Conference, in which a number of Communist-bloc "specialists" took part (above all, representatives of Fidel Castro), the political strategy for the next twelve months was established. It was reported that Holden Roberto, whose anti-Portuguese opposition was originally a genuine African independence movement, had been overshadowed by such pro-Red Chinese forces as Dr. Agostinho Neto and the ideologue Mario Pinto de Andrade. Roberto was said to have merely lent his name to the movement, but no longer has the power to determine the political line of the exile regime and its guerrilla army.

The attack on Teixeira de Sousa was designed to create a sensation and attract world-wide attention to the cause of the rebels. In addition, it was designed to weaken the vital arteries of Zambia, which depends upon Portuguese territory in both directions, east and west. Zambia is to be pushed slowly toward dependence upon Tanzania. Then, with the help of those countries which have interests in Zambian copper, and even with the help of international development funds, the new railway which has been designed by the Red Chinese at Tanzanian request will be built. In the future, Zambian ore is to be transported exclusively to Dar-es-Salaam by this railway, and then from the Indian Ocean—and not through the Portuguese ports of Beira in Mozambique and Lobito in Angola. The Congo is also to be slowly forced to eliminate its dependence on Portuguese aid and support facilities.

The whole affair is not "senseless." The attack on Teixeira de Sousa is part of a large-scale strategic conception in which

several spheres of interest are involved. These spheres of interest are all directed against the West, and they can lead to a new conflict point in international politics.

When in September 1964 rebel groups of the Maconde tribe started fomenting unrest along the northern border of Mozambique, it was assumed that it was primarily a matter of an internal political opposition of a warlike nomadic tribe. Since then, this rebellion has taken on the features of a continuing guerrilla war. In the summer of 1966 the real meaning became clear, as guerrilla troops increased their activities along the northern borders of both Mozambique and Angola, pushing deeper into the heartland of the continent.

In recent months the Portuguese have been forced to increase their troops in Africa from 75,000 to 100,000, extend the period of obligatory military service, and weaken their economy. They have discovered that the Macondes, who are trained in Tanzania by Red Chinese officers, have become better fighters, and now have the most modern Chinese weapons at their disposal.

The strategic plan to create a conflict zone through the Continent from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic can no longer be overlooked. In the east, in Tanzania, the bridgehead is being prepared by Red Chinese forces, in the West by Cuban forces. According to reports from Cuban exile sources in Madrid and Miami, there are now more than 1,000 Cuban instructors in Congo-Brazzaville alone. Brazzaville has become the new headquarters for anti-Portuguese activity.

The conflict zone is directed against "white Africa," and above all against Angola and Mozambique, for it is here that a [Western] policy directed toward better understanding [between black and white Africans] could counteract the efforts of the black "anti-imperialist liberation front." The Portuguese, who do not acknowledge racial barriers, have given the natives equal status with the white since the troubles of 1961. Economic growth, and above all the educational efforts (which, according to United Nations statistics have lifted Angola to second place in the entire continent) have been demonstrable successes. This could counteract the African policy of rejecting out of hand the "white West," a policy whose ideological foundations are furnished by China and the Soviet Union.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 12, 1967]

MAJOR CUBA EFFORT SEEN TO STIR TROUBLE IN AFRICA

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

Cuba, frustrated by failure of her efforts to export Marxist revolution in the Western Hemisphere, is now engaged in what diplomatic sources regard as a major effort to stir up trouble in seven African nations.

Political and military agents of Fidel Castro now are operating in Morocco, Algeria, Egypt, Mali, Guinea Tanzania and the Brazzaville Congo Republic. Expenditure for arms shipments, military missions, technical training and political activity is now estimated at $10 million a year.

This represents a tremendous outlay for a Caribbean country that is quarantined from all her near neighbors except Mexico, is stuck with a deteriorating home economy and is dependent on the Soviet Union for survival. Observers note that the Cuban expenditure each year to keep the pot boiling in Africa is very close to the $1 million a month in aid Havana receives from the USSR.

The largest Cuban presence is in Brazzaville where between 600 and 700 Cuban troops of Negro origin are the main prop of the anti-U.S. government of President Alphonse Massamba-Debat.

However, informed sources also say Cuban soldiers have sent both arms and military advisers to aid the maverick government of President Sekou Toure in Guinea and the permissive government of President Julius Nyerere in Tanzania.

TRAINING ROLE

In both these countries, Guinea on the West Coast of Africa and Tanzania on the east, one of the functions of the Cuban missions is to equip and train anti-Portuguese rebels for attacks against Portuguese Guinea and Mozambique. Africans in undetermined numbers also are sent to Cuba for military, technical and political training, all of it oriented to the export of the Marxist revolutionary concept.

Admittedly this militant role is more in line with the political philosophy of Red China than of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, although Castro is dependent on the Russians for money, weapons and economic assistance, the makeup of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Communist Party in Havana is heavily weighted to the Maoist theory of revolution by violence rather than by political evolution.

The three-man committee consists of Osmani Cienfuegos, a top-notch guerrilla veteran; Manual Pinero, director-general of intelligence, and Foreign Minister Raul Roa. Dr. Justo Carrillo, a career diplomat who was named deputy foreign minister last June, was fired recently because of his opposition to the committee's determination to continue exporting revolution.

Why does a nation of about 7 million that is barely able to feed itself persist in the costly business of trouble-making in Africa, let alone Latin America? Observers here believe it is partly a result of the psychosis Castro and his supporters are suffering from their isolation in the Western Hemisphere. It is also believed the African leaders who accept their support prefer Cubans to Russians or Chinese because they feel more secure with emissaries who are less likely to become permanent guests.

According to diplomatic sources, Castro's aims are to support rebel groups trying to overcome existing moderate governments as in the former Belgian Congo, Ghana and Cameroon; to support extremists already in power as in Brazzaville Congo, Mali, Guinea and Tanzania, and to ingratiate themselves with regimes they think can help stir up trouble for the west, as in Egypt, Algeria, Iraq and Syria.

The effort is bolstered by broadcasting anti-western propaganda from Cuba to Africa in English, French and Swahili to the tune of 95 hours a week. Cuba gives scholarships and sends medical teams as well as arms, military missions and political agents.

Headquarters in each of the seven African countries is said to be the Cuban embassy. Pinero and Cienfuegos control the staffing and operations of the embassies in Africa, not Roa. Two-thirds of every embassy staff reportedly is involved in political action.

In Morocco, where the United States also has base rights, the connection is largely commercial. Cuba has a deal to send 500,000 tons of sugar to Morocco in exchange for phosphates.

In Algeria the Cuban effort has decreased since the fall of the Ben Bella regime. The military mission, which even sent a tank unit into action in the short Algerian-Moroccan war, is now gone, but there is a 50-man medical mission in the service of the Boumedienne government.

In Cairo, the Cuban embassy is the main support base for all the Havana effort in black Africa although the embassy staff is limited to six.

In Bamako, capital of Mali, the Cubans' main concern is to cement ideological relations with the radical government of President Modeiba Keita, a man much in the radical mold of Guinea's Toure.

TONS OF ARMS

In Conakry, Guinea the Cuban ambassador, Oscar Oramas Oliva, is a well known DGI agent. The Cuban military mission, which may be 100-men strong, serves the double role of training Toure's 1,000-man Milice Popular military force and supply arms and training to rebels assailing Portuguese Guinea. The chief military adviser is Maj. Flavio Bravo Pardo, who was trained in Red China, North Korea and North Vietnam. Thousands of tons of arms have been sent to Guinea since last June.

Observers note that Ghana was once the scene of a large Cuban aid effort but the Cubans were thrown out when Kwame Nkrumah was overthrown. Now Nkrumah is in Guinea where Toure styles him as co-president and has vowed to help restore him to control in Ghana.

In Tanzania, the Cubans have run operations against the Congo (Kinshasa) government and operate armed boats in Lake Tanganyika. In December, the Cubans sent a mission to Zanzibar to reorganize the Tanzanian medical service. Part of the contribution was a shipment of 900 machine guns.

In Dares Salaam, capital of Tanzania, the third secretary of the Cuban Embassy, Colman Ferrer Figueroa, is in charge of subversion. Under his control, the Cubans maintain training camps in southern Tanzania for the rebel war against Portuguese Mozambique.

THE 49TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, January 22, marked the 49th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. Unfortunately the anniversary will not be observed officially in Ukraine, because within 3 years of the independence day the Communists had overrun the country and imposed imperialism once again.

This year we will be reading a great deal about the 50th anniversary of the conquerors of Ukraine and, I fear, too little about the brave Ukrainians. In spite of harsh captivity, these sturdy, determined people have preserved their rich national culture. Their churches have been harassed, defiled, destroyed. Their language was replaced by an alien tongue. Today one can find little of their art and literature in Ukraine. Thousands of their civic leaders and peasants have been deported or annihilated, yet their dream of peace and freedom has not waned. Their hope for nationhood is strong.

It is interesting to me to discover that on March 14, 1918, Stalin wrote in Izvestia:

> The war in Ukraine may grow into a war by Russia against the West. Therefore, it is obvious, that there, in Ukraine, the main knot of the whole present international existence is being tied—the knot of the workers' revolution, started by Russia, and the knot of imperialistic counter-revolution moving from the West.

Had we in the United States made a firm, clarion protest in 1918, we might

not have had a Communist regime off the coast of Florida nor been fighting the Communists in Vietnam today. Let us not neglect exposing Communist domination of Ukraine for what it is in 1967. I join with my colleagues in the hope that freedom will soon be restored to the courageous people of that proud land.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 8]

Abbitt	Flood	Pelly
Arends	Giaimo	Philbin
Ashley	Gude	Pucinski
Aspinall	Halleck	Quillen
Battin	Hansen, Wash.	Reifel
Blackburn	Helstoski	Rogers, Fla.
Bolling	Herlong	Ronan
Bow	Holifield	Roybal
Brademas	Hosmer	Ruppe
Brasco	Hull	St Germain
Bray	Jarman	Scheuer
Broomfield	Kastenmeier	Shipley
Button	Kluczynski	Sikes
Cahill	Leggett	Sisk
Clark	McCulloch	Smith, Calif.
Collier	McEwen	Smith, Iowa
Conyers	McFall	Smith, N.Y.
Corbett	Macdonald, Mass.	Smith, Okla.
Cramer	MacGregor	Snyder
de la Garza	Mailliard	Springer
Derwinski	Martin	Stephens
Diggs	Mathias, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.
Donohue	May	Van Deerlin
Dorn	Miller, Calif.	Vanik
Dwyer	Morton	Watkins
Eckhardt	Moss	Whalley
Edwards, Calif.	O'Konski	Willis
Evans, Colo.	Ottinger	Wilson, Bob
Fallon	Passman	Wyatt
Feighan		Yates

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 344 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 15, PART 1)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

A Federal budget lays out a two-part plan of action:

It proposes particular programs, military and civilian, designed to promote national security, international cooperation, and domestic progress.

It proposes total expenditures and revenues designed to help maintain stable economic prosperity and growth.

This budget for fiscal year 1968 reflects three basic considerations:

In Vietnam, as throughout the world, we seek peace but will provide all the resources needed to combat aggression.

In our urgent domestic programs we will continue to press ahead, at a controlled and reasoned pace.

In our domestic economy we seek to achieve a seventh year of uninterrupted growth, adopting the fiscal measures needed to finance our expenditures responsibly, permit lower interest rates, and achieve a more balanced economy.

In recent years, the American economy has performed superbly. Since 1963, our Nation's output has risen at an average rate of 5.5 percent a year; 5.3 million more people are employed and 1.2 million fewer unemployed. Industrial capacity has grown by 18 percent, and far less of it is idle than was the case 3 years ago.

During this past calendar year alone:

Our Nation's gross national product—apart from price changes—has grown by nearly 5.4 percent.

The unemployment rate has remained at or below 4 percent for the first time in 13 years.

More than 3 million additional jobs were found in nonagricultural employment, the largest yearly gain experienced since 1942.

Corporate profits and personal income have each grown about 8 percent to record levels.

We have at the same time become engaged in a major effort to deter aggression in southeast Asia. Some $19.9 billion of the Nation's resources will go to support that effort in the current fiscal year and $22.4 billion in 1968. This past year our economy met these requirements with minimum strain and disruption.

We have also embarked upon a series of new programs to lift the quality of American life in the fields of health, education, urban development, pollution control, and the war on poverty. Yet the productivity and vitality of our economy is such that the total Federal budget in 1968, including the full costs of the Vietnam conflict, the new programs, and all of the various Federal trust funds, will account for only 1½ percent more of our gross national product than it did 3 years ago. Since the gross national product rose sharply over these 3 years, we have been able to meet our increased commitments abroad, move forward with urgent social programs at home, and still provide a massive expansion in goods and services available for private consumption and investment.

During the year and a half since the decision to send troops to Vietnam, consumer prices have risen 4.5 percent in spite of efforts to hold them down. We have, nevertheless, had considerably better success than in similar periods during World War II and the Korean conflict. Then, prices rose 13.5 percent and 11 percent, respectively, even with the imposition of price and wage controls which we have avoided.

The economic performance of the past 3 years did not just happen. It grew out of the ingenuity, hard work, and imagination of all parts of American society. But the one element which provided a catalyst for all the rest was the imaginative and flexible use of Federal fiscal policy.

In 1964, and again, in 1965, tax reductions were enacted which gave a strong stimulus to the economy. Idle capacity came into operation, new capacity was built, and both the numbers and productivity of the Nation's work force rose sharply.

In late 1965 and early 1966, however, as the economy rapidly approached full capacity operation, inflationary pressures began to develop.

On two occasions, I proposed, and the Congress promptly enacted, tax changes aimed at dampening those pressures. At the same time I made every effort to postpone, stretch out, or eliminate all but the most essential Federal expenditures. Cutbacks totaling over $5 billion in program levels and $3 billion in expenditures are being undertaken by Federal agencies during the current year. These actions contributed to a welcome moderation of inflationary pressures in the latter part of 1966.

FISCAL PROGRAM FOR 1968

In the budget for 1968, I am again proposing a fiscal program tailored to meet responsibly the needs of an expanding economy. This program will require a measure of sacrifice as well as continued work and resourcefulness.

In the year ahead, defense expenditures will continue to rise as we carry out our obligations in Vietnam. After a rigorous review of civilian programs and a sharp paring of spending requests, a modest increase in domestic expenditures will be required as we press forward to meet our obligations at home. Equity also demands that we increase substantially social security benefits for our older citizens so that they share in the Nation's growing income which their own past work and investment helped to bring about. And finally, during the coming year, we must take every reasonable step to permit a continuation of the move toward easier monetary conditions and lower interest rates which is now clearly underway.

Under these circumstances, I am proposing a temporary 6-percent surcharge on both corporate and individual income taxes. I also ask that individuals in the lower income brackets be exempt from the surcharge. The tax should remain in effect for 2 years, or for such period as may be warranted by our unusual expenditures in Vietnam. I will not hesitate to recommend an earlier expiration date, however, if the fiscal requirements of our commitments in Vietnam permit such action. In addition, I recommend legislation to provide a further acceleration of certain corporate tax payments.

With these new measures, and the expenditures I am proposing, the Federal budget deficit as measured in the national income accounts will be $2.1 billion in fiscal year 1968, compared to $3.8 billion in fiscal year 1967.

The national income accounts budget is the measure developed and used for over three decades by economists and fiscal experts to judge the impact of the Federal budget on the flow of income and production in the economy. Its meas-

ures of total Federal receipts and expenditures are the same as those used in recording the receipts and expenditures of business firms and individuals. Together with data on business and individuals, the national income accounts budget is used to build up official statistics on gross national product and national income.

Unlike the more traditional administrative budget, the national income budget includes the large expenditures and receipts of the Federal Government's trust funds, but excludes Federal loans and receipts from the sale of loans, since these are not recorded as income or expenditures in the accounts of business firms or individuals.

I am emphasizing the national income accounts as a measure of Federal fiscal activity because the traditional administrative budget is becoming an increasingly less complete and less reliable measure of the Government's activities and their economic impact. For example, trust fund-financed activities not reflected in the administrative budget now approximate one-third of that budget. More specifically, the fiscal year 1968 administrative budget excludes $48.1 billion of trust fund receipts and $44.5 billion of trust fund expenditures.

In addition, the treatment of lending as equivalent to spending in both the administrative and cash budgets is not suitable for an analysis of the budget's impact on the flow of national production and income.

To permit a higher 1968 budget deficit than the $2.1 billion involved in my fiscal recommendations would, I believe, be unacceptable. We would run substantial risks of choking off the much-desired move toward lower interest rates by placing too much of our stabilization effort on the shoulders of monetary policy, and renewing inflationary pressures, particularly in the latter half of this year.

On the other hand, to seek a lower deficit or a surplus through a more restrictive fiscal program would be unwarranted and self-defeating under present economic conditions. Such a fiscal policy could depress economic activity, reduce the incomes of individuals and corporations, and thereby fail to secure the revenues it was designed to achieve.

Summary of Federal receipts and payments

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
FEDERAL RECEIPTS			
National income accounts receipts—Federal sector	$132.6	$149.8	$167.1
Deduct: Timing adjustment (cash versus accrual)	−1.2	−3.9	.4
Add: Loans repaid, differences in coverage, and other adjustments	.7	1.0	1.4
Total cash receipts from the public	134.5	154.7	168.1
Deduct: Trust fund receipts	34.9	44.9	48.1
Add: Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments	5.1	7.2	7.0
Administrative budget receipts	104.7	117.0	126.9
FEDERAL PAYMENTS			
National income accounts expenditures—Federal sector	132.3	153.6	169.2
Deduct: Timing adjustment (cash versus accrual)	−.3	.2	.4
Add: Loans, differences in coverage, and other adjustments	5.2	7.5	3.6
Total cash payments to the public	137.8	160.9	172.4
Deduct: Trust fund expenditures	34.9	40.9	44.5
Add: Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments	4.0	6.8	7.1
Administrative budget expenditures	107.0	126.7	135.0
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS (+) OR PAYMENTS (−)			
National income accounts—Federal sector	+.3	−3.8	−2.1
Receipts from and payments to the public	−3.3	−6.2	−4.3
Administrative budget	−2.3	−9.7	−8.1

The economy, the budget, and the aims of our society would be jeopardized by either a larger tax increase or by large slashes in military or civilian programs. I have reviewed these programs carefully. Waste and nonessentials have been cut out. Reductions or postponements have been made wherever possible. The increases that are proposed have been carefully selected on the basis of urgent national requirements.

The Congress through the appropriations process, will, of course, subject these programs to a searching examination. I welcome that examination. But it is my judgment that major cuts cannot be made without serious impairment to vital national objectives—in defense, in education, in health, in the rebuilding of our cities, and in the attack on poverty.

This Nation is healthy and growing. It can—and, I believe, must—continue to move forward in the defense of freedom against aggression; in the search for international peace and cooperation; and in the effort to improve the quality of American life.

At this juncture in our history we have two choices: to stand still and mark time; or to press ahead responsibly and confidently.

For my part, I have chosen the latter course. That choice is reflected in my budgetary and fiscal proposals.

BUDGET SUMMARY

Federal expenditures, as measured in the national income accounts will rise from $153.6 billion in fiscal year 1967 to $169.2 billion in 1968. That increase is composed of four major elements: $5.8 billion for Vietnam and other national defense outlays; $6.2 billion in benefits under the Federal Government's social security and other trust funds, two-thirds of which results from the new social security legislation I am proposing; $1 billion for the cost of military and civilian pay increases, to keep abreast of rising salaries in private industry; and $2.6 billion for all other programs of the Federal Government.

Federal revenues will increase more rapidly than expenditures, from $149.8 billion in fiscal year 1967 to $167.1 billion in 1968, reflecting both the growth in the economy and the effect of the tax legislation I am recommending. The Federal deficit, as measured in the national income accounts will, therefore, decline between 1967 and 1968 from $3.8 billion to $2.1 billion.

While the national income accounts budget is the most appropriate measure of the overall economic impact of the Federal budget, a discussion of individual Federal programs is best carried out in terms of the more conventional administrative budget and the various Federal trust funds.

Administrative budget expenditures will amount to $126.7 billion in 1967 and $135 billion in 1968. In these 2 years, revenues in the administrative budget are estimated to rise from $117 billion to $126.9 billion. As a result, the budget deficit will fall from $9.7 billion in the current fiscal year to $8.1 billion in 1968.

Administrative budget expenditures in fiscal year 1967 are $13.9 billion higher than the expenditures I estimated in my budget message a year ago; $9.6 billion of the increase is accounted for by the enlarged military program. Another $3 billion results from the impact of tight money on the Federal budget, and $1.3 billion from expenditure reestimate, as workloads increased in such programs as public assistance, medicare, and the postal service. Potential further expenditures of $2.6 billion, from congressional additions to my 1967 authorization and appropriation recommendations, were roughly offset by the budget reductions I instituted last fall. Of the $3 billion expenditure reductions, $2.6 billion will occur in administrative budget programs and about $0.4 billion in the trust funds.

In 1968, defense outlays will account for $75.5 billion, or 56 percent, of the total budget. Of the remaining expenditures, some $29.4 billion, or 22 percent, are spent on programs under which payments are fixed by law or are otherwise uncontrollable—interest on the public debt, veterans compensation and pensions, public assistance, Federal general revenue contributions to medicare, and the like. Another $15.3 billion or 11 percent will be spent in 1968 to complete contracts or obligations entered into in prior years—the purchase of mortgages under earlier commitments, the completion of construction begun in 1966 or 1967, and so forth.

The remaining $14.9 billion, or 11 percent of the budget, may be considered as "controllable" expenditures in 1968. And even these include such indispensable programs as law enforcement, the collection of taxes and customs, the upkeep of our national parks, and the operation of the Nation's air navigation facilities.

Administrative budget expenditures

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Type of controllability	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
National defense	$57.7	$70.2	$75.5
Relatively uncontrollable civilian expenditures:			
Major programs	24.1	28.3	29.4
Interest	12.1	13.5	14.2
Veterans pensions, compensation, and insurance	4.2	4.7	4.9
Public assistance grants	3.5	3.9	4.2
Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation)	1.3	1.6	1.6
Postal public service costs and revenue deficit (existing law)	.8	1.1	1.1
Health insurance payments to trust funds		1.0	.9
Legislative and judiciary	.3	.4	.4
Other	1.8	2.2	2.3
Payments on prior contracts and obligations	11.5	14.3	15.3
Relatively controllable civilian expenditures	13.6	13.9	14.9
Proposed pay increases			1.0
Sale of financial assets	−3.0	−3.9	−5.3
Other	16.6	17.8	19.2
Total administrative budget expenditures	107.0	126.7	135.0

In the 1968 budget I have sought to recommend increases only where these are vitally necessary to meet the needs of a growing society. I have given particular, but selective, attention to programs designed to bring into the mainstream of American life those to whom opportunities are now denied.

At the same time, my 1968 budget incorporates substantial economies in operations. New projects under many Federal construction programs will be held to a modest level, well below the average of prior years and below the level to which they can rise when our fiscal problems are less urgent.

By 1966, Federal civilian agencies had achieved improvements in operations which netted a saving in that year of $1.7 billion compared to their level of efficiency 2 years earlier. The Defense Department's cost reduction program begun in 1961 yielded savings of $4.5 billion in 1966. Those efforts will continue in fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The effect on the Federal budget of selective expansions in high priority programs combined with economies in operation are summarized in the accompanying table.

Civilian administrative budget expenditures

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate	Change, 1967 to 1968
Total civilian	$49.3	$56.5	$59.5	+$3.0
Major education programs	2.8	4.0	4.6	+.6
Major health programs	2.5	4.3	4.8	+.5
Other major social programs:				
Welfare, labor, and economic opportunity programs	5.1	6.1	6.5	+.4
Housing and community development, regional development, and pollution control	1.2	2.0	2.4	+.4
Interest	12.1	13.5	14.2	+.6
Proposed pay increases			1.0	+1.0
Sale of financial assets	−3.0	−3.9	−5.3	−1.4
All other civilian expenditures	28.4	30.5	31.3	+.8

In the 1968 budget I am proposing to sell $5 billion in participation certificates. These certificates are a means by which Federal credit programs can be financed, and point up the role of the Federal Government as an intermediary, assisting borrowers to find sources of credit. The sale of these certificates also has the advantage of making the cash and administrative budgets more closely akin to the national income accounts budget since, in effect, it removes the impact of new lending from the cash and administrative budget totals.

My detailed budget plans provide for the possible sale of $5,750 million of these certificates. The overall budget totals, however, make an allowance for a possible shortfall of $750 million in the actual sales of these certificates. While this tends to raise the reported deficit in the administrative budget, I have made such an allowance in order to present more conservative estimates to the Congress, taking into account the uncertainty of future conditions.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

New obligational authority recommended for fiscal year 1968 in the administrative budget totals $144 billion. This is an increase of $4.4 billion over the current estimate for fiscal year 1967, of which $2.5 billion is for the Department of Defense and the military assistance program combined.

Of the total new obligational authority estimated for 1968, the Congress will have to act this year on $126.5 billion. The remaining $17.5 billion will become available under "permanent" authorizations without further congressional action; interest on the public debt represents 80 percent of this amount. Most of the $50.2 billion in new obligational authority estimated for 1968 for trust funds represents revenues from special taxes which are also appropriated automatically.

Apart from defense and military assistance, the 1968 new obligational authority recommended for congressional action in the administrative budget will amount to $51.3 billion. The proposed amounts result from a thorough evaluation and review of program levels and needs and have been held to the minimum that will assure orderly progress in meeting national program objectives.

Major increases in new obligational authority, other than for the Department of Defense, include $1.2 billion for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including the newly enacted model cities program; $1 billion for proposed civilian and military pay increases; $0.9 billion for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, mainly for public assistance, education, medicaid, and various other health activities; $0.6 billion for the permanent appropriation for interest on the public debt.

Major decreases include: $1.8 billion for the Department of Agriculture, largely due to the reduced capital needs of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the proposal to establish revolving funds for the Rural Electrification Administration; $1 billion for the Tennessee Valley Authority since its needs for bond-issuing authority for the next several years were met by an increase of this amount granted in fiscal year 1967; $0.6 billion for the Post Office, reflecting proposed postal rate increases.

The 1967 estimate in the administrative budget includes $14.3 billion in recommended supplemental appropriations which the Congress is being requested to enact this year. Of this total, $12.3 billion is for support of military operations in southeast Asia. The remaining supplemental amounts are needed mainly (1) to provide adequate financing for certain relatively uncontrollable costs which are based on eligibility and demand for services under provisions of existing law—such as for public assistance grants, postal services, and veterans' compensation and pensions, and (2) to cover part of the cost of military and civilian pay increases and new programs which were enacted last year but for which appropriations were not provided. The estimates presented in this budget reflect fully this additional new obligational authority for the current year and the related expenditures.

New obligational authority

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Total authorizations requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	$110.9	$123.9	$126.5
Trust funds	.5	5.1	1.7
Total authorizations not requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	15.5	15.7	17.5
Trust funds	36.2	45.8	48.6
Total new obligational authority:			
Administrative budget funds	126.4	139.6	144.0
Trust funds	36.7	50.8	50.2

FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

Military forces able to defend the cause of freedom in Vietnam and to counter other threats to national security require substantial resources.

Yet we cannot permit the defense of freedom abroad to sidetrack the struggle for individual growth and dignity at home. Under my budget proposals, we will move forward at a reasonable rate the programs to broaden opportunities for the poor or disadvantaged and continue the steady advance in their effectiveness achieved in the last 3 years.

Payments to the public

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Function	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Administrative budget expenditures:			
National defense	$57.7	$70.2	$75.5
Excluding special Vietnam	(51.9)	(50.8)	(53.6)
International affairs and finance	4.2	4.6	4.8
Excluding special Vietnam	(3.9)	(4.1)	(4.3)
Space research and technology	5.9	5.6	5.3
Agriculture and agricultural resources	3.3	3.0	3.2
Natural resources	3.1	3.2	3.5
Commerce and transportation	3.0	3.5	3.1
Housing and community development	.3	.9	1.0
Health, labor, and welfare	7.6	10.4	11.3
Education	2.8	3.3	2.8
Veterans benefits and services	5.0	6.4	6.1
Interest	12.1	13.5	14.2
General government	2.5	2.7	2.8
Allowances:			
Civilian and military pay increase			1.0
Possible shortfall in asset sales			.8
Contingencies		.1	.4
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.6	.8	.7
Total, administrative budget expenditures	107.0	126.7	135.0
Trust fund expenditures:			
Health, labor, and welfare	26.4	31.5	37.1
Commerce and transportation	3.8	3.7	3.7
National defense	.8	1.1	1.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources	1.2	1.4	1.2
Housing and community development	3.2	3.0	1.0
Veterans benefits and services	.6	.8	.6
All other	−.2	.1	.3
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.8	.7	.7
Total trust fund expenditures	34.9	40.9	44.5
Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments (deduct)	4.0	6.8	7.1
Total payments to the public	137.8	160.9	172.4

To assure that the budget fully covers all the costs which we might reasonably expect in the coming year, the total includes $2.2 billion in special allowances to provide for (1) proposed increases in the pay of military and civilian personnel, including postal employees, (2) the possibility of some shortfall in planned sales of financial assets, and (3) unforeseen contingencies and the possible costs of programs on which definite decisions have not yet been made, such as the development of a prototype supersonic air transport and a nuclear space rocket.

The highlights of the proposed Government program for 1968 follow:

National defense: Today, our military requirements are dictated by two fundamental realities. We must continue to counter aggression in South Vietnam. We must also continue to enhance our ability to meet changing threats to our freedom and security elsewhere. The 1968 budget will insure that our forces remain equal to both these tasks.

Though small in relation to the Nation's total economic activity, the cost of honoring our commitment to South Vietnam is nevertheless substantial. Expenditures necessary to support military operations in southeast Asia will total $21.9 billion in 1968, about three-tenths of budget expenditures for national defense. A year ago we were in the midst of a rapid buildup of our forces in Vietnam. Rather than submit a budget to the Congress based on highly uncertain estimates, I requested funds sufficient to finance the conflict through fiscal year 1967. At the present time the situation is different. While unforeseen events can upset the most careful estimate, we are in a much better position to determine our future requirements in Vietnam. As a consequence, my 1968 budget provides for those requirements on a continuing basis, including the possibility of an extension of combat beyond the end of the fiscal year.

In 1968, we will:

Continue intensive development of Nike X but take no action now to deploy an antiballistic missile (ABM) defense; initiate discussions with the Soviet Union on the limitation of ABM deployments; in the event these discussions prove unsuccessful, we will reconsider our deployment decision. To provide for actions that may be required at that time, approximately $375 million has been included in the 1968 budget for the production of Nike X for such purposes as defense of our offensive weapon systems.

Maintain our decisive strategic superiority by initiating procurement of the advanced Poseidon submarine-launched missile, improving our present strategic missiles, and further safeguarding our capacity to direct our forces in the event of attack.

Provide our forces in Vietnam with all the weapons and supplies they need and add to our war reserves at the same time.

Add to the mobility and effectiveness of our general purpose forces by increasing the firepower of our ground forces, enlarging our helicopter strength, pursuing a vigorous shipbuilding and conversion program, and purchasing additional modern tactical aircraft.

Increase our airlift and sealift capabilities by further procurement of the giant C-5A transport plane, and procurement of five fast-development logistics ships.

Continue the vigorous research and development programs vital to maintaining the most modern, versatile, and potent forces in the world.

These sizable increases in our capabilities for nuclear, conventional, or countersubversive conflict are necessary and prudent. Nevertheless, security needs will continue to be met without waste or extravagance. Our defense programs must be conducted as efficiently and economically as possible. In 1968, the defense cost reduction program will continue to produce significant savings.

International affairs and finance: In the long run, greater opportunities and security for our own citizens will be possible only if other peoples also share in progress toward a better and more secure life. To this end, our international programs in the coming year will emphasize helping the less-developed nations to increase their food production, expand their educational opportunities, and improve the health of their citizens.

Based on a thorough review of our economic assistance objectives and programs, I will recommend new legislation and specific actions to:

Require more effective self-help measures by recipient countries as a condition for U.S. aid;

Increase the amount of assistance for the key sectors of agriculture, health, and education;

Support regional arrangements and make greater use of multilateral channels through which other nations cooperatively share the costs of economic development;

Encourage greater participation by private enterprise in the development process; and

Concentrate our aid in those countries where successful development is most probable.

We are gratified by the achievements of the Alliance for Progress and shall continue to work closely with our hemispheric neighbors to help build schools and homes, create new jobs, and improve health and nutrition. But much remains to be done. I shall be meeting shortly with the chief executives of the other American governments to review the goals and progress of the Alliance. At that time we will consider new cooperative programs to accelerate growth in critical areas.

In South Vietnam, we will increase our economic assistance for projects directly aiding people in the villages and hamlets. This stepped-up effort is urgently needed to help these people construct their farms and houses in safety and build the foundations for a better life in that strife-torn country.

To pursue the war on hunger more effectively, our assistance to agriculture and our food-for-freedom shipments will encourage and support efforts by the de-

veloping nations to increase their own food production. In cooperation with other nations, we will also carry out a pioneer program to find ways to utilize the vast unexploited food resources of the sea.

The International Development Association, which is managed by the World Bank, has proven an effective means of international cooperation to promote economic development. Its current resources, however, will soon be exhausted. Following the successful conclusion of negotiations between the IDA and the developed nations of the world, I will request authorization for the United States to pledge its fair share toward an additional contribution to this organization in ways consistent with our balance-of-payments policy. I also intend to propose legislation which will permit us to join other members in a replenishment of the Inter-American Development Bank's Fund for Special Operations.

To enable the Export-Import Bank to fulfill its role of assisting our export trade, which is so vital to our balance of payments, I am recommending that its lending authority be increased and its life extended for another 5 years.

Space research and technology: In 1961, this Nation resolved to send a manned expedition to the moon in this decade. Much hard work remains and many obstacles must still be overcome before that goal is met. Yet, in the last few years we have progressed far enough that we must now look beyond our original objective and set our course for the more distant future. Indeed, we have no alternative unless we wish to abandon the manned space capability we have created.

This budget provides for the initiation of an effective follow-on to the manned lunar landing. We will explore the moon. We will learn to live in space for months at a time. Our astronauts will conduct scientific and engineering experiments in space to enhance man's mastery of that environment.

The Surveyor and Orbiter projects, in photographing the moon, have demonstrated dramatically the value of unmanned spacecraft in investigating other objects in the solar system. Accordingly, we are proceeding with the development of the Voyager system for an unmanned landing on Mars in 1973. We will also continue other unmanned investigations nearer the earth.

In recent years the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission have jointly undertaken the development of nuclear rocket propulsion technology. We are now considering whether that effort should be expanded to the development of the rocket itself. The overall budget totals allow for the possibility of proceeding if an affirmative decision is reached.

These new ventures are the result of careful planning and selectivity. We are not doing everything in space that we are technologically capable of doing. Rather, we are choosing those projects that give us the greatest return on our investment.

To support these new projects and to maintain our existing programs, an increase of $82 million is requested in new obligational authority for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for 1968. Expenditures, however, will decline by $300 million in the coming year, primarily because of reduced requirements for the manned lunar landing program.

Agriculture and agricultural resources: Rising domestic and foreign demands have highlighted the importance of maintaining a healthy and productive agricultural economy. During the past year our surplus commodity stocks have been substantially reduced. As a result, restrictions on the production of wheat and feed grains have been eased in order to allow the Nation to maintain adequate reserves.

The increasing demand for agricultural commodities provides a favorable outlook for many of our commercial farmers. However, a large number of rural people cannot achieve an adequate income even with a prosperous agriculture. Labor requirements on the Nation's farms have declined drastically in the last quarter of a cenutry. Unemployment and underemployment in rural areas have resulted. Consequently, rural communities are often unable to provide and maintain essential public services—good schools, modern hospitals, and other necessary community facilities—to meet today's needs.

I have directed the Secretary of Agriculture to take the lead in helping rural people achieve a quality of living comparable to other segments of our population. To this end, the Department of Agriculture will work with State and Federal agencies and with local groups to help rural communities make the best use of all existing governmental programs. In addition, legislation is needed to encourage establishment of pilot multi-county development districts.

To assure modern and efficient electric and telephone services for rural people, legislation should be enacted promptly to provide new sources of private financing for Rural Electrification Administration borrowers, while minimizing Federal outlays.

Natural resources: My recommendations in this budget for natural resource conservation and development will help meet the most urgent needs of our people and the requirements for economic growth.

Action must be taken now to—

Reduce water pollution in our lakes, rivers, and estuaries.

Insure an adequate supply of pure water.

Preserve scenic areas of irreplaceable natural beauty—scenic rivers, the Redwoods, North Cascades in the State of Washington, and the historic Potomac Valley.

Forestall the escalation of land prices in the acquisition of Federal lands for recreational use.

The continued pollution of our rivers, lakes, and estuaries is one of the major resource problems facing this Nation. The transfer last year of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the Department of the Interior now permits a major attack on the problems of water pollution in entire river basins. In 1968, the Department will also give major emphasis to reviewing and approving State standards required by the Water Quality Act of 1965.

Many regions of the country are facing increasingly critical problems of adequate supply and efficient use of water. I urge prompt enactment of legislation to establish a National Water Commission to assess our major water problems and develop guidelines for the most effective use of available water resources.

I also recommend legislation to enable the Department of the Interior to participate with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and the Atomic Energy Commission in developing and constructing a large prototype power and desalting plant. This will be a major step toward the development of economical projects for conversion of seawater to fresh water.

This budget provides for continued investment in the development and improvement of our vital water resources. Last fall, however, in order to help relieve inflationary pressures on the economy, I directed Federal agencies to slow down or defer construction projects wherever possible in fiscal year 1967. For 1968, I am recommending that a small number of new water resources projects be started. Advance planning will begin on a number of projects to be constructed in later years.

Authorized recreation areas must be acquired as promptly as possible to avoid speculative increases in land prices. Accordingly, I propose that an advance appropriation be made to the land and water conservation fund for this purpose.

A significant advance in research on the fundamental structure of matter will be made possible with the construction of a 200 billion electron volt accelerator by the Atomic Energy Commission. This research machine, to be located near Chicago, Ill., is expected to provide U.S. physicists with the world's highest energy proton beam. Design funds are provided in the 1968 budget.

Commerce and transportation: A strong and balanced national economy requires accurate and timely information; efficient transportation facilities; rapid communication; and special aids to lagging regions and sectors of the Nation.

Accordingly, the Federal Government will augment significantly its investment in commerce and transportation programs in the year ahead. The 1968 budget provides funds to:

Increase technical services and other aids to business;

Undertake a special sample survey to pinpoint the social and economic needs of our people;

Give added impetus to our efforts to encourage travel to the United States and our export promotion programs to improve our balance of payments;

Support a world weather watch to improve long-range weather forecasting;

Explore means for modifying the weather, and examine the implications of this new science;

Strengthen our effort to encourage regional economic development; and

Improve our transportation facilities and services under the leadership of the new Department of Transportation.

Our transportation programs in 1968

will include an all-out attack to reduce the alarming carnage on the Nation's highways, using the tools made available in the highway safety legislation enacted last year. We are currently considering the construction of a prototype civil supersonic transport. The allowance for contingencies is adequate to cover the possible costs of this effort, should an affirmative decision be made to proceed.

Special emphasis will be placed on improved management and acquisition of modern facilities and equipment to increase the efficiency of our postal system, one of the largest business operations in the world. To provide improved services, to cover proposed pay increases for postal workers, and largely offset the remaining postal deficit, a postal rate increase is both necessary and desirable. As required by law, I am proposing such an increase. The budget reflects $700 million in postal revenues from this source.

Housing and community development: The problems of the American city are great and vexing. They involve the entire physical and social fabric of deteriorating central cities and rapidly growing suburbs. Trapped in the declining centers of our cities are the poor and the victims of discrimination—who lack the resources to solve their problems without outside help.

This budget provides funds to help meet these needs. Outlays for grants and loans for programs directed specifically at community development will total an estimated $1.3 billion in 1968, triple the level in 1963. Moreover, other programs providing aid to urban areas will make substantial additional amounts available.

I have directed that community development programs emphasize aids for the poor. The recently enacted program of rent supplements is an essential element in helping the needy obtain adequate housing facilities and increasing their freedom of choice as to where they can live. To carry on this important program, I am requesting the full amount authorized for rent supplements for 1968, and urge the Congress to act favorably on this request.

To be effective, concerted attacks on city problems must be planned by the cities themselves. The new model cities program is now the primary incentive provided by the Federal Government to accomplish this objective. Special grants will be made to help transform entire blighted areas into attractive and useful neighborhoods. To receive these grants, cities must:

Develop imaginative and comprehensive plans of action; and

Enlist Federal, State, local, and private resources in a concerted effort to bring their plans to fruition.

Many cities are now planning their programs. It is essential that the funds I am requesting for these special grants be available in 1968 when these cities are ready to begin the task.

Under a new program enacted last year, further encouragement will be given to the planned development of entire metropolitan areas. Supplementary Federal grants will be made under 10 Federal aid programs in those metropolitan areas which demonstrate that they are carrying out through joint planning efforts all activities which affect metropolitan development. I urge enactment of the appropriations requested for this program.

One of the most serious difficulties in solving city problems is our inadequate knowledge about the roots and nature of these problems. I urge that sufficient funds be provided the Department of Housing and Urban Development to start a systematic research effort to acquire needed information on the causes and possible solutions for the housing and urban problems which we face today.

To be effective, our aids for community development must be put to use by competent, well-trained local employees. I am therefore requesting the appropriation of funds to initiate the authorized program for grants to States to help them provide training for State and local employees in community development programs.

The problems of the city are many; the resources, limited. More resources are essential if we are to build better cities for the future. We must start now to provide them.

Health, labor, and welfare: The 89th Congress enacted a far-reaching series of programs to improve the health and well-being of American citizens—particularly the less fortunate.

In the year ahead we must proceed to carry out these programs effectively, and seek the revisions and additions needed to maintain our progress. This budget so provides.

Health: The specter of inadequate health care is being removed from the aged and needy as we move ahead with the new medicare and medicaid programs, and with other activities aimed at bringing comprehensive modern treatment to all. With expanded Federal aid, more medical resources will become available, including medical facilities and qualified health personnel. The Nation's system for providing health care—public and private—will be improved to make it more efficient and to insure use of the latest advances of medical science.

In 1968, we will:

Strengthen our partnership with the States in health planning and in using broader and more flexible grants to fill gaps in health services.

Begin operating the new regional medical programs which will narrow the gap between the advanced methods used at university hospitals and day-to-day medical practice in the community.

Continue research and development to prevent or control diseases.

Expand programs to increase efficiency in hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and neighborhood health centers.

Additional measures are needed and will be proposed to:

Extend medicare to disabled workers.

Expand child health services, including dental care.

Reduce the menace of air pollution which is a threat to the health and safety of our citizens.

Labor and manpower: My budget proposals provide increased opportunity for the disadvantaged to participate in and contribute productively to our expanding economy.

I am recommending funds for 280,000 trainees under the Manpower Development and Training Act, an increase of 30,000 over the current year.

Programs under that act and those of the U.S. Employment Service will continue to emphasize serving the severely disadvantaged.

In addition, under programs financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, 355,000 jobs and training will be made available for youths in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. An estimated $328 million will be provided for expanded work-training programs, primarily for adults, with special emphasis on reaching the hard-core unemployed and underemployed in slum areas.

Economic opportunity programs: Poverty remains an ugly scar on the Nation's conscience. The war against it will be long, difficult, and costly. But we are making headway.

The $2.1 billion of new obligational authority included in the 1968 budget for the Office of Economic Opportunity will enable us to expand programs which help people rise out of poverty. The increase of $448 million over the 1967 level will be used largely for community action programs, for training programs, and for new Headstart followup efforts.

In addition to those helped by the work-training programs described above, the budget will provide for 737,000 children in Headstart; $135 million for improving primary school services as a followup to Headstart; 38,000 enrollees in the Job Corps; 6.5 million persons to be served through other activities by 1,100 community action programs.

Benefits and services which aid the poor are being provided by a number of Federal agencies. In total, 10 agencies will devote $25.6 billion in 1968 to help the more than 31 million poor people in our Nation. This represents an increase of $3.6 billion or 16 percent from the current year, of which $2 billion will be from trust funds.

Federal aid to the poor

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Category	1960 actual	1963 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Education and training	$0.3	$0.3	$3.1	$3.8
Health	.7	1.0	3.6	4.2
Cash benefit payments	8.3	10.4	12.8	14.6
Services, economic and community development, and other	.7	1.2	2.5	3.1
Total funds	9.9	12.9	22.0	25.6

Social security and public assistance programs: More than a third of our citizens receiving social security exist on incomes below the poverty level. Cash

assistance to welfare recipients generally fails to meet even State standards of need, which are often unrealistically low. And many of the poor are not even eligible for this meager assistance. As a step toward correcting these inequities, I will propose legislation to:

Provide an overall 20-percent increase in social security benefits for retired workers and their survivors, with a 59-percent increase at the bottom of the scale;

Assure that the public assistance program provides incentives for work and training and more nearly meets economic need;

Assure public assistance support and work training opportunities for unemployed fathers in impoverished families with dependent children.

Education: Our Nation's greatness depends upon the full development of the talents and abilities of its citizens.

The 89th Congress wrote a memorable record in education legislation. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 marked a significant advance in Federal support to help improve and enlarge educational opportunities at all levels. Our task now is to use this authority in an imaginative, creative, and responsible way.

New obligational authority for education will total $5.2 billion in 1968, $622 million more than in 1967. These funds will be used to:

Assist the disadvantaged by increasing grants to improve elementary and secondary education for about 8½ million less fortunate children from low-income families and by providing new grants for education of handicapped children;

Encourage creative change through an increase of almost 80 percent in grants for supplementary centers and other special projects designed to introduce better teaching and innovation in our educational programs.

Widen higher educational opportunities by providing more than $1.1 billion in scholarships, loans, and part-time work for students, a 22-percent increase over 1967; and

Improve teacher training through additional funding and amendments providing for a more flexible use of legislative authority.

I will propose legislation to:

Extend and enlarge the Teachers Corps;

Initiate experimental projects to improve vocational education, particularly for the disadvantaged and those not planning to attend college;

Extend and expand Federal support for educational television; and

Strengthen education program planning and evaluation by State governments and localities.

Veterans benefits and services: This Nation continues to recognize a particular obligation to those who have served in the Armed Forces. Special programs have long been available to aid the veteran and his dependents in the event of disability, death, ill health, or old age.

More recently, following World War II and the Korean conflict, extensive programs were enacted to assist the veteran in his readjustment to civilian life. In the second session of the 89th Congress, this type of assistance was again provided, through enactment of the third major veterans readjustment benefit program or "GI bill." Upon leaving the Armed Forces, young men of recent military service will find their readjustment made easier through the availability of substantial education, training, medical, and home-loan benefits.

In addition, the 1968 budget continues the improvements of the past few years in hospital staffing and the provision of new medical services and facilities. The objective is to provide both a higher quality of care and to reduce the duration of hospitalization, enabling the veteran to return sooner to his home and job.

Certain gaps currently exist in the benefits available to veterans of service in Vietnam relative to those for veterans of previous active military operations. I will propose legislation to fill these gaps so that fair and equitable treatment is provided for those who bear the brunt of the struggle in southeast Asia. I will also submit proposals to the Congress to remove or modify certain long standing but outmoded or inequitable provisions of law governing veterans programs.

General government: This administration is determined to help our States and cities reduce crime in America. Significant strides have already been taken. The Law Enforcement Act of 1965, the Bail Reform Act of 1966, and the Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965 have helped to strengthen law enforcement agencies, establish more equitable bail procedures in Federal courts, and improve the effectiveness of prisoner rehabilitation programs.

However, still greater efforts must be made. In 1965, I appointed a Commission of prominent citizens to study law enforcement and the administration of justice. With the aid of its findings, I will propose legislation for a major new program to help strengthen State and local government law enforcement and criminal justice systems.

District of Columbia citizens should have a voice in their own affairs. Our commitment to democracy demands no less. I again urge the Congress to grant home rule to the Nation's Capital.

PUBLIC DEBT

On the basis of the receipts and expenditures estimated in this budget, the public debt on June 30, 1967, will be $327.3 billion, and will increase to $335.4 billion on June 30, 1968.

The temporary limit of $330 billion on the public debt under present law will expire on June 30, 1967. If no action is taken, the limit will revert on that date to the permanent ceiling of $285 billion.

The present temporary debt limit, enacted last June, was based on an estimated administrative budget deficit for fiscal year 1967 of $1.8 billion. The request then made to the Congress was for a temporary debt limit of $332 billion. In reducing this request by $2 billion, the Congress indicated that if increased costs for Vietnam or other contingencies required reappraisal of this tight limit, the Congress would take whatever action is necessary.

Public debt at end of year

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1965 actual	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Owned by Federal agencies and trust funds	$63.0	$66.5	$74.9	$80.0
Owned privately and by Federal Reserve banks	254.8	253.8	252.4	255.4
Total	317.9	320.4	327.3	335.4

NOTE.—For further details see table 11 in pt. 2 of this document.

The increase in the 1967 deficit, coupled with the tightness of the current limit on the outstanding debt, make an immediate increase imperative. Without such an increase, management of debt operations and other fiscal policies will be seriously hampered.

Later this year, when the fiscal requirements for 1968 are more precisely known, specific recommendations will be presented for modifications in the temporary limit for that year. The exact amounts of the revisions in the temporary limit will depend not only on the specific outlook for the fiscal year as a whole, but also on the time pattern of receipts and expenditures in prospect.

Both for 1967 and 1968 the debt limits requested will provide the margin of flexibility necessary to manage the debt most prudently—to permit the Treasury to take full advantage of the most favorable market conditions and thus avoid unnecessary interest costs or adverse effects on the economy

IMPROVING GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

In the past few years, the Federal Government has undertaken an unprecedented number of forward-looking programs which promise to enrich the quality, the justice, and the opportunity of American society to an extent no one would have dared hope only a few short years ago.

But our responsibilities to the American people are not discharged with the enactment of new programs which meet the needs of the Nation. There exist two other closely related obligations of equal gravity:

First, we are obligated to assure effective and economical management of governmental programs—both old and new. Effective management of government activities enhances the benefits of those programs. Economical management releases resources for the people's use.

Second, we are obligated to maintain close and harmonious working relationships with State, county, and local gov-

ernments—our partners in a new and creative federalism.

Government organization: We have made significant strides in the last 2 years to improve Government organization—

By creating the Departments of Transportation and of Housing and Urban Development.

By transferring the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the Department of the Interior.

By reorganizing the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the scientific programs of the Department of Commerce, and the Bureau of Customs.

But additional action to improve the management of the Federal Government is necessary. One of the Government's major objectives is the promotion of a vigorous and growing economy. While there are many ways in which the Government pursues this objective, there are a number of highly interrelated activities now carried on separately by the Departments of Labor and Commerce and several other agencies:

Planning and execution of manpower programs designed to increase the skills and productivity of the labor force;

Promotion of the economic development of depressed areas and regions, to help them achieve balanced economic growth;

Provision of technical and other services to business and labor;

Collection, dissemination, and analysis of data about economic conditions of the Nation, its various industries, and its geographic areas;

Advising the President and carrying out national policies for improved labor-management relations.

The Secretaries of Commerce and Labor have recommended to me, and I strongly agree, that the President, the Congress, and the Nation will best be served by bringing together these closely related operations into one institution headed by a single responsible official of Cabinet rank. I will, therefore, propose legislation to merge the Departments of Labor and Commerce and the functions of several related agencies into a new Department of Business and Labor.

Federal-State-local cooperation: Our agenda must give high priority to a stronger and more effective federal system of government in the United States. To meet urgent and growing needs, the Federal Government is providing a wide range of programs to assist State and local governments. Now the chief task is to manage these programs efficiently at every level of government to assure the most effective public services. This effort will require support and action by the Congress.

At the national level the Federal Government has a responsibility to examine and improve the grant-in-aid system, making it more flexible and responsive to State and local fiscal realities. Last year we began a new partnership in health program through which numerous separate grant programs are being brought together. The model cities legislation enacted last year will also help to integrate the wide range of Federal aids available to communities. In the coming year we will examine other areas of Federal aid to determine whether additional categorical grants can be combined to form a more effective tool for intergovernmental cooperation.

Another aspect of the problem of intergovernmental cooperation has been the process of consultation with elected officials of State and local governments on matters concerning the development and administration of Federal assistance programs. Governors and local chief executives are responsible for the management of their units of government. The Federal Government should take all practical steps to increase the role of these executives in the administration of federally aided programs. I recently instructed Federal officials to work directly with State and local chief executives to accomplish this objective.

The Federal Government has a vital stake in the workings of our federal system. Federalism is not a one-sided partnership, and the States and local governments do not exist simply to carry out programs on behalf of the National Government. When we lose sight of these facts the federal system suffers, governments work at cross purposes, and the programs fail to achieve their objectives. Our task now is to improve Federal programs and administration, while we do more to help State and local governments strengthen their machinery for planning and management.

At the same time, State and local governments must help themselves. Serious problems of modernization in State and local government can be solved only by the people directly concerned. The Federal Government cannot and should not seek to remedy their internal deficiencies of organization or obsolete restraints on financing and executive direction. The Federal Government can, however, increase its technical assistance to general units of Government. As one example, we can work with State and local executives to improve budgeting and management. In a similar way, the Federal Government stands ready to cooperate with the States in developing more adequate general systems of comparative statistics—an area where State governments have great needs.

Capable personnel are essential for effective service to the public at the State and local level no less than at the national level. I am recommending legislation to broaden educational and training opportunities for students planning careers in the public service and for public employees who desire to improve their skills. Provision will also be made for financial and technical assistance to strengthen State and local personnel management and to permit interchange of personnel between the Federal Government and State and local governments.

Some States have created special offices concerned with community development, which focus their organizational and financial resources on urban problems within their borders. The work of these offices can be made more effective, and other States can be encouraged to make similar efforts, by the new program authorized last year for grants by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to States to support technical assistance and information services to their local communities. I urge the Congress to stimulate such improvements by providing the funds I am requesting for this new program.

Budgetary concepts: As I have already made clear in this message, some of our traditional budget concepts do not adequately portray the Federal Government's activities. The conventional administrative budget, for example excludes the expenditures and receipts of the trust funds. Both the administrative and cash budgets treat repayable loans in the same way as nonrepayable grants or purchases. While the national income accounts budget has been carefully formulated to measure Federal activities in relation to the flow of income and production in the economy, it is not now well suited for an analysis of individual Federal programs.

For many years—under many administrations—particular aspects of the overall budget presentation, or the treatment of individual accounts, have been questioned on one ground or another.

In the light of these facts, I believe a thorough and objective review of budgetary concepts is warranted. I therefore intend to seek advice on this subject from a bipartisan group of informed individuals with a background in budgetary matters. It is my hope that this group can undertake a thorough review of the budget and recommend an approach to budgetary presentation which will assist both public and congressional understanding of this vital document.

PLANNING-PROGRAMING-BUDGETING SYSTEM

Our most comprehensive effort to improve the effectiveness of Government programs is taking place through the planning-programing-budgeting system. This system, which was initiated throughout the executive branch a little over a year ago, requires all agencies to:

Make explicit the objectives of their programs and relate them carefully to national needs;

Set out specific proposed plans of work to attain those objectives; and

Analyze and compare the probable costs and benefits of these plans against those of alternative methods of accomplishing the same results.

This system is primarily a means of encouraging careful and explicit analysis of Federal programs. It will substantially improve our ability to decide among competing proposals for funds and to evaluate actual performance. The full effects of this effort will not be felt until next year and later, as the necessary data are gathered and analyses now in progress are completed.

A few examples of the kind of work which is in progress indicate the wide range of matters to which organized analysis and programing can be applied.

Disease control: The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has completed an analysis of the relative cost and effectiveness of selected disease control programs. Cost per life saved and other criteria of relative effectiveness were developed. These programs are be-

ing reviewed and funding priorities are being reexamined in light of these findings.

Child health: The Department of Health. Education, and Welfare completed an analysis of alternative programs aimed at reducing infant mortality and improving child health. This analysis led to the legislative program focused on early identification and treatment of needy handicapped children and experimental projects aimed at improving delivery of medical care to children.

Urban planning: Experimental projects in urban planning designed to link planning with budgeting are underway at the local level. These efforts should produce a more effective allocation not only of Federal outlays but also of local resources.

Agricultural research: On the basis of a long-range study conducted by the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant universities, a new set of priorities for agricultural research has been established. Increasing emphasis is being given to research on improvement of nutrition and health, efficient low-cost housing, improved community services, and other means which can help directly in raising the level of rural living.

Tax administration: As a result of intensive analyses of the tax administration system, Internal Revenue Service programs have been steadily improved to produce higher tax collections per dollar of cost, while strengthening the emphasis on equity and voluntary compliance on which our tax administration is based.

With its emphasis on developing better methods of accomplishing program objectives, the new planning-programing-budgeting system is also helping our Government-wide cost reduction program. We will continue to offset a significant part of increased costs of important new programs by increasing efficiency throughout the Federal Government. Savings from this source have been substantial during the past year under our drive for cost reduction. I have made it clear to the heads of all departments and agencies that they are to continue their emphasis on cost reduction in the coming year.

The careful research and analysis which is required under the planning-programing-budgeting system does not just happen. It requires the efforts of intelligent and dedicated men and women. The number of analysts required is not large—but the need for them is great. I urge the Congress to approve the funds requested in the budgets of the various Federal agencies to make possible this improvement in the management of Federal resources.

CONCLUSION

Our Nation is stronger today than ever before. We need not, indeed we dare not, forsake our basic goals of peace, prosperity, and progress.

The pursuit of peace is essential for the continued advancement of our Nation and all mankind.

Prosperity and progress will lead us toward a society where all can share in the bounty of nature and the products of man's ingenuity and creativity.

At various times in the past, democracies have been criticized for their seeming inability to make hard choices—for seeking soft, easy answers to critical problems. This Nation has proven the doubters wrong time and again, and will not fall prey to such weakness now.

We can afford to achieve our goals. Let us not retreat from the task, no matter how demanding it may be.

This budget represents a careful balance of our abundant resources and our awesome responsibilities. As President, I have weighed the alternatives and made the hard choices as best I could. The responsibility for similar action now rests with the Congress. I urge your support for the goals and programs embodied in this budget for the coming fiscal year.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 24, 1967.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the President's budget immediately following my remarks and the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the annual budget of the President is our focal point for the consideration of fiscal matters. It is a mass of figures and information. It is extremely complex. It brings the whole range of governmental activities into focus as they compete for financial support. It represents a drawing of the line, so to speak, from the President's viewpoint between national wants and national necessities. The President has drawn the line where and how he thinks it should be drawn. It is now our responsibility to study and dispose of the countless budget recommendations and to redraw the lines as we see fit.

Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of the Congress to look with a skeptical eye on any budget and go through it with a fine toothcomb so to speak, and try to make reductions in spending wherever they can safely and logically be made.

The President's budget just submitted to us will be no exception.

A budget is a plan for the year—an estimate—an educated guess—and should be considered as such.

In no instance has a Federal budget predicted precisely what actually happened during the fiscal year for which the budget was prepared, nor could it. I would say that President Johnson's budget estimates for the fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966 have, in the overall, been more accurate in projecting what actually did happen with respect to year-end deficit figures than those of any of his modern predecessors.

I can pledge to the House that its Committee on Appropriations, in accordance with its duty and responsibility, will screen the budegt requests as thoroughly as possible, recommend reductions wherever they appear warranted, and present appropriation bills to the House as expeditiously as can be done, with the view of passing all of the regular appropriation bills through the House prior to July 1, the beginning of the new fiscal year.

It does seem to me that for the first time in several years there is good reason to hope for an early adjournment, and by early I mean some time prior to August 1.

Of course, many of the appropriation bills or portions of them will have to be authorized before Congress can enact appropriations, but I am confident that the legislative committees will bring up for consideration as early as possible the various authorization legislation which will be required.

With further respect to the budget, I would say that we cannot, on short notice, judge the validity of the items in the budget or anticipate the actions which Congress may take after a searching study of the countless recommendations.

The President has made some hard choices, hard decisions. It is now up to Congress to evaluate the President's decisions and make hard decisions of its own. Congress has the final responsibility as to how much money will be granted for expenditure. This is a part of our system.

When we are in an inflationary period and the budget is out of balance, it is especially imperative that we take a critical look at all phases of the budget and cut everything that we safely and logically can.

The President's administrative budget for expenditures is, of course, $135 billion. That is the money that he estimates will be spent from appropriations now requested and from carryover balances of appropriations made in previous years. The work that Congress will undertake in the field of appropriations this session will relate not so much to the $135 billion spending figure but to a figure of $165 billion, roughly, the amount requested in new appropriations.

This is the amount of obligational authority, stated in traditional appropriation terms, which the President has requested in the budget which has just been submitted to us.

I would like to make a statement which I believe may be a bit shocking to some, and which certainly should be sobering to us as we consider authorizations and appropriations. Two years ago we increased appropriations over the previous year by some $13 billion. Last year, we increased appropriations over the previous year by nearly $25 billion. This year, we are being requested to increase appropriations over last year by roughly $21 billion. So we can see how rapidly appropriations have escalated in the last 2 years and what we are confronted with in our considerations during this session.

Of course, the war has had a very tremendous impact on Government spending. It is fair to say that we were

well on the way to a balanced budget, and in my judgment we would have achieved a balanced budget, except for the war. But, of course, the war is the number one problem before the Nation. It is a matter of the greatest concern. It is the war that is primarily responsible for the budget being out of balance for the fiscal year 1968.

As was said last week in a discussion on the floor of the House, a President can always submit a balanced budget by a few strokes of the pen. The President's budget is not only made up of traditional appropriation requests and estimated expenditures, but it is also made up of revenue proposals.

There is a tendency on the part of the Congress and the public in discussing a budget to overlook the revenue proposals and to think only of the spending proposals in evaluating what the budget really contains. Failure to enact revenue proposals contained in the budget would be a significant factor to consider in projecting income and outgo. There is no way for us to know at this time whether the revenue proposals will be adopted and what will be done by Congress with appropriations requests.

The administrative budget deficit for the forthcoming fiscal year is estimated by the President to be $8.1 billion, but if we do not pass the proposed increase in postage rates, for example, the deficit will be $700 million more.

If we do not approve the program for financing certain projects by the participation sales method, the deficit will be very much more indeed. We could go through the entire budget and balance revenue-raising proposals with spending proposals and better evaluate what the true situation may be when the end of the session has arrived.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain tabulations when I revise my remarks. In the revision of my remarks I shall undertake to insert some material which will bear on the tremendous problem which will be confronting us every day of the session as to how much we shall authorize the Executive to spend as a result of the actions of the session of Congress in the calendar year of 1967.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks which have just been made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee relating to the budget message which has just been received and read in the House of Representatives. I find myself in concurrence and in accord with virtually everything the chairman of our committee has had to say about this. I respect his knowledge of budgetary matters. I, of course, respect his ability to present the matters which come before the House from the Committee on Appropriations.

I should merely like at this time to call the attention of the House to House Concurrent Resolution 63, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia on January 16, which would express the sense of the Congress that the funds derived from special highway user taxes not be withheld from expenditure in such a matter as would interfere with the orderly construction of the interstate and other Federal aid highway programs under a long-range planned program. That program has certainly demonstrated that the idea of long-range highway construction planning has been both in the interest of economy and of efficiency.

It has always been my position, and still is, that the revenues from the special highway user taxes go into a trust fund account which cannot be used for any other purpose and should not be delayed or deferred from use in highway construction as intended.

I certainly hope that the substance of the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 63 will be concurred in by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to respond to the remarks made by the gentleman from Georgia.

As the House knows, last year the President announced a policy of slowing down expenditures of funds made available in order to reduce the spending of the Government, in order to relieve some of the inflationary pressure. He stated that he would undertake to curtail programs by $3 billion, in an effort to reduce the rate of spending. This was to a very considerable extent a proposed stretching out, or a postponement. This was not held out to be a real saving of money.

Among the expenditures which the President proposed we stretch out were those having to do with the highway construction program.

I believe we are all in favor of a good road system and an adequate highway program.

There is some talk that additional funds in the highway program may be withheld from expenditure. Just what may be recommended by the executive branch on the matter of withholding an additional $400 million I do not know. I myself would think it unwise to withhold additional funds, and I believe we need to look carefully into the withholding of funds for the highway program as has already been advocated by the President.

I would not undertake to prejudge this matter at this time.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, this budget was at least 6 months in the making, and it has been available to us in the legislative branch only a few short hours. Therefore, I have not had an opportunity to give it the study I believe it deserves before I make any extended analysis of it or any lengthy comments about it.

However, I should like to say that I am satisfied this budget can be cut, and I believe it can be cut by a sufficient amount of money to obviate the necessity of increasing taxes.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee serving under the distinguished gentleman from Texas, I pledge to him and to the House and to the country a maximum effort to find places where this budget can be cut without sacrificing national security.

I have never seen a budget that could not be cut.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to serve on this committee for some 12 or 14 years. Recently a compilation was made which shows that during that period of time the House Committee on Appropriations cut budgets submitted by four Presidents by a total of more than $50 billion.

These cuts did not stand up because the House did not go along with all of the recommendations of the committee. And as you know we have another body that has to have its word on appropriations also. I mention this only to prove that budgets can be cut if there is a will to cut them.

The thing that worries me about this budget, from my casual examination of it thus far, is that I see no evidence of any major effort on the part of the executive branch of the Government to cut back on nondefense spending. As a matter of fact, the only nondefense areas in which budget cuts are proposed occur in three fields; namely, in space exploration where a very modest reduction of $300 million is set forth out of a $5 billion appropriation item, in commerce and transportation where there is a small reduction of $400 million, in education where there is a reduction of $500 million, and $300 million in veterans services. Throughout all of the rest of the Government there are no major reductions proposed. I think in view of the fact that we face a critical situation in Vietnam with ever-increasing costs and with no prospect of any end in sight soon, all of us, ought to make a really serious effort to cut back on nondefense spending. I think this can be accomplished, and I am going to be very greatly disappointed at our efforts in the House Committee on Appropriations if we do not come up at the end of this current session with appropriation recommendations substantially under those recommended by the President. I think we can cut a sufficient amount to obviate the necessity of increasing taxes and without sacrificing any essential activity and without impairment to national defense. I intend to devote my efforts in that direction.

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman that he is eminently correct in saying that any budget can be reduced, can be cut. The President made some hard choices resulting in reductions below what some agencies requested. Of course, there are some who want to go far beyond the figures he has submitted with regard to various programs. We all know this. Certain people in the country and some Members of Congress want to go far beyond anything proposed by the President. There are many of us who do not want to go as far as the President proposes.

I believe that the House of Representatives should and will make reductions in the President's budget in appropriation bills. Last year, in the calendar year 1966, we made reductions in appro-

priation bills in the sum of $883 million. This year I would hope we can do better than that. We must make recommendations for reduction in view of the very difficult fiscal situation confronting us. We have an estimated budget deficit in the sum of $9.7 billion for the current fiscal year and in the sum of $8.1 billion estimated for the next fiscal year even with a tax increase of $4.7 billion and other revenue-increasing proposals which have been and will be made.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. First of all, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and, of course, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], who are among the most able and knowledgeable Members of the House. It is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to go over the budget every year with a fine-tooth comb. After all, the business of appropriating money is primarily a legislative matter in this country.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman from Texas has had to say about the further stretching-out of the highway funds. However, I would like to state, in addition to what the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] said with reference to not cutting where actual defense is concerned, that there are fixed obligations of the Government and it is important that the House of Representatives know how the various cuts on every item will affect the total economy and the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I think some of the gentlemen who have expressed such serious concern with the size of the budget we received today should pause and consider the fact that more than three-fourths of the budget expenditures are for programs that are virtually uncontrollable. Five of every nine dollars estimated to be spent by the Government in 1968 will be for national defense. More than $14 billion will be paid out as interest on the public debt. Nearly $5 billion more will be spent for veterans pensions, compensation, and insurance. Public assistance grants to States account for more than $4 billion. A total of more than $6 billion will be spent for such essential items as operation of the postal system, farm price supports, Federal contributions to medicare, and a number of other smaller but equally necessary and equally uncontrollable type of programs.

If we exclude all of these uncontrollable expenditures, there is only about $30 billion remaining to be spent on the tremendously vital but relatively controllable items such as law enforcement, tax collection, operation of our national parks, aids to education, operation of the Patent Office, control of air and water pollution, and operation of the Federal air navigation system. Furthermore, of this $30 billion to be allocated among a large number of important activities, about half will be spent for payment of obligations incurred in previous years. In other words, after making allowance for expenditures for uncontrollable items such as national defense, interest and veterans pensions, as well as for money to be spent to fulfill existing contracts and commitments, there remains only about $15 billion of 1968 expenditures that are really controllable. When put in its proper perspective, and after considering in all fairness the tremendous amount of uncontrollable spending necessary to operate the Government. I think it is a remarkable achievement that the budget is not considerably larger.

I note that many of the more necessary and socially desirable programs show increased budgets for 1968, yet the total amount budgeted for all activities that are controllable in the budget year is the same in 1968 as in 1967.

All of this evidences to me a sincere effort by the President to continue and increase spending for high priority programs which benefit the taxpayer the most, while at the same time cutting and slowing the less essential activities of the Government. I think this budget sets forth a wise program, truly reflecting the relative priorities of the many activities of the Government.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I shall yield to the gentleman from Missouri very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, the President has discharged his statutory responsibility. He has submitted his budget plans. He has made some hard choices, and now it is up to the Congress to make the hard choices and it is up to us to determine—and we have the sole responsibility—just what we shall do about the budget, and making cuts thereon. But when cuts are made in a program, take for example a military housing program, and I use this only for illustration—we can cut the amount of money but when we cut the amount of money we reduce the number of houses. In short, at some point we have to face up to the fact that we cannot have the same number of houses if we cut deeply.

What I am saying is that we must make decisions not only as to money, but also as to programs and what we wish to achieve by reductions we may make.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a few observations which I would like to make with respect to this subject.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I concur in the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] when the gentleman said that we have just received this budget message. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this is a document which takes considerable effort in order to get to the bottom of the items contained therein. So, we on this side shall be, I hope, making a more determined effort and undertaking a more detailed response with reference to the President's budget. There are some things which I feel need to be said at this point. However, if I might say to the gentleman from Texas when he responded, there are some who want to go even beyond the President in his proposals for nondefense expenditure contained in this budget.

All I can say referring to the President's message containing his proposals for social security benefit increases is that if they are indicative of the kind of proposals that are incorporated in this budget, then I defy anyone to go beyond the President's proposals. I cannot imagine anything that could be more irresponsible than the President's request—in the message we just received yesterday.

Mr. MAHON. Well, if the President——

Mr. CURTIS. Let me finish, please, and I shall be happy to hear the gentleman's response.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining of the 30 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Missouri can obtain his own time for further elaboration, but I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], that I, of course, could obtain my own time. But, if we are to have a colloquy then let us engage in it. Frankly, I do not like the business—on an important message like this—of Members simply inserting their remarks in the RECORD, when people reading them the next day, or the following day, have no knowledge as to whether those remarks have been submitted to the possible rebuttal of Members of the House who might disagree with them. That is why I like to engage in a live colloquy.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, enjoy a live colloquy. Debate on these important questions is necessary. However, I would like to say at this point—while the gentleman from Missouri said it is unbelievable that anyone would want to go beyond this——

Mr. CURTIS. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. I was not limiting my reference to any one single proposal. I am speaking generally. The mayor of the city of New York has suggested, as I understand it, that about $50 billion of Federal assistance might be required for the city of New York in the next 10 years. I feel certain that there are many political figures of both the Democratic and Republican political faith, and many citizens otherwise, who feel that the President's budget is wholly inadequate in some respects. I believe the gentleman from Missouri knows this as well as I do.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman means that these proposals would be in complete disregard for the revenue aspects of the budget, and I would say this

budget, just handed to us, is almost in complete disregard for the revenue aspects and for the economic consequences of financing programs at this time through further deficits. If the gentleman from Texas means this, then I can agree that every one of us can conceive of additional areas where we could spend money. But I thought our discussion of the budget was in context with what one might say is within reason. To have a budget presented such as this and then to suggest going beyond the President's expenditure requests is unthinkable, that was what I was saying; it is very difficult for me to believe that anyone would seriously suggest increasing the President's expenditure requests.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I appreciate the gentleman's position.

I myself feel that this country, during a period of a high level of employment and with a gross national product now approaching $800 billion, could and should pay its own way.

Mr. CURTIS. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. Especially in view of the fact that the war effort in Vietnam is requiring less than 5 percent of the gross national product—I am referring to the war; I am not talking about the cost of the entire Defense Department.

It is for this reason that I feel so strongly that we should do the best possible job in bringing appropriations into line with revenues.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me say to the gentleman that I could not agree with that approach more. I feel deeply that this is so. I think this country most needs a balanced budget at this time. And we can have a balanced budget. Granted, it would be austere. We would start with the fixed charges.

I think we can all agree that the costs of defense would have to be included. The gentleman is right in saying, and the President has boasted about the fact, that this war is costing less as a measure of the gross national product than any war before. But we would put our defense needs in and then see what is left—I might say there would be considerable left—and then fit the rest of the programs into the remaining moneys.

I think the key to the future of this country lies in getting a balanced budget.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Ways and Means, beginning Monday, is going to be involved in this area of expenditures long before the Committee on Appropriations will be involved, because the respect to increase debt ceiling is coming up. The President's lack of estimates on revised expenditures at the time he requested an increased debt ceiling last year and again when he presented his proposal for a suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit to the Committee on Ways and Means has brought about a situation where I believe there is a violation of the law going on right now on the part of the Executive in order to escape the discipline of the debt ceiling; namely, putting participation certificates into the social security trust fund. This is one way, of course, of getting around the debt ceiling.

So, indeed, hopefully, beginning next Monday, we will have before the Committee on Ways and Means some data which will shed light on the matter. I hope that members of the Committee on Appropriations will come before the Ways and Means Committee to suggest where the budget for 1968 might be revised and cut down, and also the budget of 1967, which has been expanded considerably beyond the original presentation last year. We can, hopefully, develop a recision bill. This is something that this country has never heard of before, but it is certainly possible to take some of this $125 billion carryover power to spend that the President has, go over it and see where we might be able to cut back.

Let me remind the Members of the House that the President says that he is doing this rescinding of his own accord. He has boasted about the fact that he has. Certainly the Congress can do it, too. What is happening is that the President is exercising an item veto. The President decides where he wants to cut back in a certain program, or where he wishes to put some program on the shelf. But the Congress has not been brought into this operation as to what priorities should be established in cutting. Congress can and should be brought into this process. Congress can do something about the expenditures right now, as of right now.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may be allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we extend that for 10 minutes, because I do have a couple of other points I would like to cover.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I then ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be allowed to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the gentleman that there are other special orders pending.

Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, before yielding further to my colleague, my good friend from Missouri, I would like to say I think it is fortunate for the Congress that the Committee on Ways and Means must in the very near future give consideration to the overall fiscal picture. This will be brought about when consideration is given to the question of raising the debt ceiling. This has been called to our attention as one of the vital questions before this session of the Congress which undoubtedly will be considered.

I would not at all agree that the President has not sought to hold the spending level down. Apparently, the President is successfully not spending funds available to him in the sum of $3 billion during this fiscal year. I do not believe it is correct or proper to ascribe any violation of the law or procedure to what the Executive is seeking to do.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me say to the gentleman that this is an intellectual discussion and I hope that when I say that something in my judgment is not constitutional or is illegal that I am not impugning the motives of the President.

The President has a letter from the Attorney General saying that this is legal. I question this legal opinion. I am calling attention to just one element of the problem. During the debate on the participation certificates, we offered an amendment on this side to make these participation certificates subject to the debt ceiling. And in the wisdom, or the lack thereof, on the part of the House, this amendment was defeated. So these participation certificates are outside of the debt ceiling.

The social security law was carefully written. I think it was—the way I read it, it was, to see that the only securities which could be purchased for the trust funds were in effect Government obligations which were under the debt ceiling and were in a complete way guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the United States.

So let us keep this on this level. I am making a serious charge—I agree—but I am not impugning any motives when I am trying to describe it. I certainly think it is a quite serious situation.

Let me say to the gentleman, the only way that we can understand this budget for 1968 fiscal year and in particular I am talking about the revisions of fiscal year 1967 which are set out in it is to take this 1968 budget and compare it with the 1967 budget we were presented in 1966. Let me compare some of the tables.

I want to call attention to page 413 of the 1968 budget, "Table B-9—Gross Expenditure of Government Administered Funds in Millions of Dollars."

This includes both what we call the administrative budget and the budget which includes various trust funds.

Take column 2 on this page where you see the 1967 expenditure estimates. Now go to the document of the 1967 budget presented last January, page 394 and we find an identical "Table B-9—Gross Expenditures of Government Administered Funds in Millions of Dollars." In the final column there are the 1967 expenditure estimates.

Now here is something—because these are estimates on the same subject matter made a year apart. National defense in the first is $63 billion—and national defense in the revised one of 1967 is $73 billion.

In other words, there was a $10 billion increase just in revision.

Now we get the total. It is $175 billion in the 1967 estimate of 1967 expenditures and it is $192 billion in this new document—making a difference of $16.7 billion.

So the estimates on defense increases are $10 billion.

The estimates on nondefense expenditures have increased $6.7 billion. This is something that the country needs to know because we have been hearing a lot about how all of this increased Government cost is because of the war. The gentleman has pointed out, as I have said, that we can have guns and butter—but not rancid butter. But we have to start looking carefully and establishing priorities in the butter area.

But this clearly shows in the first revision a revising upward of $6.7 billion in nondefense expenditures, and let me remind everyone that the estimates last January were by no means skimpy. That was a lush budget and the $6.7 billion is on top of it.

Very little has been done, I might say, to hold expenditures by the Executive.

One final point on this subject—I tried to find out last year during the interrogation of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget twice, once on the debt ceiling and the other one when we suspended the investment tax credit, where was this $3 billion cut in expenditures they boasted about? And the record is still open for the administration to document it. I shall frankly state again that I do not believe they can, because I do not think there was any $3 billion cut. I think that was just rhetoric. There was a $6.7 increase. The more we get into this budget I know we are going to find a great deal more to have been rhetoric, and we are going to find many funny figures.

Let me refer to one other thing——

Mr. MAHON. Let me make one comment.

Mr. CURTIS. I have one final comment, but go ahead.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to point out that while all Presidents are required to make projections, an educated guess, present a budget, this administration, I believe, has done the best job of estimating differences between spending and revenues of any administration in recent years.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Let me finish first——

Mr. CURTIS. Let me make this one point, and then you can respond to the point. You mentioned that before, but you are talking about deficits. One reason the deficit might have been less is because of the misestimation of revenues. Let us refer to the estimated expenditures.

Mr. MAHON. Here is the point I am trying to make: You pay off on the deficit or the surplus, the relationship between outgo and revenues. This administration has, as I said, done the best job of any administration in modern history in estimating the amount of the deficit. I shall insert at this point in the RECORD information which will corroborate that statement:

Variations in administrative budget projections, 1955–66

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget receipts			Budget expenditures			Surplus or deficit		
	Original	Actual	Swing	Original	Actual	Swing	Original	Actual	Swing
1955	62.5	60.2	−2.3	65.4	64.4	−1.0	−2.9	−4.2	−1.3
1956	59.7	67.8	+8.1	62.1	66.2	+4.1	−2.4	+1.6	+4.0
1957	65.0	70.6	+5.6	64.6	69.0	+4.4	+.4	+1.6	+1.2
1958	73.1	68.6	−4.5	71.2	71.4	+.2	+1.8	−2.8	−4.6
1959	74.0	67.9	−6.1	73.6	80.3	+6.7	+.5	−12.4	−12.9
1960	76.4	77.8	+1.4	76.3	76.5	+.2	+.1	+1.2	+1.1
1961	83.3	77.7	−5.6	79.1	81.5	+2.4	+4.2	−3.9	−8.1
1962	82.3	81.4	−.9	80.9	87.8	+6.9	+1.5	−6.4	−7.9
1963	93.0	86.4	−6.6	92.5	92.6	+.1	+.5	−6.3	−6.8
1964	86.9	89.5	+2.6	98.8	97.7	−1.1	−11.9	−8.2	[1] +3.7
1965	93.0	93.1	+.1	97.9	96.5	−1.4	−4.9	−3.4	[1] +1.5
1966	94.4	104.7	+10.3	99.7	107.0	+7.3	−5.3	−2.3	[1] +3.0

[1] Original deficit projection decreased by this amount.

But it is true that there was an underestimate of the cost of the war. We must bear in mind that the budget is submitted 18 months in advance of the end of the fiscal year for which it is submitted. That is one of the reasons why original budgets are sometimes off the mark. The President underestimated the cost of the war and he also underestimated the amount of revenues. So this would seem to have been an action in all good faith. Otherwise the President might have estimated revenues far beyond what he did in order to make himself look better at the beginning of the session when the estimates were first submitted.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. It will be very interesting to go over those tables.

Mr. MAHON. Before we get into that subject, one other thing: The President had said originally that he would reduce the programs, if possible, during this fiscal year to the extent of $3 billion. Actually he has now translated that statement and said that he would undertake to, or would reduce "expenditures" by $3 billion, which is an entirely different matter from reducing program. So I think we can document many reductions that can be made. Some of the enumerated reductions in program were not very well founded, in my judgment. We do not have time to go into all those details, but I think a substantial amount of money is being withheld and will be withheld in order to reduce expenditures during the current fiscal year.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to say to the gentleman that I am anxious to see that documentation. Let me make one other point. One of the reasons for the lower amount of deficits compared with expenditures is that the administration has been selling off capital assets and, as the gentleman knows, under the funny kind of bookkeeping, of the Federal Government, not peculiar to this administration, but peculiar to all of them, sale of capital assets goes in as a reduction of expenditures instead of, as it should, an increase in revenues. The sale of capital assets, selling off capital in order to make a showing for the time being, I do not regard as very accurate bookkeeping or sound fiscal policy.

One final point, if I may make it. In attempting to understand where the Congress can do something so far as expenditures for this fiscal year is concerned, I refer to carryover powers to spend. How this can affect the debt may be seen by looking at the chart, table 8 on page 49 of this budget. Then take a look at the comparable chart on page 47 of the 1967 budget. There we see the new authority to spend requested by the President coupled with the carryover balances to spend previously granted by the Congress but unspent, to make the grand total of power to spend. For fiscal 1968 it would be $144 billion—NOA—plus $125.6 billion carryover or $269.6 billion of which the President says he will spend $135 billion in fiscal year 1968.

This Congress can cut in two ways. It can cut carryover balances to spend through recession bills. A cut in carryover balances will affect expenditures for both the rest of fiscal year 1967—that is until June 30, 1967, and for the full fiscal year 1968. Then the Congress can cut in the appropriation bills this year the requests for new power to spend made by the President. Both will hit at expenditure levels.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has once again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional one-half minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The gentleman is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is very wholesome for us to discuss the fiscal picture confronting the country and to try to excite interest throughout the country and take steps to do something meaningful about bringing outgo and income into balance, making reductions wherever safely they can be made in defense and in nondefense spending as this session of Congress unfolds.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks I will include at this point

data which, hopefully, will be useful in understanding some of the ramifications of the 1968 budget.

WHICH SPENDING BUDGET?

It is desirable to discuss the matter of which budget we will act upon at this session. There will be confusion on this point.

The big headlines this evening and tomorrow may say that the President's budget is $135,033,000,000. If one will thumb through today's budget, he can find that figure in several places. It is the total of the so-called administrative expenditure budget. It is the amount the President mentioned in his state of the Union message. It is the checks-to-be-issued budget. It relates only to the 12 months of fiscal year 1968, not to this calendar year session of Congress. It is important, but it is not the budget Congress will process this session.

GROSS EXPENDITURES

In reviewing the budget document, one may be shocked to find what could be called a conglomerate budget that totals $210,222,000,000. It is the gross expenditures budget for all Government administered funds. You will find it on page 413. It is an arresting total and a revealing figure, but it is not the budget Congress will process this session.

THE CASH BUDGET

At another place, one finds a spending figure of $172,403,000,000. That represents the cash budget—or more precisely, receipts from and payments to the public. It combines the administrative budget with the various trust funds such as social security. And like the administrative budget, it is essentially on a disbursements basis. The President projects the cash budget for fiscal 1968 in deficit by some $4.3 billion, in contrast to the projected administrative expenditure budget deficit of $8.1 billion for 1968. While some new social security recommendations are before us for consideration as a result of the President's message yesterday, the cash budget is not the budget Congress will process this session. Most trust fund expenditures take place automatically under permanent laws enacted in earlier years.

NATIONAL INCOME ACCOUNTS BUDGET

Another budget—one on which the message puts considerable stress—is the so-called national income accounts budget, called at times the NIA. It is not too dissimilar from the cash budget, in that it includes trust funds, but it excludes the lending operations of the Government. It shows estimated expenditures of $169,200,000,000 for fiscal 1968, and is estimated to be in deficit by $2.1 billion. It is the budget especially useful in connection with decisions designed to influence the operation of the economy. But it is not keyed to individual budget items and it is not the budget Congress will process this session.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

The congressional action budget—the spending authority budget before the Congress for consideration is the "appropriations" or "new obligational authority" budget based on authority to obligate the Government to pay out money. The requested new obligational authority for fiscal year 1968 totals $143,994,000,000. Appropriation bills are stated on this general concept. Authorization bills are stated on this concept. It is from this budget that administrative budget "expenditures" flow in due course.

The grant of authority to obligate is the significant point of legislative decision. The act of drawing the checks to pay the obligations—whether done in the same year the obligation was made or in some future year—is immaterial to the fundamental decision. Approximately 29 percent, involving about $39.3 billion, of today's administrative "expenditure" budget of $135 billion for fiscal 1968, for example, represents estimated disbursements in fiscal 1968 from carryover balances of appropriations or new obligational authority voted earlier.

CONGRESSIONAL SESSION ACTION

The appropriation or new obligational authority budget to be processed this session has to do not only with fiscal 1968 that begins July 1 next, but it also contains sizable recommendations with respect to the current fiscal year 1967. The session is the "business year" of the Congress.

Today's budget not only presents new obligational authority requests aggregating $143,994,000,000 for fiscal 1968 but an additional $14,308,000,000 for fiscal 1967—a total of $158,302,000,000 for consideration in this session on the new obligational basis. I should say that $17,453,000,000 of that total has already been authorized in earlier Congresses for what are known as permanent appropriations. They recur automatically without any further action by Congress. Interest on the debt, of some $14 billion, is the principal item. So, more precisely speaking, on the basis of today's budget, we are asked to take action at this session on some $140,849,000,000 in administrative budget spending authority.

Allowing for the few variations that result from differences in the "appropriations" and "new obligational authority" concepts, I would roughly translate the $158.3 billion NOA session total to be about $165 or $166 billion under the conventional "appropriations" method of counting, which is the way Congress keeps accounts. The gross postal service appropriations of $6 billion, plus, for example, rather than just the net postal deficit included in NOA, are counted in the "appropriations" figures. And appropriations to "liquidate prior contract obligations"—of roughly $1.8 billion in 1968—are also omitted from 1968 NOA since the contract authority was counted as NOA when first granted. Thus, the "appropriations" requests before us are about $22 billion, more or less, above the approximately $144 billion of appropriations enacted in the session last year.

These are the general dimensions of what we are asked to authorize and appropriate in the administrative budget at this session—$158.3 billion on the "new obligational authority" basis and roughly $165 or $166 billion on the "appropriations" basis.

The following may be helpful in focusing on grand totals of the administrative spending authority budget before us for action this session:

Administrative spending and new obligational authority budgets—The portions subject to action in the 90th Cong., 1st sess.

	Administrative budget estimate of expenditures (disbursements)	Administrative budget requests for new obligational authority
Relating to fiscal 1968:		
1. Totals proposed, President's budget, Jan. 24, 1967	$135,033,000,000	$143,994,000,000
2. Deduct estimate of expenditures in fiscal 1968 against obligational authority made available in prior sessions (and therefore not before the present session for action)	−39,328,000,000	----------
3. Deduct amounts applicable to permanent appropriations recurring automatically without necessity for action in this session (several items, interest on the public debt is by far the largest; expenditure figure here may negligibly duplicate some (small) part of item 2, but not enough to distort)	−17,453,000,000	−17,453,000,000
Amount relating to fiscal 1968 involved in proposals for direct consideration and action in this session	78,252,000,000	126,541,000,000
Relating to fiscal 1967:		
4. Supplementals for fiscal 1967 as shown in the President's 1968 budget, Jan. 24, 1967, for direct consideration and action in this session	6,811,000,000	14,308,000,000
Totals for this session:		
5. Totals proposed, President's budget, Jan. 24, 1967 (items 1 and 4)	141,844,000,000	158,302,000,000
6. Totals for direct consideration and action in this session (item 5, less items 2 and 3 which arise out of actions taken in prior sessions)	85,063,000,000	140,849,000,000

NOTES

Item 2, in the "expenditure" figure, would include some amounts applicable to activities subject to annual scrutiny under the Corporation Control Act, which would largely result, however, from new obligational authority granted in previous sessions.

Item 3, "expenditure" figure is a bit arbitrary, because a few relatively small items cannot be separately identified.

Source: The Budget for 1968.

BUDGETARY CONTINGENCIES AND ASSUMPTIONS

Processing all features and all sides of the annual Federal budget in Congress involves the work of many hands, of several committees of the House to one extent or another, and the minds of all Members who bring to bear many conflicting interests and philosophies. This 1968 budget is no exception. The tentatively projected administrative budget

deficit of $8.1 billion hinges on countless decisions and assumptions, many of which will be changed or will otherwise not turn out as projected.

REVENUES

On the revenue side, this budget assumes that the economic expansion of the past 6 years will continue, with some easing of inflationary pressures. The gross national product is assumed to increase by some $47 billion over last year; last year's GNP was some $58 billion higher than calendar 1965. The Joint Economic Committee will be evaluating this assumption and reporting its judgment to the House in late March.

The new 6-percent surcharge tax proposal in today's budget is valued at $4.7 billion in budget revenue for fiscal 1968. If that proposition were not in the budget, the currently projected 1968 administrative deficit would theoretically be $12.8 billion. This tax proposal is a matter for initial consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means.

There is a further proposition for accelerating corporation tax payments into the Treasury, for which $800 million additional in 1968 is accrued in the budget. This would also require legislation out of the Committee on Ways and Means; without it, the projected deficit would be $800 million deeper.

There are a number of user charge tax proposals, mainly in the transportation area, some of which are resubmissions that Congress did not see fit to adopt from earlier budgets. They do not weigh heavily in the totals but they do affect them. They would entail consideration by various legislative committees.

There is a proposal requiring new legislative action that would create a beauty-safety highway trust fund and transfer 2 percent excise tax on automobiles from the administrative budget to fund it. That involves an estimated $400 million in 1968; if that were not adopted, the projected administrative deficit would be considerably less, but not $400 million lower, because the programs would have to be continued under the general fund budget.

The propositions in some earlier budgets to put Rural Electrification Administration and the power marketing agencies operations of the Department of the Interior on revolving fund financing arrangements are again submitted and will be before the appropriate legislative committees. They have the budget effect of reducing both administrative receipts and expenditures equally—by some $279 million—and thus have no bearing on the deficit.

Legislation to shift the financing of forest and public land highways to the highway trust fund that was proposed but not adopted in earlier sessions is resubmitted in today's budget. The 1968 administrative budget reflects reduced expenditures of $43 million on account of it; failure of the proposition would present the question of adding that much to the 1968 administrative budget spending.

SPENDING

While the great bulk of the outgo side of the budget is processed through the annual appropriation bills, a fairly long list of budget items are first considered by the appropriate legislative committees. There are the annual reauthorization bills for a number of continuing programs. There are the propositions for new legislation in today's budget that must first be authorized by bills out of legislative committees before being eligible for appropriation; the number of such new proposals, dollar-wise, is quite small this year. There are still a scattering of so-called back-door bills. And there are the so-called permanent appropriations that will recur automatically under previous law as I mentioned earlier.

BUDGET CONTINGENCIES

Propositions of new legislation, that is, involving new undertakings or enlarging the dimensions of existing law or programs, are programed in the budget for fiscal 1968. The list is not long. It includes several items designed to diminish new obligational authority and expenditures chargeable to the administrative budget—and, in fact, the grand total of the list reflects a minus effect. I will include the list later in my remarks.

For example, there is an allowance of $1,000,000,000 in today's budget for civilian and military pay increases for which authorizing legislation would first be necessary. That is one item on the list.

A postal rate increase is also in the list. It will require legislation out of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—$700,000,000 is figured in the 1968 budget for this.

Some $36,730,000,000, or about 30 percent of the fiscal 1968 new obligational authority requested in the administrative budget, on which action must be taken in the session, is involved in the 8 principal annual reauthorization bills that must be brought out by various legislative committees before the related appropriations would be in order on the floor of the House. I am referring to the Coast Guard, the antipoverty program, foreign aid, the Peace Corps, defense procurement and research, military construction, the atomic energy program, and the space agency. Action on these bills has a direct bearing on the budget because they authorize the maximum amounts that can be appropriated for the year.

There are budget requests for other programs for which authorization is expiring and which will need further legislative underpinning if Congress wishes them to be continued. The food stamp program, economic development assistance, the Teachers Corps, and several others are involved.

There are some $5,000,000,000 of proposals in this budget for additional sales of certificates of participation in pools of Goverment-owned loans held by a number of agencies. These were authorized by Congress last session in the Participation Sales Act. It was the subject of some controversy. Translated into budgetary terms, which count these sales as offsets to administrative budget expenditures rather than as receipts, the $135 billion expenditure budget for 1968, and thus the $8.1 billion projected deficit, would increase by $5 billion if these additional sales are not authorized. We shall, of course, want to carefully examine these propositions.

I repeat what I said earlier that, in no instance, has a Federal budget predicted precisely what actually happened during the fiscal year for which the budget was prepared, nor could it.

The President always predicates his budget on the assumption that Congress will take the legislative actions recommended in the budget. Rarely, if ever, however, does Congress take the legislative actions in every detail which are assumed in the President's budget presentation.

It is interesting to speculate on the various combinations of events which must come to pass in order for the estimates made in the budget to become realities. I am inserting a brief tabulation illustrative of some of the possible results of varying actions on these contingencies:

Selected major contingencies surrounding the administrative budget for 1968 (a partial lis only)

	Amount
1. Administrative budget deficit as projected by President	$8, 096, 000, 000
2. If proposed 6-percent surtax is not adopted	4, 700, 000, 000
Then the projected 1968 deficit would be	−12, 796, 000, 000
3. If the proposed postage rate increase is not adopted	700, 000, 000
Then the projected 1968 deficit would be	−13, 496, 000, 000
4. If the proposal to further accelerate corporate tax payments is not enacted	800, 000, 000
Then the projected 1968 deficit would be	−14, 296, 000, 000
5. If it were not for the offsetting effect of sales of "participating certificates," shown in the budget for 1968, and treated as offsets to expenditures rather than receipts, of	5, 000, 000, 000
Then the projected 1968 deficit would be	−19, 296, 000, 000
6. On the other hand, if the proposals in the budget for pay raises were not enacted	1, 000, 000, 000
Then the projected 1968 deficit would be (this is a partial listing only. Other considerations enter)	−18, 296, 000, 000

NOTE.—Perhaps the most important single contingency that could affect the tentatively projected budget picture—and it is not tabulated above—would be if the general performance of the economy in calendar 1967 were to vary significantly from the economic assumptions underpinning the budget. And of course, large unforeseen military requirements could introduce some turbulence.

BUDGET PROJECTIONS VERSUS RESULTS

Mr. Speaker, in six of the last 12 administrative budgets, actual revenues were less than the original January projections—for a number of reasons. In six they exceeded the original figures. Largely because of the great surge of revenues in fiscal 1966, the net result of the 12 years was a net plus of $1.9 billion.

In nine of the last 12 administrative budgets, actual spending exceeded the original January estimates. Spending was less than estimated in only 3 years. But in total, original estimates were exceeded by some $28.7 billion.

As a result, instead of a 12-year deficit of $18.5 billion shown in the original budgets, there was a net deficit of $45.4 billion.

The comparison on the new obligational authority budget requests is even more arresting. In 11 of the 12 years, more NOA was finally enacted than was shown in the original January budgets. After the original budget, supplemental requests were submitted. And Congress made changes—both up and down. Over the 12-year period, the aggregate excess was some $63,200,000,000.

I am inserting a table summarizing the totals for the 12 years 1955–66:

Variations in the administrative budgets—Original projections versus final results (using the last 12 budgets, 1955–66)

[Rounded amounts used]

Net budget receipts:		
Original January budget projections	$943, 663, 000, 000	
Final results (when the years were over)	945, 551, 000, 000	
Revenues went higher by		+$1, 888, 000, 000
(NOTE.—In 6 of the 12 years, revenues were less than the original budget; in 6 they were more.)		
Net budget expenditures:		
Original January budget projections	962, 189, 000, 000	
Final results	990, 942, 000, 000	
Expenditures went higher by		+28, 753, 000, 000
(NOTE.—In 9 of the 12 years, actual spending exceeded the original budget. In 3 years, it was less.)		
So, in total, there was a deviation of		+26, 865, 000, 000
Budget surplus (+) or deficit (−):		
Original January budget projections	−18, 526, 000, 000	
Final results	−45, 391, 000, 000	
So, in total, instead of a total deficit of $18.5 billion over the 12 years as originally projected, there was a deficit of $45.4 billion—a change for the worse of		−26, 865, 000, 000
New obligational authority (the forerunner of actual expenditures):		
Original January budget proposals from the President (which he not infrequently amends and supplements from time to time)	980, 600, 000, 000	
Final amounts enacted	1, 043, 800, 000, 000	
Final amounts enacted exceeded the original budget proposals by		+63, 200, 000, 000
(NOTE.—In 11 of the 12 years, the final amount enacted exceeded the original January budget proposal for the year.)		

Source: Budget documents.

MAJOR APPROPRIATION AREAS AND TRENDS

Mr. Speaker, Federal spending creeps upward. As heretofore pointed out, the last budget was higher than the one of a year before, and so were appropriations and estimated expenditures. Growth of the population and growth of the country virtually ordain some growth in public services, that is, over the long stretch of time.

For example, there are 2,180,000 more Americans this morning than when the previous budget came last January 24. And when it came a year ago, there were some 2,308,000 more Americans than there were when the preceding budget came down from the President.

President Eisenhower recognized this phenomenon in his budget message to Congress in 1960:

> Moreover, inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of our Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years. * * * We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities.

The key factor, gross national product, measuring the economy's total production of goods and services, grew by some $58 billion last year, and today's budget projects a further growth in the current calendar year of some $47 billion—which, in conjunction with the 6 percent surtax proposal, is the basis of much of the anticipated rise of nearly $10 billion in administrative budget revenues during fiscal 1968 over fiscal 1967.

It may be helpful in considering the fiscal business of the session, to glance at the major areas of spending of recent years.

Over the last 12 to 14 years, from 70 to 85 percent of Federal budget spending went for broad functions and objects carried on at the Federal level since the early days of the country. These would be national defense; conduct of foreign affairs; the postal service; aid to veterans; interest on the debt; collecting internal revenue; and administration of justice. The current percentage for those functions is nearly 75 percent of the whole administrative budget.

National defense is, of course, the largest single functional area. In the 1968 administrative budget, the new obligational authority request of $77.9 billion is not immune to the knife, but great cuts are not practicable under present circumstances.

Interest—principally on the debt—is, of course, obligatory, and has risen greatly in recent years as the debt has gone up and as interest rates have risen sharply. It is estimated at $14.1 billion in today's budget.

Veterans service obligations are budgeted at $6.7 billion.

Postal services are reflected on a net basis in the administrative budget; that is, net of postal revenues and even with the $700 million rate increase figures in, there is a net change, estimated, of $651 million. Gross postal appropriations are budgeted at over $6.6 billion. A growing country probably means no significant reduction in this area, though greater efficiencies may help hold the line.

Public assistance grants are budgeted at $3.1 billion and are essentially mandatory under existing laws.

I cite these few illustrations merely to sketch a rough indication of the general characteristics of some big segments of the budget. There are, of course, many other essential functions, aside from the question of the precise level of funding.

In essence, prior commitments—more or less binding commitments—and world conditions ordain a great deal of the budget. As a matter of fact, over the years the greatest controversy tends to surround a relatively small percentage of the total in any given year. I am speaking generally.

RECENT BUDGET TRENDS

Notwithstanding recent growing defense expenditures and enlarging nondefense outlays, a rising tide of revenues from the unprecedented general national economic boom of recent years enabled the Government to make big strides toward balancing income and outgo. In each of the last 3 fiscal years the administrative expenditure budget deficit has been reduced from the prior year:

	Millions
Deficit, 1964	$8, 226
Deficit, 1965	3, 435
Deficit, 1966	2, 251

The administrative budget of last January, for the current fiscal year 1967, projected a further reduction in the deficit, to $1.8 billion. A sharp upswing—now estimated to be $6 billion—in revenues for 1967 above the projections in the original budget, was more than offset by military operations in southeast Asia and certain other outlays. The original estimate of administrative spending is now increased by some $13.9 billion, thus reversing the trend to a budget balance.

Today's budget could be in the black for both 1967 and 1968 were it not for war costs. Some $19.4 billions of expenditure for 1967 and $21.9 billions for 1968 are identified as special support of Vietnam operations.

The revised 1967 administrative budget spending also reflects an outlay for interest on the debt $600 million higher than originally foreseen in last January's budget. Veterans expenditures are $700 million higher. There are a number of other revisions—as there usually are—in the spending items that make up the $13.9 billion overall upward adjustment.

NEW PROPOSITIONS OF LEGISLATION WITH NOA AND EXPENDITURE AMOUNTS IN BUDGET OF 1968

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, some portions of the new budget relate to legislative propositions for new undertakings or expansion or revision of existing laws. They must first be taken up in bills from the legislative committees before any related appropriations can be considered. A striking feature of this year's budget is the much smaller number of such propositions, in contrast to some recent budgets. It is worth noting that there are a handful in the current list designed to diminish rather than increase administrative budget totals. Thus, failure to enact them would result in elevating the totals.

For general information, I am inserting a tabulation prepared by the Budget Bureau:

1968 budget—Proposed legislation for separate transmittal

[In thousands of dollars]

	1967 new obligational authority	1967 expenditures	1968 new obligational authority	1968 expenditures
Funds appropriated to the President, expansion of defense production: To cancel interest on Treasury borrowings				−52,563
Agriculture:				
To place certain plant and animal disease and pest control activities on a self-supporting basis			−1,536	−1,536
To finance certain marketing services on a fee basis and for repeal of certain acts			−11,526	−10,800
To permit REA loan receipts to be used to reduce new obligational authority and expenditures		−193,500	−399,200	−201,000
Total, agriculture		−193,500	−412,262	−213,336
Defense, military:				
Liberalize quarters and dislocation allowances for personnel without dependents			24,000	23,000
Provide Federal employee status for civilian technicians of the Army and Air National Guard			18,000	17,000
Total, defense, military			42,000	40,000
Health, Education, and Welfare:				
Sale of participation certificates for NDEA student loans			2,000	−100,000
Vocational education innovation grants			30,000	12,000
Expand partnership for health			25,000	20,000
Extend social security benefits			24,000	24,000
Improvements in cash assistance (medicaid)			60,000	58,000
Revisions in medical assistance (medicaid)			−35,000	−35,000
Child health			38,000	33,000
Extend Federal support for educational television			20,000	12,000
Comprehensive educational planning grants			15,000	10,000
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare			179,000	34,000
Interior:				
Capital improvements in the trust territory			12,500	5,400
To permit receipts from sale of power to be used for Bonneville, Southeastern, and Southwestern Power Administrations	−48,431	−73,631	−52,798	−77,998
Provide for financial participation in a large non-Federal electric power generating and desalting plant in Los Angeles			8,000	3,500
Further improvements of programs for Indian people			30,000	15,000
Total, Interior	−48,431	−73,631	−2,298	−54,098
Justice: State grants to plan and improve systems of criminal justice			31,000	20,000
Labor: User charges for the maritime industry			−3,320	−3,320
Post Office: Increase in postal rates			−700,000	−700,000
Transportation:				
Transfer various activities to trust funds:				
To highway trust fund:				
Forest highways			−33,000	−33,000
Public lands highways			−16,000	−10,000
To beauty-safety trust fund:				
Highway beautification			−1,750	−72,066
Traffic and highway safety			−32,555	−23,000
State and community highway safety			−100,000	−100,000
Total, transportation			−183,305	−238,066
Treasury: Fund mint operations through a revolving fund		−26,000	−16,100	−22,013
Veterans' Administration:				
Compensation, pension, education, and medical benefits for Vietnam veterans			86,000	86,000
Refinement of legislation on various benefits (arrested TB, burial benefits, railroad retirement as base for pension)			−89,000	−89,000
Total, Veterans' Administration			−3,000	−3,000
District of Columbia:				
To fix payment authorization at 25 percent of local general fund revenues			10,600	10,600
To base loan authorization on the ability of the District to repay from available revenues			34,200	
Total, District of Columbia			44,800	10,600
Allowance for civilian and military pay increases			1,000,000	1,000,000
Grand total	−48,431	−293,131	−23,485	−181,796

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE COMPARISONS

Mr. Speaker, it may be useful to our consideration of the new budget requests to see something of the trend of new obligating authority granted over a period of time. I am inserting a table on that point, dividing the total between national defense, and nondefense functions.

I am also including a table showing the broad division of administrative budget expenditures as between national defense and nondefense over a period back to the Korean war.

In addition to the basic amounts, the expenditure table shows that the new budget total would continue to preempt about the same percent of the gross national product as have budgets of the last 12 to 15 years. And it further shows that national defense spending still takes less than 10 percent of the GNP.

Administrative budget new obligational authority—Defense and nondefense for fiscal years 1953–68

[Rounded amounts used]

Fiscal year	National defense functions	Other than national defense	Total new obligational authority
1953 enacted (Korean war year)	$57,298,000,000	$23,010,000,000	$80,308,000,000
1954 enacted (1st post-Korean year)	39,471,000,000	23,294,000,000	62,765,000,000
1955 enacted	33,656,000,000	23,420,000,000	57,076,000,000
1956 enacted	35,903,000,000	27,295,000,000	63,198,000,000
1957 enacted	40,365,000,000	29,814,000,000	70,179,000,000
1958 enacted	40,512,000,000	35,833,000,000	76,345,000,000
1959 enacted	45,586,000,000	35,779,000,000	81,365,000,000
1960 enacted	44,832,000,000	34,742,000,000	79,574,000,000
1961 enacted	45,994,000,000	40,681,000,000	86,675,000,000
Increase in level, 1961 over 1954	+6,523,000,000	+17,387,000,000	+23,910,000,000
1962 enacted	52,414,000,000	40,448,000,000	92,862,000,000
1963 enacted	54,323,000,000	47,960,000,000	102,283,000,000
1964 enacted	53,762,000,000	47,341,000,000	101,103,000,000
1965 enacted	53,198,000,000	53,410,000,000	106,608,000,000
1966 enacted	67,364,000,000	59,075,000,000	126,439,000,000
1967: Enacted in the last session	62,224,000,000	63,029,000,000	125,253,000,000
Proposed supplementals in current session	12,884,000,000	1,425,000,000	14,309,000,000
Total proposed, 1967	75,108,000,000	64,454,000,000	139,562,000,000
1968 total now proposed (as shown in 1968 budget)	[1] 77,851,000,000	[2] 66,143,000,000	143,994,000,000
Comparisons: [3]			
1968 total proposed compared to 1961 enacted	+31,857,000,000	+25,462,000,000	+57,319,000,000
1968 total proposed compared to 1966 enacted	+10,487,000,000	+7,068,000,000	+17,555,000,000
1968 total proposed compared to 1967 enacted last session	+15,627,000,000	+3,114,000,000	+18,741,000,000
1968 total proposed compared to 1967 total proposed	+2,743,000,000	+1,689,000,000	+4,432,000,000

[1] This is understated by some unspecified portion of the $1,000,000,000 lump-sum allowance for proposed legislation for pay raises of both military and civilian personnel in fiscal 1968.

[2] This is overstated by some unspecified portion of the $1,000,000,000 lump-sum allowance for proposed legislation for pay raises of both military and civilian personnel in fiscal 1968.

[3] See footnotes 1 and 2.

NOTE.—Data in this table corresponds to the classification used in the 1968 budget. "National defense functions" include Department of Defense military functions, including foreign military assistance; Atomic Energy Commission; stockpiling of strategic and critical materials; Selective Service System; expansion of defense production; and civil defense and emergency preparedness activities.

Source: Budget documents.

Administrative budget Defense and non-Defense expenditures for the fiscal years 1953–68

[Dollars in millions]

Fiscal year	National defense functions			Other than national defense			Total budget expenditures	
	Amount	Percent of budget totals	Percent of GNP	Amount	Percent of budget totals	Percent of GNP	Total	Percent of GNP
1953 actual (Korean war year)	$50,442	68.1	14.1	$23,678	31.9	6.6	$74,120	20.7
1954 actual (1st post-Korean war year)	46,986	69.6	13.0	20,551	30.4	5.7	67,537	18.7
1955 actual	40,695	63.2	10.7	23,694	36.8	6.3	64,389	17.0
1956 actual	40,723	61.5	10.0	25,501	38.5	6.2	66,224	16.2
1957 actual	43,368	62.9	10.1	25,598	37.1	5.9	68,966	16.0
1958 actual	44,234	62.0	10.0	27,135	38.0	6.2	71,369	16.2
1959 actual	46,483	57.9	9.9	33,859	42.1	7.2	80,342	17.1
1960 actual	45,691	59.7	9.3	30,848	40.3	6.2	76,539	15.5
1961 actual	47,494	58.3	9.4	34,021	41.7	6.7	81,515	16.1
Increase in level, 1961 over 1954	+508	+1.1		+13,470	+65.5		+13,978	
1962 actual	51,103	58.2	9.4	36,684	41.8	6.8	87,787	16.2
1963 actual	52,755	56.9	9.2	39,887	43.1	7.0	92,642	16.2
1964 actual	54,181	55.5	8.9	43,503	44.5	7.1	97,684	16.0
1965 actual	50,163	52.0	7.8	46,344	48.0	7.1	96,507	14.9
1966 actual	57,718	54.0	8.1	49,260	46.0	6.9	106,978	15.0
1967 (current estimate in 1968 budget)	70,222	55.4	9.2	56,507	44.6	7.4	[1] 126,729	16.6
1968 (as shown in 1968 budget)	[2] 75,487	55.9		[3] 59,546	44.1		135,033	
Comparisons: [4]								
Increase in level, 1968 estimate over 1961	+27,993	+58.9		+25,525	+75.0		+53,518	
Increase in level, 1968 estimate over 1966	+17,769	+30.8		+10,286	+20.9		+28,055	
Increase in level, 1968 estimate over 1967 current estimate	+5,265	+7.5		+3,039	+5.4		+8,304	

[1] Includes $6,811,000,000 applicable to fiscal 1967 supplementals estimated to be submitted for action in the current session.

[2] This is understated by some unspecified portion of the $1,000,000,000 lump-sum allowance for proposed legislation for pay raises of both military and civilian personnel in fiscal 1968.

[3] This is overstated by some unspecified portion of the $1,000,000,000 lump-sum allowance for proposed legislation for pay raises of both military and civilian personnel in fiscal 1968.

[4] See footnotes 2 and 3.

NOTE.—Data in this table corresponds to the classification used in the 1968 budget. "National defense functions" include Department of Defense military functions, including foreign military assistance; Atomic Energy Commission; stockpiling of strategic and critical materials; Selective Service System; expansion of defense production; and civil defense and emergency preparedness activities.

Source: Budget documents.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. Speaker, no résumé of our fiscal situation could be complete without some statistics on the national debt.

On December 31, it was $329,813,892,966.68, but it is estimated to decline to about $327.3 billion at June 30, 1967, which, however, is considerably above the figure of a year earlier, $320.4 billion on June 30, 1966.

If every projection on every side of today's budget materialized exactly, the debt at June 30, 1968—the end of the budget year of 1968—would rise to $335.4 billion. The economic burden of the debt, as measured in relation to the size of the growing economy, continues to decline, according to the budget figures.

The debt ceiling problem will, of course, be early on the schedule of fiscal business in this session.

I include an excerpt from the December Treasury statement:

Summary of direct and guaranteed debt on significant dates

[Based upon statement of the public debt published monthly; consequently all figures are stated as of the end of a month]

Date	Classification	Total debt (including interest-bearing debt, matured debt on which interest has ceased, and debt bearing no interest)				General fund balance [2]
		Direct debt (gross)	Guaranteed debt [1 2]	Total direct and guaranteed debt	Per capita [3]	
	WORLD WAR I					
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt	$1, 282, 044, 346. 28		$1, 282, 044, 346. 28	$12. 36	$74, 216, 460. 05
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt	26, 596, 701, 648. 01		26, 596, 701, 648. 01	250. 18	1, 118, 109, 534. 76
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt	16, 026, 087, 087. 07		16, 026, 087, 087. 07	129. 66	306, 803, 319. 55
	WORLD WAR II					
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program	42, 967, 531, 037. 68	$5, 529, 070, 655. 28	48, 496, 601, 692. 96	367. 08	1, 890, 743, 141. 34
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt	55, 039, 819, 926. 98	6, 324, 048, 005. 28	61, 363, 867, 932. 26	458. 47	2, 319, 496, 021. 87
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt	279, 213, 558, 897. 10	550, 810, 451. 19	279, 764, 369, 348. 29	1, 989. 75	25, 960, 900, 919. 30
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased	269, 422, 099, 173. 26	476, 384, 859. 30	269, 898, 484, 032. 56	1, 908. 79	14, 237, 883, 295. 31
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt [4]	251, 530, 468, 254. 82	22, 851, 485. 16	251, 553, 319, 739. 98	1, 690. 29	3, 995, 156, 916. 79
	SINCE KOREA					
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950)	257, 357, 352, 351. 04	19, 503, 033. 97	257, 376, 855, 385. 01	1, 696. 74	5, 517, 087, 691. 65
Dec. 31, 1952		267, 391, 155, 979. 65	53, 969, 565. 31	267, 445, 125, 544. 96	1, 687. 90	6, 064, 343, 775. 84
Nov. 30, 1966	Highest debt [5]	329, 411, 297, 586. 82	494, 535, 950. 00	329, 905, 833, 536. 82	[6] 1, 667. 91	4, 798, 603, 142. 83
Dec. 31, 1965	Debt a year ago	320, 904, 110, 042. 04	455, 241, 200. 00	321, 359, 351, 242. 04	[7] 1, 641. 00	6, 582, 097, 195. 90
Nov. 30, 1966	Debt last month	329, 411, 297, 586. 82	494, 535, 950. 00	329, 905, 833, 536. 82	[6] 1, 667. 91	4, 798, 603, 142. 83
Dec. 31, 1966	Debt this month	329, 319, 249, 366. 68	494, 643, 600. 00	329, 813, 892, 966. 68	[6] 1, 666. 01	6, 011, 249, 121. 82

[1] Does not include securities owned by the Treasury.

[2] Includes outstanding matured principal of guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies for which cash to make payments is held by the Treasury of the United States in the general fund balance.

[3] Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.

[4] Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$251, 245, 889, 059. 02
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies	23, 876, 001. 12
Total direct and guaranteed debt	251, 269, 765, 060. 14

[5] Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was on Dec. 19, 1966, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$329, 655, 180, 927. 18
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies	494, 736, 000. 00
Total direct and guaranteed debt (includes $266,205,234.53 not subject to statutory limitation)	330, 149, 916, 927. 18

[6] Subject to revision.

[7] Revised.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, may I just close by saying that the Committee on Appropriations is scheduled to discuss the overall features of the budget with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget on February 7.

We welcome any and all constructive suggestions about the important business at hand. As I said initially, it seems to me that it is the duty of Congress to look with a skeptical eye on any budget and go through it with a fine-tooth comb. When we are in an inflationary period and the budget is in the red, it is especially imperative that we take a critical look at all phases of the budget and make such reductions as we safely can.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, for the past 7 months several hundred executive branch employees have been busily engaged in preparation of the President's budget for fiscal 1968. We received it just 24 hours ago. In that limited time, it has not been possible to give the budget the detailed analysis that is demanded by the present Federal fiscal situation and by existing economic conditions. We have, however, rather hurriedly perused the budget and have some comments to make with respect to some of its provisions. We shall devote a great deal of time and attention to it in the weeks ahead and we certainly shall share our further analysis of the budget with Members of the House.

Continuing, Mr. Speaker, with what our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has said about the proposed budget for fiscal 1968, I would certainly want to add that:

First. It is not the austere budget which our war commitments demand.

Second. It does not establish a system of priorities for those programs we can afford and those we cannot afford in a wartime economy.

Third. It does not even stretch out or hold the line on nondefense spending, much less propose substantial cutbacks in programs that could be delayed until the war is won.

What then is the proposed budget for fiscal 1968? As I see it, the budget is an enigma proposing, on the one hand, something for almost everybody, and on the other hand, moving to gobble up our economic resources and dull the will of private enterprise to invest and expand and create the jobs that are needed to maintain stable economic progress and full employment.

In short, it embodies a modern-day version of the Greek fable about the man who killed the goose to acquire its stock of golden eggs. It seems to me, that if the Federal Government continues to grasp at more than its due, it may sorely impair the taxpaying capacity of individuals and corporations and thereby destroy its supply of golden eggs.

As was the case in last year's budget, this one contains fiscal gimmicks and proposals which the 89th Congress did not approve and which this Congress probably will let fall by the wayside.

In so far as I am concerned, Congress owes it to the American people to give this budget a most detailed and critical examination for the purpose of determining where it can be cut and how we can get the Federal Establishment back on the road to thrift, prudence and fiscal responsibility.

I have never seen a budget that could not be cut and this one certainly is no exception.

THE CONFUSION AND EFFECT OF THREE BUDGETS

The executive branch utilizes three budgets to portray Federal fiscal affairs. For a good many years they used only two—the administrative budget and the cash budget—but, in recent years, they have added the national income accounts budget. This year the emphasis is on the latter budget because by adding trust fund revenues in the cash budget to those of the administrative budget and then eliminating Federal loans and receipts from the sales of Federal loans and loan participation certificates, the resulting anticipated deficit is ever so much smaller than it will be in either the administrative or the cash budget.

Let me give you a brief explanation of these three budgets and what each estimates our fiscal situation to be in fiscal 1968:

The administrative budget covers the receipts and expenditures of funds owned by the Federal Government. In this budget, the President proposes spending $135 billion in fiscal 1968—up from the current estimate of $126.7 billion for fiscal 1967—against which he expects budget revenues to approximate $126.9 billion—up from $117 billion currently estimated for this year—which will result in a budget deficit of $8.1 billion—down from $9.7 billion currently estimated for this year.

Just a year ago at this time, the administration estimated fiscal 1967 expenditures at $112.8 billion, revenues at $111 billion, and the deficit at $1.8 billion. Thus, we can all see that revenues

are estimated to be $6 billion higher than the estimate of last January. That increase is occasioned principally by inflation and growth in the economy. Expenditures for 1967 are now estimated at $126.7 billion, or $13.9 billion higher than the original estimate of a year ago. Of this increase, $9.6 billion is for military activities—principally in southeast Asia—and $4.3 billion is for nondefense activities.

While we all recognize that defense expenditures necessarily rise with escalation of the war effort in Vietnam, it is obvious that defense and nondefense spending for 1967 were grossly underestimated in the original budget of last January. If this comparison of currently estimated spending in 1967 with the original budget for that year is any indication of the administration's ability to accurately forecast expenditures, then I am afraid that the spending proposed for 1968 may also be grossly—yes, even capriciously—underestimated.

What is even more alarming is the fact that a comparison of proposed spending in fiscal 1968—$135 billion—with the original estimate for 1967—$112.8 billion—reveals an increase—an incredible increase—of $22.2 billion, or 20 percent.

The cash budget covers all receipts and payments to the public, including transactions in the various trust funds—social security, highway, and so forth.

In the cash budget, the President expects to spend $172.4 billion—up from $160.9 billion currently estimated for 1967—against which he foresees receipts from the public of $168.1 billion—up from $154.7 billion for 1967, which will result in a deficit of $4.3 billion.

The national income accounts budget includes actual cash receipts and expenditures and the accruals of receipts and obligations but it eliminates Federal loans and receipts from the sale of loans.

In this budget, the President estimates expenditures at $169.2 billion—up from $153.6 billion currently estimated for 1967—against which he anticipates receipts of $167.1 billion—up from $149.8 billion in 1967—and a deficit in these accounts of $2.1 billion.

Last year, the administration followed the usual practice of emphasizing the traditional administrative budget since it forecast a modest deficit of $1.8 billion for fiscal 1967. This year, since the deficits in the administrative and cash budgets are estimated to be $8.1 billion and $4.3 billion, respectively, in fiscal 1968, the administration has placed its emphasis upon the national income accounts budget where the deficit is expected to be only $2.1 billion.

In his budget message the President said:

> I am emphasizing the national income accounts as a measure of Federal fiscal activity because the traditional administrative budget is becoming an increasingly less complete and less reliable measure of the Government's activities and their economic impact.

What the President said may very well be true with respect to the sophisticated measuring devices that have been developed under the "new economics," but we here in Congress are concerned with actual cash receipts and expenditures. They, too, are the only measure generally understood by the public, and they certainly should be what is emphasized in this or any other Government budget. The President also said:

> To permit a higher 1968 budget deficit than the $2.1 billion involved in my fiscal recommendations would, I believe, be unacceptable. We would run substantial risks of:
>
> Choking off the much-desired move toward lower interest rates by placing too much of our stabilization effort on the shoulders of monetary policy, and renewing inflationary pressures, particularly in the latter half of this year.

Well, I wonder at this moment, and I am sure others do, too, what effect the $8.1 billion administrative budget deficit and the $4.3 billion cash budget deficit will have on interest rates and on inflationary pressures. It seems to me that deficit financing of Federal activities in periods of relatively high economic activity is of itself inflationary in nature and tends to force prices and interest rates upward. So, the very conditions—higher interest rates and more inflation—which the President hopes to avert may be further generated if Congress blindly follows his fiscal recommendations.

ANTICIPATED BUDGET RECEIPTS

Let us look for a moment at the principal sources which are expected to produce the $9.9 billion increase in administrative budget revenues, from the $117 billion currently estimated for this year to the $126.9 billion anticipated in fiscal 1968.

The President's major tax proposals include a 6-percent surcharge on the income tax liabilities of individuals and corporations, to be in effect for 2 years from next July 1. This surcharge is expected to produce additional tax collections in fiscal 1968 of $3.4 billion from individuals and $1.3 billion from corporations. A further acceleration of corporation income tax payments is estimated to produce $800 million in fiscal 1968.

The $5.5 billion of revenue expected from these sources in 1968 will be offset by $500 million which represents a net reduction from a variety of revenue and expenditure proposals involving excise taxes, user charges, and the establishment of revolving funds for the Rural Electrification Administration and Department of the Interior power marketing agencies. After eliminating this resulting $5 billion from the $9.9 billion increase in revenues in 1968 over 1967, there remains $4.9 billion which must come either from inflation or from growth in the economy. But that is not all the increased revenue that must come from those sources. To the $4.9 billion increase must be added the $5 billion collected in 1967 from one-shot revenue sources which will not be available in fiscal 1968 and later years. It follows then that the economy must grow sufficiently to produce $10 billion more Federal revenues in 1968 that it is expected to produce in 1967.

In light of the present downward trend in the private sector of the economy, coupled with the depressing effect of the President's tax proposals and the potential cost-push effect of this year's wage and fringe benefit settlements, I think this estimate in revenue growth is very optimistic.

If Congress does not elect to approve all of the President's revenue producing proposals and if the economy should fail to grow as fast as is projected, Federal revenues would fall short of their estimated goals and the budget deficit would increase. Congress has refused to approve some of these proposals in prior years and it may refuse again this year. Moreover, if the present economic downturn is not reversed, and who can say with certainty that it will be, revenues could fall a good many billions short of the estimates.

PROPOSED SPENDING

With respect to planned spending in fiscal 1968, the budget fails to reveal that any major effort has been made by the administration to cut back or even halt the rise of nondefense spending. The table that follows reflects the administrative budget increases and decreases in estimated spending in 1967 and 1968 over actual expenditures in fiscal 1966, which ended just 7 months ago:

[In billions of dollars]

	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1967 versus 1966	1968 estimate	1968 versus 1966	1968 versus 1967
National defense	57.7	70.2	+12.5	75.5	+17.8	+5.3
Excluding Vietnam	(51.9)	(50.8)	(−1.1)	(53.6)	(+1.7)	(+2.8)
International affairs	4.2	4.6	+.4	4.8	+.6	+.2
Excluding Vietnam	(3.9)	(4.1)	(+.2)	(4.3)	(+.4)	(+.2)
Space research	5.9	5.6	−.3	5.3	−.6	−.3
Agriculture	3.3	3.0	−.3	3.2	−.1	+.2
Natural resources	3.1	3.2	+.1	3.5	+.4	+.3
Commerce and transportation	3.0	3.5	+.5	3.1	+.1	−.4
Housing and community development	.3	.9	+.6	1.0	+.7	+.1
Health, labor, and welfare	7.6	10.4	+2.8	11.3	+3.7	+.9
Education	2.8	3.3	+.5	2.8		−.5
Veterans	5.0	6.4	+1.4	6.1	+1.1	−.3
Interest	12.1	13.5	+1.4	14.2	+2.1	+.7
General government	2.5	2.7	+.2	2.8	+.3	+.1
Pay increases				1.0	+1.0	+1.0
Shortfall in asset sales				.8	+.8	+.8
Contingencies		.1	+.1	.4	+.4	+.3
Total	107.6	127.5	+19.9	135.7	+28.1	+8.2
Less interfund transactions	.6	.8	.2	.7	.1	+.1
Total	107.0	126.7	+19.7	135.0	+28.0	+8.3

In the nondefense area, the table indicates that it is only in space research and technology and in agriculture and agricultural resources that reductions in

spending below 1966 are planned for 1967 and 1968. All other items reflect increases, some of which are very substantial. In comparing the estimates for 1968 with those for 1967, there are anticipated reductions only in space research and technology, $300 million; commerce and transportation, $400 million; education, $500 million; and veterans benefits and services, $300 million.

These proposed reductions totaling $1.5 billion hardly represent very much effort on the part of the administration to curtail nondefense spending and even that modest goal may not be reached.

Furthermore, the budget contains a number of tenuous assumptions which materially affect budget expenditures. The accomplishment of these assumptions is contingent upon the administration's success in implementing them and upon Congress' willingness to enact authorizing legislation.

Some proposed expenditure and new obligational authority reductions in this budget are similar to proposed reductions in earlier budgets. Those reductions cannot be effected in the absence of authorizing legislation—legislation which Congress has not seen fit to enact heretofore and may not enact this year. The major proposals in this area follow:

Establishment of revolving funds	Proposed reductions in—		
	New spending authority	Expenditures	
		1967	1968
Rural Electrification Administration	$399, 200, 000	$193, 500, 000	$201, 000, 000
Bonneville Power Administration	89, 219, 000	42, 831, 000	46, 388, 000
Southeastern Power Administration	2, 000, 000	26, 200, 000	26, 200, 000
Southwestern Power Administration	10, 010, 000	4, 600, 000	5, 410, 000
Total	500, 429, 000	267, 131, 000	278, 998, 000

The administration has also proposed the imposition of user fees for services performed by Agriculture's Consumer and Marketing Service and the establishment of a revolving fund in connection with these user charges. This proposal is expected to reduce 1968 new obligational authority by $11,526,000 and expenditures by $10,800,000. Congress refused last year to authorize user charges to finance meat and poultry inspection.

Other user charges, which would reduce 1968 expenditures by $3,320,000, are proposed for operation of the maritime safety program and for administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation program.

A $700 million postal rate increase is proposed as a means of reducing the budget expenditures stemming from the deficit operations of the Post Office Department.

Legislation is proposed to transfer the costs of our forest and public lands highways to the highway trust fund. This proposal would reduce 1968 budget expenditures by $43 million.

It is also proposed to establish a "beauty-safety" trust fund which would finance the highway beautification and safety programs. If enacted, this proposal would reduce 1968 budget expenditures by $195,066,000.

Establishment of a revolving fund to finance operations of the Bureau of the Mint is proposed. This proposal would be expected to reduce budget expenditures by $26 million in 1967 and $22,013,000 in 1968.

A proposal is made to cancel the interest payments made by the Defense Production Administration to the Treasury for funds borrowed from the Treasury to finance Government purchase of strategic materials for our stockpiles. This proposal would reduce administrative budget expenditures by $52,563,000 but, at the same time, miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury would be reduced by a like amount.

The administration also proposes to sell in 1968, notes and mortgages held by it as a result of its lending operations. Outright sales are expected to total $275 million. Sales of certificates of participation are expected to total $5,750 million, but a shortfall in these sales of $750 million has been provided for in the event the administration is not able to market the total amount proposed. In no recent year has the administration been able to market all of its loan paper proposed for sale. At the moment, nothing has happened which would lead anyone to believe that its sales goal will be reached in 1968. Moreover, the present tight money market dims the prospect that they can reach the 1967 sales goal set at $3,922 million. In 1965 the administration was able to market only $2.961 million in loan paper.

To the extent that Congress refuses to enact any of the foregoing proposals, and no one can say with certainty that it will not reject some of them, and to the extent that the administration cannot fulfill what it proposes to do on its own, administrative budget expenditures and the deficit will increase.

WHERE HAVE THE SPENDING INCREASES OCCURRED?

In this and the 1967 budget, the administration has alluded to our necessary war spending as the principal culprit causing the ever-increasing size of the administrative budget's expenditure estimates and requests for new spending authority. That reference, and the emphasis placed upon it by the administration and the press, is unfair to the public because the percent of growth in nondefense activities has exceeded the percent of growth in defense—and very substantially so in the 8 years since fiscal 1960, which was the last year of the Eisenhower administration and the last year in which the budget was balanced.

The table that follows reflects a comparison of expenditures for 1968 with those of 1960 and those of 1968 with 1963, the last Kennedy year, and 1963 with 1960. An examination of the table reveals that while defense spending increased 65.2 percent in the years from 1960 to 1968, nondefense spending—exclusive of interest—increased by 97.2 percent. And there was a 76.4-percent increase in spending overall. In the years from 1963 to 1968, defense spending increased 43.1 percent, and nondefense spending rose by 44.4 percent. From 1960 to 1963, the last Kennedy year, defense spending rose by only 15.5 percent, but nondefense spending went up by 36.5 percent.

Expenditures

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	1960	1963	1968	Comparison, 1968 with 1960		Comparison, 1968 with 1963		Comparison, 1963 with 1960	
				Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
National defense	$45, 691	$52, 755	$75, 487	+$29, 796	+65. 2	+$22, 732	+43. 1	+$7, 064	+15. 5
Interest	9, 266	9, 980	14, 152	+4, 886	+52. 7	+4, 172	+41. 8	+714	+7. 5
Nondefense	22, 277	30, 419	43, 925	+21, 648	+97. 2	+13, 506	+44. 4	+8, 142	+36. 7
Civilian and military pay increase			1, 000	+1, 000		+1, 000			
Possible shortfall in asset sales			750	+750		+750			
Allowance for contingencies			400	+400		+400			
Interfund transactions	−694	−513	−682	+12		−169		+181	
Total, administrative budget	76, 539	92, 642	135, 033	+58. 494	−76. 4	+42, 391	+45. 8	+16, 103	+21. 0

NOTE.—Details do not add because of rounding.

With respect to new obligational authority—spending authority—the table that follows reflects that the growth in defense spending authority from 1960 to 1968 is 73.7 percent but the growth in nondefense spending authority—exclusive of interest—is 97 percent. Comparing 1968 with 1963 reveals the growth in defense to be 43.3 percent and growth in nondefense to be a relatively modest 32.1 percent. From 1960 to 1963 the defense spending authority rose only 21.2 percent while nondefense went up 49.1 percent.

New obligational authority

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	1960	1963	1968	Comparison, 1968 with 1960		Comparison, 1968 with 1963		Comparison, 1963 with 1960	
				Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
National defense	$44,832	$54,323	$77,851	+$33,019	+73.7	+$23,528	+43.3	+$9,491	+21.2
Interest	9,266	9,980	14,153	+4,887	+52.7	+4,173	+41.8	+714	+7.7
Nondefense	25,476	37,981	50,191	+24,715	+97.0	+12,210	+32.1	+12,505	+49.1
Civilian and military pay increases			1,000	+1,000		+1,000			
Contingencies			800	+800		+800			
Total, administrative budget	79,574	102,283	143,994	+64,420	+81.0	+41,711	+40.8	+22,709	+28.5

NOTE.—Details do not add because of rounding.

CREDIBILITY AND THE BUDGET PROCESS

At a press conference last November 29, the President announced that he had approved recommendations of his Cabinet and agency heads for a fiscal 1967 budgetary cutback of $5.3 billion in Federal programs. With that program cutback, the President said his administration planned to achieve a $3 billion reduction in Federal spending during the remaining 7 months of this fiscal year.

I did then and I do now commend the President for this effort to cut back on those domestic programs which can be delayed. I was especially gratified by the President's announcement because what his administration is attempting to do in reducing domestic spending follows the goal of the Bow expenditure limitation amendment, which was rejected five times last year by an overwhelming majority of the President's own party here in the House.

Among those savings listed in the administration's "Summary of 1967 Budget Cuts" was one item of $898 million identified as "increased congressional authorizations for which we do not plan to request appropriations." This item was expected to cut 1967 expenditures by $579 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the President obviously was misled with respect to the effect of this item on 1967 expenditures. As a matter of fact, his advisers crossed the borders of absurdity when they indicated to the President that this item would reduce 1967 expenditures by almost $600 million. The administration never had the $898 million—no, not even the $579 million because Congress provided no such appropriations. So, I ask you in all candor and sincerity, how in Heaven's name can the administration save what they never were given?

The only way in which the administration could reduce 1967 expenditures for this item would be for Congress to appropriate the funds and then the administration impound them.

Mr. Speaker, the context in which this $600 million "expenditure reduction" was detailed by the Budget Bureau leads me to believe that it was intended to deceive. And, I for one, feel the President's advisers do him, the Congress, and the public a distinct disservice when they resort to such practices. It is just such items as this one, the reported savings in defense costs because the Defense Department did not do something it might have done, the gimmick proposals in the 1967 and 1968 budgets, and the administration's failure to request adequate funding of our war effort in the regular defense appropriation bills that have nurtured questions of credibility with respect to its fiscal and budgetary procedures.

A RECESSION WITH INFLATION?

Throughout all of calendar 1966 the economy was plagued with the pressures of demand-pull inflation. Federal dollars being expended for the war and for domestic purposes were chasing goods and services around the marketplace in vigorous competition with private spending. When it finally dawned on the administration that this competition was overheating the economy and inflating prices, did the administration take any steps to materially curtail nondefense spending to ease the situation? No, not at all. Instead, the administration proposed and the Congress approved suspension of the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation for new buildings as a means of cooling the economy.

For some time past, there have been developing indications of a slowdown in the economy generally and in the job-creating investments in plant and equipment. The housing industry has suffered a genuinely serious setback in construction and sales because of our tight money market; the trend in production and sales is downward for the automobile, appliance and steel industries, and downward for retail sales generally. In the light of these indications of an economic slowdown, the adoption by Congress of the President's 6-percent surcharge on individual and corporate income tax liabilities may trigger a recession of substantial magnitude.

Wage contract negotiations that are in the offing for over 2 million workers in 8 major industries, as well as for workers in other segments of the economy, certainly can be expected to result in wage increases averaging 5 percent or more. Inevitably, these wage increases will exert cost-push pressures on prices all along the line and we may find ourselves in a serious recessionary period with prices climbing as rapidly as they did in 1966.

Such a situation will only serve to hurt those persons—the disadvantaged, the retired, and the employed on relatively fixed incomes—whom the administration seeks to help through the ill-conceived Federal largess that is embodied in a number of its domestic programs.

WILL CONGRESS REDEEM ITS PLEDGE TO THE PUBLIC?

Mr. Speaker, do you suppose that this might be the year in which Congress will redeem its 1964 pledge to the American people? All of us who were here then well remember section 1 of the Revenue Act of 1964 but let me cite its provisions for the benefit of those who have come to the House since that time:

SECTION 1. DECLARATION BY CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the tax reduction provided by this Act through stimulation of the economy will after a brief transitional period, raise (rather than lower) revenues and that such revenue increases should first be used to eliminate the deficits in the administrative budgets and then to reduce the public debt. To further the objective of obtaining balanced budgets in the near future, Congress by this action, recognizes the importance of taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending and urges the President to declare his accord with this objective.

This provision was written into the act by the House, it was stricken by the Senate, and it was restored by the House-Senate conference because the declaration in section 1 was a most important consideration in the House's approval of the act.

On February 24 when the House adopted the conference report on the Revenue Act of 1964, our distinguished and able chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], had the following comments to make with respect to the act:

In enacting this revenue bill, as I emphasized last September, we are choosing tax reduction as the road toward a larger, more prosperous economy and we are rejecting the road of expenditure increases. We do not intend to try to go along both roads at the same time. If we fail to limit the growth of Federal expenditures, we will be leaving the tax reduction road. Even a 1-year detour may make it extremely difficult to get back on it.

A major and impressive beginning has been made in bringing the expenditures of the Federal Government under the tight control needed to justify this tax reduction and those we should look forward to in the future. All of us will have to cooperate in extending these economies, in making them the fiscal habit of this Nation. We must not fail to do so if we are to keep the tax reduction avenue open.

Following those remarks by the gentleman from Arkansas, I commented that he had pointed the way to a sound fiscal policy, that minority members of the Appropriations Committee applauded his foresight, and that we on this side of the aisle would exert every effort to hold the spending line.

During the 88th Congress, the administration and the Congress followed reasonably well the provisions of section 1 of the Revenue Act of 1964. Appropriation requests were cut substantially and budget spending slipped from $97.7 billion in fiscal 1964 down to $96.5 billion in fiscal 1965.

But, what happened in the 89th Congress? With the advent of the Great Society, the administration and the majority party in the Congress abandoned any pretense of honoring the pledge of 1964. The administration formulated expansive and expensive legislative proposals and budget requests, most of which Congress approved—some at even higher spending levels than the administration dared suggest.

As a consequence, nondefense spending increased by leaps and bounds and our fiscal situation was further complicated by rapidly rising defense expenditures on behalf of the war in Vietnam. Federal spending leaped up $10.4 to $106.9 billion in fiscal 1966 from the $96.5 billion level of 1965. It is expected to accelerate even more rapidly this year to $126.7 billion, or $19.8 billion above the $106.9 billion of 1966. While the rate of climb is expected to decline somewhat in fiscal 1968, spending then will still be $8.3 billion higher than this year since 1968 expenditures are now pegged at $135 billion. Time alone will tell whether the 1968 estimate is accurate.

Remember, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas said:

> If we fail to limit the growth of Federal expenditures, we will be leaving the tax reduction road. Even a 1-year detour may make it extremely difficult to get back on it.

I am sad to say that we have now been on a 2-year detour—a detour which has obviously driven us from the tax reduction road since we are now asked to increase the tax burden on individuals and corporations by 6 percent of their income tax liabilities.

I urge the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas to use his influence to convince the big spenders in Congress that it is imperative for us to get back on the road to expenditure control, balanced budgets, and debt reduction—and get back without further increases in taxes.

FISCAL EXCESSES AND A CALL FOR RESTRAINT

At a chamber of commerce meeting in Lubbock, Tex., last October 25, our distinguished chairman, [Mr. MAHON], expressed some reflective and thoughtful concern over the spending binge of the 89th Congress. His speech was reproduced almost in its entirety in the November 7 issue of U.S. News & World Report. I commend a thoughtful reading of his remarks to all Members of the House but I commend it especially to the big spenders on the other side of the aisle.

Let me quote briefly some excerpts from the chairman's comments:

> They [new programs and concepts adopted by Congress] will contribute to changing the course of the Nation. And, my friends, they will be expensive—very expensive.
>
> Nor do I need to remind you that they all add up to bigger Government; to higher budgets: and to more taxes—or more debt.
>
> I know that we must continue to strive to improve our country and the lives of the people in every State, but, in my opinion, the Federal Government must not be permitted to intrude too far into our lives. Some new legislation tends to permit such intrusion. Moreover, we cannot possibly raise taxes high enough to finance every noble idea that somebody dreams up.
>
> Congress not only adopted many of the Great Society programs; it even outdid the President in some respects by going further than he recommended on a number of proposals. At times, we galloped when we should have walked or stood still. That applies to the President and it also applies to Congress.
>
> In consequence of all this, we are suffering from some legislative indigestion; from too much government, from too much spending, and from too much inflation.

I could not agree more sincerely with the gentleman from Texas. What the administration and the Democrat majority in Congress accomplished in the last 2 years has in fact, first, changed the course of our Nation; second, irresponsibly increased Federal spending and added unconscionable burdens on the people with a prospective increase in income taxes and in the insidious hidden tax of inflation; third, intruded immeasurably into the lives of Americans everywhere; and fourth, triggered a case of legislative indigestion which will require a Herculean effort by Congress and a massive fiscal purgative if the affairs of our Federal Establishment are ever to be put in order again.

And, what did our distinguished chairman conclude was the answer to this financial dilemma in which we now find ourselves? He said:

> The ultimate answer is only partly in Congress; it is only partly in the White House. More importantly, control of public spending rests with the people who create public sentiment and elect officials of Government. . . . Congress is not going to practice restraint unless the message comes through loud and clear from the people generally.

To his conclusion, I would add my amen and point out that following our chairman's speech the public did, on November 8, express a demand for restraint and for elimination of the fiscal excesses of the administration and the 89th Congress.

I now express the sincere hope that the gentleman from Texas can this year convince his colleagues on the other side of the aisle that they erred grievously on fiscal matters during the 89th Congress. I want him and the membership of the House to know that we on this side of the aisle will do all within our power to right these fiscal wrongs. So, let us join together in a devoted and unstinting effort to restore a course of fiscal responsibility in Federal affairs which the electorate has demanded.

Finally, I would express the hope that an aroused and thoughtful public will continue to demand no less a course of action from the administration and from the Congress.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], has commented at length on the President's budget just presented to the Congress.

Chairman MAHON has pointed out that we must continue to build up our military strength—support our military forces—meet our international commitments—at the same time—provide for a system of priorities in domestic affairs.

The real problem facing the Congress in considering the budget is the matter of setting priorities on programs that need to be funded.

We must find the answers to these hard questions:

Which programs shall have the highest priority at home—and which can be deferred?

Which programs can be scaled down and reduced?

Which projects are essential and which can be delayed?

Which programs can be curtailed or stretched out?

It seems to me, that we can do one of two things.

We can increase taxes and finance the entire budget as recommended—or—

The Appropriations Committee and the Congress can carefully examine the budget—take a good hard look at what the President is proposing—make cuts and reductions—and avoid the necessity of a tax increase.

It is my feeling that cuts and reductions can be made—and should be made—that priorities must be set.

We are faced with the fact of the Vietnam war.

It is here.

It is costly.

It has first priority—and certainly should have first priority—in our national commitment.

We do not know how long the struggle will last—or what the ultimate cost of the war will be.

With the large amounts recommended by the President for our defense effort—$73 billion in fiscal 1968—we must be realistic.

Other items such as interest on the national debt—veterans pensions and compensation—social security payments—are fixed costs and cannot be reduced.

I repeat—our problem then is to adjust our domestic programs to the war effort.

We must set some priorities.

This is the sensible approach.

This is expected.

This is what the American people expect of their elected Representatives in Congress.

This is the approach I urge—as we begin consideration of the President's budget proposals.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's announcement that he intends to establish a bipartisan commission to review budgetary concepts in order to "assist both public and congressional understanding of this vital document" is certainly welcome at this time. The President should be commended for recognizing the importance of and the need for truth in budgeting in order that the fiscal and monetary affairs of our country can be handled responsibly.

There is perhaps no greater example of the need for such a bipartisan commission than the fiscal year 1968 budget submitted to the Congress today. Its various elements lend themselves to wide and diverse conclusions depending on how you analyze it.

For example, depending on your perspective, the President's fiscal year 1968 budget is going up, going down, or just moving sideways.

It is going up if you look at spending. Total expenditures are on the rise on any basis—defense, nondefense—cash, ad-

ministrative budget, or national income accounts.

Mr. Speaker, in at least one respect, however, it seems to be going down. At least the deficit forecast for fiscal year 1968—$8.1 billion—is smaller than the estimated deficit for fiscal year 1967—$9.7 billion. This is not too difficult to appreciate when one sees that the 1967 deficit—whether you figure it on a cash basis, a national income accounts basis, or an administrative budget basis—is the highest in 8 years.

In still another respect, however, the budget is moving sideways. The Federal share of gross national product—GNP—for fiscal 1968 is forecast to be the same as in 1961—11 percent. That is slightly higher than in the last few years.

The upshot of all this, of course, is that this budget for fiscal year 1968 is a highly confusing document. Some might wish that it had been submitted in advance to the Food and Drug Administration to determine if it would pass appropriate labeling and packaging tests.

In the very brief time that has been available to study this document, I have attempted to recast the highlights of the budget figures to show more accurately its results in deficit terms. Obviously, this in no way is a complete analysis on my part but rather an attempt to get things started along the lines of needed budget improvement.

The key problem of budget credibility arises, of course, from the administration's confusion between assets and liabilities. The fiscal 1968 budget assumes that some $5 billion of special I O U's will be issued by the Government in fiscal year 1968. These are very special I O U's because they do not show up in the public debt but rather as a revenue item. The accompanying table adjusts for this confusion in what might be termed the Johnson administration's "new accounting" which seems to go hand in glove with its pursuit of the "new economics."

Specifically, the sales of certificates of participation in Federal loan programs are treated as purchases of assets by the private buyers and should but are not treated by the Treasury as a liability for future payment by the Government. Adjusting for this one item as well as one even more technical item, gives a better indication of the true magnitude of the expected Federal deficit.

Federal cash budget

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year		
	1966	1967	1968
Cash deficit (as stated in budget document)	−3.3	−6.2	−4.3
Some needed adjustments:			
Debt issuances which have been treated as program receipts (sales of certificates of participation)	−2.6	−3.6	−5.0
Unexplained swing in receipts of Government-sponsored enterprises (Federal Home Loan Bank Board)	------	------	−1.5
Cash deficit with necessary adjustments	−5.9	−9.8	−10.8

Source: The Budget of the United States Government for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1968.

It should be realized that to private investors—PC's—are very much like Treasury securities insofar as they increase the magnitude of Government demand for investment funds and Government competition with private borrowers. In light of the President's concern with high-interest rates expressed in his state of the Union message, it is surprising to find such a large offering of PC's contemplated in his budget since this will exert even stronger upward pressures on interest rates.

The second adjustment item in the table is the essentially unexplained swing from net expenditures to net revenues on the part of the Federal Home Loan Bank. This may seem like a very minor technical matter except for the fact that it reduces the deficit by $1.5 billion in fiscal year 1968.

In his budget message, the President talks about cutting out waste and nonessentials and about limiting increases to urgent national requirements.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there is no statement of priorities by which to guide the Congress or the public. Therefore, we can only infer them from the items which are reduced as compared to those for which the President has programed increases.

The major civilian areas that show increases include international aid, agriculture, interest, General Government, natural resources, housing and, of course, labor, health, and welfare.

The major areas that show decreases are rather interesting to note. They include veterans, commerce and transportation, and NASA. The single, biggest area of apparent reduction or cutback will be a surprise to many Americans. It is the area of education which shows a decrease of some $500 million.

Of course, this paper reduction is achieved by proposed sales of PC's on college housing loans, a good example of how PC's are used in the budget to confuse the true expenditure picture.

In contrast, the budgeted increases in natural resources and General Government may be even more surprising. The administration still has not adopted a policy of no new starts on civilian public works. You may recall we had such a policy during the Korean war. We do not now. On the basis of the very quick review that I have been able to make of the budget in the short time available to me, I came across 21 new projects being started in the 1968 budget.

Although the total defense budget shows an increase overall, serious questions should be raised about cutbacks in areas other than southeast Asia activities. For example, the budget shows that total inventory of Air Force aircraft goes down from 1967 to 1968, that this budget contains one less wing of B-52's, that there will be four fewer squadrons of fighters and of C-124 transports although the transports are offset in the budget by the addition of one additional squadron of modern military transports.

The question of our capabilities in the whole defense area as we look down the road to the period of the 1970's and beyond will, of course, be given close attention by the Defense Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of both Houses in the weeks and months ahead. In the meantime, it is to be hoped that the President will recognize the need for establishment of a Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense as has been proposed by the minority members of the House Defense Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, proper packaging and proper labeling in Government operations is a crucial necessity in a democracy. Hopefully the President's determination to seek advice from a top-level, bipartisan Commission on the Budget will insure that the fiscal 1969 budget will be a much more accurate and more easily understood statement of the fiscal plan of the administration.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the President today transmitted to the Congress the proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1967 to support the Department of Defense.

The vast bulk of these funds are directly related to southeast Asia. But I take this occasion to note that the request underlines the attention that this administration and Congress give to the welfare and morale of our personnel everywere who are serving valiantly in the cause of freedom.

I call to this body's particular attention that almost 5 percent of the request, some $600 million, will provide necessary funds for pay increases, implementation of dependents' medicare, and homeowners assistance which were enacted during the second session of the rightly much-lauded 89th Congress.

The Military Medical Benefits Amendments Act of 1966, signed into law by the President on September 30, 1966, authorized certain additional medical benefits to dependents of Armed Forces members on active duty. The homeowners assistance program will provide relief to Department of Defense personnel who, as a result of base closings, have to sell their homes in a depressed area.

These two programs stand as examples of our continued interest in the welfare of Department of Defense personnel and their families—an interest we can unmistakably show by enactement of the requested appropriations.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the 1968 budget shows once again the President's belief in both the prudent hand and the open mind: A prudent hand in cutting out fat and waste, and open mind to the needs of the people. The budget message contains abundant documentation for these efforts.

The President reports that cost reductions and greater operating efficiency led to savings last year in the civilian agencies totaling $1.7 billion. On the defense side, the savings over the past 5 years reached $4.5 billion in 1966. In other words, without the hard work that has gone into cost reduction, the budget would probably be several billion dollars more than it is.

Obsolete Government organization means spinning wheels and waste of money and manpower. For this reason the President has overhauled Federal agencies, secured establishment of two new departments and proposed to merge

two others. He will also submit several other reorganization proposals to improve the efficiency and economy of the executive branch.

Now the President is taking a completely fresh look at the budgeting process itself. He wants better and keener tools for getting at the true costs of Government programs. He seeks better methods for analyzing the costs and benefits of public expenditures—for examining less costly alternatives. Therefore, he proposes to introduce the new planning-programing-budgeting system into all departments and agencies at the earliest possible time.

These three major strategies: Cost reduction, Government reorganization, modern budget methods, are clear evidence of the President's concern for the wise and effective use of the public's dollars.

These are progressive steps to sound budgeting and better government.

WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAM UNDER TITLE V OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is never pleasant to inform the House of misfortune. But I believe I have a duty to report to you and to the country that a particularly hurtful blow has fallen upon many good and deserving people in my district of eastern Kentucky as a result of action taken by the Congress last year.

This misfortune extends far beyond the boundaries of my district. It affects the constituents of many other Members of this House.

It is, simply stated, that 36,000 heads of families and their 108,000 dependents are being denied the opportunity to improve themselves under a Federal program already existing—the work experience and training program under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act.

This, Mr. Speaker, is more than misfortune. It is tragedy. And it is all the more distressing to realize that it is unnecessary.

This unhappy situation comes as a direct result of Congress decision to cut funds for title V operations to a level 33⅓ below the President's budget of 1966.

I submit that this is neither a fair nor sensible reward for a program that has been among the best directed, the most effective, and the most successful in our broad-scale attack on poverty in America.

The work experience and training program undertakes to provide education, special training, and practical on-the-job experience for the hard-core unemployed—those of low-income and no-income families who are unable to obtain jobs to support themselves and their dependents, and those who are present or potential recipients of public assistance.

It has had much success in taking the "unemployables" and turning them into jobholding, wage-earning, family-supporting citizens.

In the 2 years since the title V programs went into operation in December 1964, approximately 133,000 persons have participated in it. Of the approximately 66,300 who have passed through or are no longer in the program, half have been helped toward achieving self-sufficiency as a direct result of their participation.

Some 22,000 persons immediately found employment upon leaving title V projects. Another 3,500 heads of families received sufficient upgrading and educational improvement to qualify for Manpower Development and Training Act and other advanced vocational educational training as a step toward better paying jobs. And another 6,700 persons who did not find employment immediately upon leaving the program were in a more competitive situation in the labor market because of the instruction they received.

These three groups of title V trainees make up a better-than-50-percent success level achieved by title V in its first 2 years.

That is an outstanding achievement, Mr. Speaker, and the Congress should be proud of it. But because of authorization cuts made last fall, the level of operation must be sharply curtailed.

The work experience and training program received an appropriation of $150 million for the 1966 fiscal year. In his budget message last January, the President asked for $160 million to operate the program during fiscal 1967. Congress cut this request by $60 million and we wound up with an appropriation of only $100 million: This is $50 million less than it had the previous year.

Now, instead of being able to fund 74,800 training spaces, the program will be held down to 46,200. The effect of this cutback of 28,000 spaces is already being felt.

Many projects have been reduced in size and 75 more projects will be phased out.

Except in unusual circumstances, it will be impossible to approve new projects in areas greatly in need of the benefits that title V can achieve with the hard-core unemployed of America.

Some of the projects that have already ended or are in the process of being ended are Fulton County, Ga.; Yell County, Ark.; Lake County, Calif.; Bucks, Berks, Chester, Montgomery, and Westmoreland Counties, Pa.; and St. Lawrence County, N.Y.

As of December 31, there were pending 24 project proposals totaling more than $20 million. These include three counties in Minnesota, two counties in Nebraska, 10 counties in New Mexico, four counties in Oklahoma, two counties in Texas, three counties in Virginia, and single counties in Wisconsin, Montana, and New York, and for an Indian reservation in South Dakota.

It is unlikely that any title V funds will be available this year for funding these and other new project proposals. It is difficult to calculate and painful to consider the tremendous potential in human resources that will go to waste because we in the Congress failed to provide funds for these projects. And it is sad to contemplate the burden of future welfare costs we are strapping onto the back of American taxpayers because, in this instance, we have taken a very short-range view of economy.

It is false economy that counsels us to cut $60 million from the budget today only to spend many times that sum tomorrow supporting those people and their children who are handicapped by lack of training and experience to become independent, self-supporting members of society.

What I tell you today about title V is not hearsay. I have seen it in operation and I know it produces results.

Since the establishment of the title V program in a group of eastern Kentucky counties, more than 9,000 fathers plus some 31,500 dependent children have been helped by the program.

More than 1,500 of these participants have been graduated to full-time employment with wages ranging from $1.25 to $3 an hour in a wide variety of occupations, such as stock clerk, counter salesman, automotive repairman, welder, road equipment operator, gardener, and electrician.

All participants who are found deficient in education are enrolled in adult basic education which extends through the eighth grade level.

At least 900 eastern Kentucky fathers have completed eighth grade work under the title V program, and 600 others have completed high school equivalency.

The Governor of Kentucky, the Honorable Edward T. Breathitt, recently praised this program for keeping thousands of young Kentuckians in school and for reducing the dropout rate. He noted that bridges have been built by the fathers, streams have been cleared, roads have been built to bring school buses to the hollows where children had been required to walk for miles to get to school. These, said the Governor, are quiet miracles.

I wish it were possible for all of you to read the many letters I have received from fathers in my district who are enrolled in the title V program.

Written on lined tablet paper with stubby pencils, many with imperfect grammar and original spelling, they tell the story of title V's success in frank, direct sentences of little children. But these letters glow with the honesty and pride of men who are accomplishing something, who are gaining in confidence and self-respect, and who are determined that this one last chance for independence shall not slip away. And perhaps the most touching thing of all is the concern they show for the education and future of their children.

Listen to these random sentences:

"There a lot a people around here that cant read or write and you no without an education its hard to find employment."

"This has helpt me and my famely to keep my children in school and has helpt me to improve my own condition in school so help us to keep the school going please."

"But the greatest help about the program is the help I get to send my children to school. I have two boys in high school and three in grade school. Without the help from the program I could not send my children to school."

"The people that needs it most of all, us old miners, is nocked out and cant get a job and I hope it goes on. It helps me keep my children in school."

"I hope it goes on for it is the only way

I have got to send my kids to school. It is the best thing we have had."

"You have helped me get something I didn't have the chance to get when I was young. That is school, and most of all I do thank you for this program that I can support my family better and give my children more school and better food and warm clothes to wear to school. Mr. Perkins this program is the wonderfulest thing you could have done for the poor people."

"I am willing to work and go to school and do my best so I can feed and clothe my family. Please, Mr. Perkins, help us. It gets so dark and cold here on Middle Creek. I lay awake wondering how I am going to keep my family from starving. I have 11 kids, 7 in school."

"The program is helping me give my children a good education. My medical card has helped me give my children proper medical care when needed. I got glasses which I've needed for a long time but couldn't afford to buy. The children have had their teeth filled. I am an abled bodied man 39 years old with six kids, and I've found it hard to make a decent living here in Menifee county."

"You have kept many poor child from a hungry hour while in school. Many men has put their children in school that couldn't have if it wouldn't for your help."

"It has helped to keep my child in school and it has helped us all to get more schooling."

"It has been a great help to me and my family in sending my children to school."

"I have learned well in school and my kids has had good lunches because I have been able to pay for them."

"I couldnt even write my name when this school started."

"The whole community responded to this program. It has done more to create a community spirit and educate the people and to help the poor to feel a part of the whole program than anything else has ever done. This is the key to help people to understand what our government is trying to do for its people."

While these men are improving their educational status, they are learning something else very important to their future as wage earners. The program stresses basic habits: Punctuality, persistence, dependability, personal neatness, and pride in workmanship.

In my State, the program is operated under regulations that have teeth in them. If participants do not show up for the work assigned them, they do not get paid. Repeated absences result in their being dropped from the program.

And in the words of a program supervisor in my State:

This provides an incentive to maintain regular work habits thus setting a good example for their children.

Some of the most eloquent praise for the program comes from a respected teacher in Menifee County, who had great misgivings about the educational program when she was drafted to teach in one of the early courses. This letter which I would like to insert in the RECORD in full is her testimony:

MENIFEE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL,
Frenchburg, Ky., January 11, 1967.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: In October of 1965 my superintendent called and asked if I could teach Level 1 in our basic adult education course here at Menifee County High School. As you know Level 1 is the first three grades. I said I would and then almost panicked. What could I teach these men ranging from 19 years of age to 57. When I saw them I wondered even more, for they were dirty, unshaved and I feared of very low morals.

But you know, Mr. Perkins, I could never have been more wrong. I have been in the teaching profession 21 years and I've never been shown more respect than these boys show. They feel their inability to read and write so acutely. They actually feared trying.

Now they are so anxious to show me each week what they recall from last week. Since I teach the lowest level I've had nearly all our boys that are in the program here and they have nearly all been eager to learn and are so proud that they can sign their names, that they can earn money and that their children can have the necessities of life and even sometimes a treat. They come neat and clean now that they have money for clothes and seem to take great pride in their appearance.

But the improvement does not stop with the fathers, I have several of their children in my general science class in our high school—their attendance is better, their appearance just like the other boys and girls, and their appearance shows the result of being able to eat well for maybe the first time in their lives. Their medical cards are being used too.

Some call them "Happy Pappies," and why shouldn't they be happy? They are not being given charity but are being given a chance to earn a living and at the same time an education. I could almost write a book on the change I've seen in our Happy Pappies, and it's all been good. I hope you can use your influence to help us keep this program in Menifee County. We have no industry here.

Sincerely,

MRS. EMOGENE COMBS.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after all of the progress we have made it has been necessary to reduce the size of the title V project in eastern Kentucky. It will receive almost $4 million less this year than it had in fiscal 1966. That means that more than 1,500 men—heads of families with wives and dependent children—will have to be dropped from the program. We cannot begin to assess the loss of hope and the reduced economic circumstances which again face those 1,500 families who were beginning the upward climb to self-sufficiency and self-respect.

Let me quote the words of a group of title V participants in eastern Kentucky in a petition addressed to the President of the United States:

We respectfully represent that the continuation of the employment program is essential to the welfare of every man who is participating in it, and to their families. We submit that it is the first opportunity for most of these men, many of them past the prime of life, to achieve minimum education standards so necessary to the acquisition of jobs in the economy of this region; and it enables families, and more particularly the children of these men to acquire a basic measure of freedom from hunger which most of them have known throughout their lives.

Because we are faced with this severe cutback, it is incumbent upon all of us to search for alternate ways of reaching the hard-core unemployed of America.

I have recently asked the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Willard Wirtz, to see if it is possible to transfer some of the potential cutoffs from the title V program to training projects under the Scheuer-Nelson program, or to the Neighborhood Corps for the Elderly.

I include my letter to Secretary Wirtz for the RECORD:

DECEMBER 30, 1966.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am very much concerned about the cutback in funds under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act from the budget figure of $160 million to the actual authorization figure of $100 million. This will affect several thousand needy families who are receiving useful work experience and training under Title V in eastern Kentucky. Approximately 6,000 people are affected and these are the real hard core unemployed, the people who for all intents and purposes are unable to feed their families and purchase the necessities of life. In fact, they cannot feed their families under the subsistence provided under the MDTA program.

According to the testimony of Mr. Ruttenberg before my Vocational Subcommittee last fall, we have barely touched the hard core unemployed under MDTA. To my personal knowledge, many applications are now pending that have not been funded for eastern Kentucky, but these pending applications do not involve the hard core unemployed who will be affected by the cutoff under Title V.

I am wondering whether you will be able to take on several hundred of these hard core unemployed who will within a few months be cut off of the Title V program. It would appear to me that some relief could be afforded under the Nelson-Scheuer or the Neighborhood Corps for the Elderly. I have discussed this subject matter with several of the area directors of the community action programs in eastern Kentucky and have requested that they submit Nelson-Scheuer applications to take up some of the slack from the cutoff.

I will appreciate your immediate consideration of this request inasmuch as several thousand people will be affected by early spring in eastern Kentucky and at that time, unless other programs assume the responsibility of Title V, their families will be faced with starvation. Thought I would call this to your attention in order that your manpower people and other experts may have time to survey the situation thoroughly before the cutoff date.

With best wishes for the New Year,

Sincerely,

CARL D. PERKINS,
Member of Congress.

Dr. Ellen Winston, the Commissioner, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been greatly concerned about the potential cutoff of title V participants in my State, as elsewhere in the Nation.

I also include for the record an exchange of correspondence between Dr. Winston and Commissioner C. Leslie Dawson of the Kentucky Department of Economic Security, Frankfort, Ky.:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
December 27, 1966.

Mr. C. LESLIE DAWSON,
Commissioner, Department of Economic Security, Capitol Office Building, Frankfort, Ky.

Dear Mr. DAWSON: This is in reply to your further correspondence under date of December 14, 1966, regarding the Kentucky Title V work experience and training project.

It is an unfortunate circumstance if, as you say, the level of prevailing wages is lower than the amount determined by the State to be necessary for a minimum standard of living. However, this is not a justification for falling below the State's standard. Congressional intent that State standards be adhered to in assistance payments under Title V projects is stated on page 20 of H.R. No.

1568 of the 89th Congress, 2d Session, as follows:

"Finally, HEW will continue to make certain that all participants have funds to secure sufficient food, clothing, shelter, and other living necessities to derive maximum benefits from the program. The standard of sufficiency is the full amount of the State's relevant definition of needed assistance."

Since a waiver was granted previously to permit assistance payments under the Kentucky project to be made on the basis of full need up to a monthly family maximum of $250, this same condition will be approved for the third year renewal.

While we do not agree that the problem can be solved by reducing the level of assistance payments, we certainly share your concern about the families who will have to be removed from the project because of the 12½ percent ceiling. In the absence of a general assistance program we urge that serious consideration be given to implementing the existing legislation in your State which authorizes payment of aid to families with dependent children in need as a result of unemployment of the parents. Our records indicate that this legislation was passed in 1964 to become effective July 1, 1964, in 39 countries and to be extended Statewide by July 1, 1965. An AFDC–UP demonstration project under Section 1115 of the Social Security Act was funded for the period from December 1, 1963, through June 30, 1964, by the Welfare Administration for nine Kentucky counties in the amount of about $400,000. As of July 1, 1964, when the special project funds under Section 1115 terminated, the State law was implemented and payments were made in the nine counties under the regular Federal matching provisions for AFDC–UP for the balance of the year. Because State funds were becoming depleted, a work experience and training project was approved under the provisions of Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act effective January 1, 1965, for the original nine counties and later extended to 19 counties. A total of $32,325,245 in Federal funds has been granted to Kentucky under the work experience and training program to date.

Federal financial participation under the regular AFDC–UP program again would be available if Kentucky provided the necessary matching funds to implement the State legislation passed in 1964. Economic conditions must be more favorable now than in 1964 when the State found it possible to match AFDC–UP payments for a number of months. If it is not possible for the State to provide matching funds for an AFDC–UP program on a Statewide basis, approval could be given for a waiver to operate the program in a designated number of counties with regular Federal matching. In many States, the Governor has discretionary or emergency funds that can be drawn upon for special purposes.

We are deeply concerned over the hardship and suffering of persons who must be terminated during the winter months. Also, in order to conserve the investment that has already been made, every effort should be made to continue the program at its present level. A number of gains have been made in the program such as strengthening the training component, establishing a labor mobility demonstration project, provision of adult basic literacy and high school equivalency courses, and training of crew foremen to improve the quality of the work experience provided. It is regrettable if the momentum that has thus been gained must now be lost.

If no State matching funds can be made available, you have proposed that the reduction in the Title V project be made by terminating trainees who have been on the program for longer than two years. This proposal is not approvable for the reason that over the past two years a sizeable proportion of trainees have been brought to the point where they are now able to move into advanced training or relocate in other areas where jobs are available for which they have been trained. To drop them from the project would deprive them of services at the point where the program's investment is about to pay off.

Further, a 24-month cutoff is contrary to the direction given by Congress in the 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. Section 503(b) as amended provides "that participation of individuals in such programs will not ordinarily exceed 36 months * * *" This provision was enacted by Congress in recognition of the severe deficiencies and needs of the group served. Many of the trainees require a substantial period of time to bring them to the point where they can secure and hold regular employment in a competitive labor market.

As stated in my letter of December 5, 1966, it is our belief that within the present budgetary constraints "the renewal for a third year should provide emphasis on the training component for a small number of participants in a more circumscribed geographic area. Limiting the project to a smaller number of counties should make for a more efficient and economical operation with a concentration of needed services including those related to labor mobility." In phasing out the program in any county, trainees should be allowed to finish vocational training programs and high school equivalency courses. It is my understanding that 670 trainees out of the total of 750 enrolled in vocational training programs or high school equivalency courses are located in the original nine counties covered by the initial Title V project. This suggests that consideration be given to continuing the program in these counties and terminating it in counties that were added later, if it proves impossible to find State funds for Federal matching as suggested above.

Sincerely,

ELLEN WINSTON, *Commissioner.*

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY,
Frankfort, December 14, 1966.

Dr. ELLEN WINSTON,
Commissioner, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WINSTON: In your reply of December 5 to my letter of November 22, you indicated that you could find no justification for reducing the level of payments for Work Experience and Training Program participants to the level of the regular AFDC program (86.5% of deficit, with family maximums of $180 for families of fewer than 7 persons and $220 for families of 7 or more persons). In light of the tremendous hardship which the reduction in Kentucky's allocation will produce in this program in East Kentucky, I request that you reconsider this decision.

At this point we have made every decision that could conceivably be made which would reduce the number of participants that would have to be cut off the program and still the cut will be extreme. For those who would be removed from this program during this winter season there is no type of assistance available to them other than food stamps for which they are already eligible and it will produce hardships that will be difficult for many of us to explain. I have no argument with any of the department's policies which are calculated to produce a higher standard of living for the disadvantaged. We are both attempting to achieve the same goals but in this instance, it is essential that the hardships produced by a reduction in appropriation be minimized. I suggest that a consideration be given to a grant reduction as previously suggested, for at least a year's period until the program can be adjusted.

The greatest criticism which has been leveled at this program in East Kentucky has been that the grant payments are in excess of what small industries could conceivably be expected to pay for unskilled employees. This criticism has been bitter and has come not only from small industries but from the large and powerful coal mining industry. Even though we do not agree with much of this criticism, this does not offset the fact that it exists and has had a great deal to do with reducing the effectiveness of the program.

There are over 28,000 people in this 19-county area where the WET program is in operation that are not on public assistance of any type and yet are below the $3,000 federal poverty standard relative to income. This group, of course, is also critical of the program because they are attempting to get by without the benefit of the program by working for many of the small businesses located in that area, such as sawmills, garages, farming, etc. At the present time unemployment in Appalachia, by our figures, is running at about 4.2% and in the rest of the State it is running between 1.6% and 1.7%.

The federal poverty standard of $3,000 cannot logically be used in this situation as the reason for not minimizing the required reduction in the Work Experience and Training program. The number of participants to be removed must be held to a minimum or the program loses much of what it has already accomplished with many of these people and it certainly will lose a great deal of support among many sponsors here in Kentucky.

I have enclosed a letter received in November by Mr. Aaron Paul from the U.S. Shoe Corporation relative to the grant structure and also an article which appeared in the Courier-Journal in July of this past year as well as copies of two other articles relating to the program which contain comments from the coal mining industry.

Regardless of how you or I feel, these opinions have had an effect on Congress.

Yours very truly,

C. LESLIE DAWSON.

Because I have dwelt on the effects of a cutback of title V funds in Kentucky, I hasten to tell you that the effects elsewhere across the Nation are also damaging.

In California, for instance, the title V program will receive $3,300,000 less than it had previously received for work experience and training for unemployed heads of families and other needy persons. This cut will mean that projects in 9 of the 21 presently participating counties must be terminated. About 4,000 trainees with 12,000 dependents may no longer share the hope and the promise of a brighter future unless Congress acts to correct its mistake of last year.

Of course, title V will continue even with reduced funds, but the achievement will be much smaller than it could be. Fewer of the hard-core unemployed will be made employable. Fewer unemployed parents will be qualified to take advanced vocational instruction under MDTA. Fewer parents will be moved into the competitive labor market.

Title V will have to reduce the size of projects such as the concerted services activities it shares with other Government agencies in fighting poverty in rural areas—projects like those in St. Francis County, Ark.; Todd County, Minn.; and Sandoval County, N. Mex.

Nor will funds be available for special projects to meet the particular needs of the hard-core unemployed in urban areas.

It seems to me to be especially unfortunate that this cutback in title V comes at a time when a little more basic education, training, counseling, work experience and supportive services, including medical care, can make so many persons employable at a time when there are so many job opportunities.

It is nothing short of a tragic loss that 28,000 new persons are not going to have an opportunity of participating in the title V program this year. And it is nothing short of cruel that 21,000 persons who are part way through their training will have to be dropped.

These people are not alone the losers. The Nation is the loser if this unhappy situation is permitted to stand.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am asking for the immediate authorization and appropriation of an additional $60 million this fiscal year to bring this important and worthwhile program up to the level of operation sought by the President in his last budget message.

It is important that this worthwhile program be adequately financed so that in the future, we will not be running into the disruption and the demoralizing uncertainty we are experiencing now.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment President Lyndon B. Johnson for his message asking that social security benefits be increased by an average of 20 percent.

If Congress carries out the President's request, the recipients of social security will receive a much-needed assist in their struggle to provide themselves with the necessities of life. I am glad the President has fixed on the figure of 20 percent. I am introducing legislation based on that figure.

What Congress does to carry out the President's proposal will be the measure of our willingness to make the social security system serve the purpose for which it was created—which is to free elderly people of the fear of want and need when they no longer are able to make their own way in life.

It is not enough for any single Member, for any political party to rest content with the workings of the social security system as we have known it in the past. We must keep it up to date to meet the changing needs of our people.

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter addressed to Speaker McCORMACK about age discrimination in the Employment Act of 1967:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit to the Congress herewith a draft bill for an "Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967" as recommended by the President in his Older Americans Message of January 23, 1967.

The bill would establish as a matter of national policy the elimination of arbitrary age discrimination in employment. The legislation would provide minimum standards barring arbitrary age discrimination for workers between the age of 45 and 65 with authority in the Secretary of Labor to adjust these limits upwards or downwards in order to effectuate the purposes of the Act. At the same time it would preserve and encourage State legislation for coping with this problem.

The bill would be administered by the Secretary of Labor.

The prohibitions of the legislation would be directed to arbitrary discrimination by employers, employment agencies, and labor organizations in industries affecting commerce. The prohibitions would be enforceable through administrative proceedings conducted by the Secretary of Labor.

Such proceedings could be initiated by aggrieved persons or someone acting on their behalf, or by the Secretary of Labor, subsequent to informal efforts to eliminate any discriminatory practices by conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Any administrative adjudications would be subject to judicial review and enforcement.

The legislation would clearly indicate that the prohibitions are designed to bar arbitrary age discrimination. Reasonable differentiations not based solely on age, including but not limited to bona fide occupational qualifications which may be reasonably necessary to the normal operation of a particular business, would not fall within the proscription. In addition, the Secretary of Labor would be given authority to establish reasonable exemptions as he finds necessary and proper in the public interest.

The legislation also provides for attention to be given to institutional arrangements which work to the disadvantage of older workers, including those giving rise to involuntary retirement. Research would be undertaken and promoted with a view to reducing barriers to the employment of older workers.

The legislation contemplates that the United States Employment Service and the affiliated State services would take action to increase the availability of work for older workers. The services constitute the basic operating resource for getting this job done. Fostering job opportunities and potentials for older workers through the public employment service system is expressly provided for in the draft bill.

In addition, a beginning would be made by cultivating understanding and communicating information to employers, labor organizations, and other interested persons concerning the abilities and talents of older persons. Finally, there would also be a positive program for cooperating with employers, employment agencies, and labor organizations and affording technical assistance to them in developing plans and methods for progress toward the elimination of age discrimination.

I urge prompt enactment of this legislation.

Sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

THE MIDDLE EAST ARMS RACE: DANGER AHEAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my profound concern over recent developments in the Middle East. The Senate minority leader correctly spoke of the "explosiveness" of the situation in the Republican state of the Union address last Thursday.

In this troubled region, U.S. policy has become enmeshed in the always mysterious and uncertain fate of political rivalries. Given the fact of massive Soviet aid, particularly weapons, one cannot hold that this involvement is categorically evil or contrary to our interests. For the Soviets quite obviously are infiltrating the area, backing certain horses, with the hope of establishing positions of strength and influence.

As events unfold we are inevitably made to react. This is producing a sort of myopia. I am concerned lest our preoccupation with the daily ebb of affairs blinds us to the crucial importance of finding long-range and basic solutions to the bitter problems in the Middle East.

Our piecemeal attempts to shore up friendly Arab regimes reflect this preoccupation. At this time I am not questioning specific arms agreements with Arab governments, although in perspective, their validity is a matter of legitimate debate. Rather, I simply want to point out that this pattern of schizophrenic effort is frequently unintelligible. Keen observers will tell you that things are seldom what they seem in Arabia. This is probably true. We must be flexible. But what is our long-range objective in the Middle East? Are our daily decisions tuned to this objective? Have we got a proper grasp of the key factors involved, and are our endeavors geared to laying the basis for a peaceful settlement between Israel and the Arabs?

I have no doubt that officials will answer me with a resounding "Yes." But I am skeptical. In the first instance, a policy wholly absorbed in the practical necessity of maintaining a power balance and restricting Soviet machinations is inherently negative and self-propelling. I am not suggesting that we should ignore these immediate considerations. I am saying that our attention must focus primarily upon the longer term.

The spiraling arms race in the Middle East is, of course, an offshoot of conflicting national ambitions and the Arab-Israel confrontation. With arms and other inducements, the great powers compete for influence and allegiance. It is a perilous situation.

In order to stem this contest, the United States should, through normal diplomatic channels or other means, seek an agreement with the Soviet Union for

the limitation of arms shipments into the Middle East. This is the substance of a recent letter I addressed to the Secretary of State, which I will include in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

I am in full accord with suggestions that there be a reconvening of the Tripartite Guarantee Powers, for the purpose of reconsidering the threat to peace and security in the Middle East. In this connection, I wish to remind the House that this point was stressed by the distinguished Senate minority leader in his foreign policy presentation last Thursday.

Such a reassertion of previously stated commitments by the three governments—United States, Great Britain, and France—would be helpful.

But Russia and the United States are the principle powers concerned. Britain will soon be withdrawing from the Aden base, and the position of France is ambiguous at best.

It is my hope that the United States will press this matter vigorously with Soviet officials at the earliest opportunity.

The letter mentioned above follows:

JANUARY 20, 1967.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want to express my profound anxiety over recent developments in the Near East. The United States has a vital stake in the maintenance of peace in the area, but I am concerned now that restraining influences are giving way to a rising extremist temper which could erupt in open conflict.

For the past several years, the United States has attempted to maintain a balance between opposing forces, believing that this represented the best hope of averting aggression. The influx of Soviet arms into the region, and unmistakable evidence of Soviet military incursion, has also influenced us to conclude piece-meal armament agreements wtih various nations.

It is my impression that United States policy has failed to take the larger view of political and military developments in the Middle East. I do not wish to question here the validity of specific American actions. What concerns me most is an apparent over-emphasis upon short-run considerations, leading to a naive expediency which frequently has the effect of inflaming local passions rather than easing tensions and furthering prospects for an amicable settlement between the parties concerned.

For this reason, as I have previously suggested, our primary concern must be to explore with the Soviet Union the possibility of mutually limiting arms shipments to the Middle East. In the last ten years, the Soviets have earmarked over two billion dollars' worth of arms toward Arab countries. We ourselves have contracted numerous bilateral agreement's.

There is every indication, today, that the Russians are pressing their objective to achieve footholds in this volatile region, chiefly through economic and military aid. The United States has an interest in opposing these schemes, and hence we can expect an accelerating arms race unless the United States and Soviet Russia can come to an early understanding to deescalate this tragically wasteful and perilous infusion of weapons.

Basic to an accord of this nature is the realization, in both Washington and Moscow, that this exportation of weaponry is most probably self-defeating in long-range terms. To the extent that an arms deal buys leverage, the other side will quickly react in an effort to offset the adventage. Any presumed gain is temporary and elusive at best, particularly in the Middle East where, historically, attempts to influence the destiny of changing Arab leaderships have met with measurable failure.

I strongly urge the Department, through normal diplomatic channels or other means, to renew initiatives with the Soviet Government in an effort to control and reduce this dangerous arms race.

SEYMOUR HALPERN,
Member of Congress.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, as the senior Democratic Congressman from the Bronx, it is my sad duty to inform this Chamber of the death of our former Member, Hon. Charles A. Buckley, of New York. Mr. Buckley represented the 23d Congressional District of the Bronx with distinction for 30 years. During 12 of these years, he served as chairman of the Public Works Committee.

Charlie Buckley began his political career when he was elected to the Board of Aldermen of New York City in 1918. He was appointed State tax appraiser and later New York City chamberlain. He was elected to Congress in 1934.

Our vast Federal highway program, improvement of our rivers and harbors, flood control programs throughout our country, came into being under Congressman Buckley's chairmanship of the House Public Works Committee.

The people of New York owe him deep gratitude for the many public works projects authorized for our State. Through his efforts our harbors, our waterways, parks and beaches, have been improved; we have the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Niagara power project, and Hudson River improvements, the Major Deegan Expressway and New England Thruway.

He worked hard for the authorization of a new Federal building in the Bronx. Within a short time, we will see that building go up. It will house Federal agencies, including the Bronx Post Office, and will provide more efficient Federal service to the people of the Bronx.

Perhaps Congressman Buckley's foresight and determination were most dramatically displayed in his early recognition of the presidential potential of John F. Kennedy. Congressman Buckley was one of the first to see President Kennedy as the great man most of us subsequently found him to be. He brought to bear the powers of his leadership in John F. Kennedy's behalf and was one of the men most influential in President Kennedy's ultimate nomination. For this alone, he won the appreciation of the country.

Charlie Buckley was a political leader frequently maligned and much misunderstood. It must never be forgotten, however, that to every position which he held he was duly and properly elected. Charlie Buckley had a great capacity for leadership and it was this which won him both public and party offices. He was a modest and honest man dedicated to the people of his district, the city of New York, and the United States. He gave himself to his people and his country without reserve.

I was honored to serve in the House of Representatives with this great American, who will be remembered for his unselfish dedication to the welfare of the people of New York and for his courageous and eminent leadership to the Democratic Party.

Mrs. Gilbert joins with me in extending condolences to Mrs. Buckley and the family.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. CELLER. It is always sad to know that a Member of the House or a former Member has passed away.

I knew Charley Buckley for a great many years. It was always a pleasure to serve with him.

Of all the qualities that were made manifest by him, the outstanding one was his loyalty—his loyalty to his country, his loyalty to his party, and his loyalty to his friends. He never deserted his country, his friends, or his party.

Despite the fact that he was ofttimes beset by critics, he stood stanch and firmly entrenched. He never dipped his colors and never allowed anyone to gainsay him when he was fighting for what he deemed to be his principles.

We mourn his loss. The good Lord has placed his finger upon him, and he sleeps.

Our condolences go out to his dearly beloved wife and the dear ones that Charley leaves behind.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I am happy to yield to my colleague from the Bronx.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have the honor to represent the people of the 23d District of New York which Charles A. Buckley represented for 30 years. On behalf of the people of that district and especially of those thousands who knew Mr. Buckley and his family personally, I want to join today in these expressions of grief at his passing and of sympathy to his family.

Although Mr. Buckley and I had political differences, I respected him as a faithful supporter of Democratic Presidents and Governors and as one who—as my colleague from the Bronx [Mr. GILBERT] has said—had a great deal to do with the nomination of John F. Kennedy for President in 1960.

Charles A. Buckley was a hard fighter and a man who lived his convictions.

Others here can speak better than I of his contributions here in the House, but I do know from my 4 years as secretary to Averell Harriman, when he was Governor of the State of New York, that Congressman Buckley was always ready to respond to requests from the Governor and to carry them out, especially where the interests of New York State were concerned.

Mr. Buckley was a devoted husband, father, and grandfather.

Although not unexpected, his passing

is a grievous loss for his family and especially for Mrs. Buckley.

My wife and I and my family join in extending our deepest sympathy to them.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I yield to my distinguished colleague from the Bronx [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened this weekend by the death of a beloved colleague of yesteryear, the Honorable Charles A. Buckley, of New York.

Charlie Buckley is a symbol of a bygone era. There will never be another Charlie Buckley. Nor will there ever be another Bronx era like the era of Charlie Buckley. Some say this is progress. I disagree.

To me, Charlie Buckley was a colleague in two ways. We were both Members of Congress, but we were more—we were both chairmen of our respective party committees in Bronx County.

I remember when I was a college student, back during the 1930's. Charlie was a junior Congressman, just beginning his climb on the ladder of congressional seniority. The Bronx was a different place in those days. The Democratic organization, of which Charlie was a part, ruled supreme throughout the Bronx. In those days, Charlie Buckley's Bronx was the "banner" Democratic county in this Nation—north of the Mason-Dixon line at least.

I remember those days very well. People were poor, but nobody was "deprived." People were thin with hunger and blue with cold, but nobody thought to riot. Policemen were respected in those days.

In recent years, this has changed. And other things have changed, too. Impatient "reformers" clutching half-baked sociology books have come to the Bronx, and they have spewed out a lexicon of "deprivation," "social action," and "reform." Reform of what? Reform of the respect for law and order that was part of the old Bronx? Reform of pride in self-help? Yes, that too. Reform of respect for a man's word and character?

Charlie Buckley's Bronx has been displaced by the inroads of "reform." Now we have people who are "deprived." Now we have rioters. The Bronx will miss Charlie Buckley. We will regret his passing—and the passing of his era.

As I said, Charlie and I were not just congressional colleagues, we were each chairman of our respective county political organizations. In recent years, our Republican Party has made gains in the Bronx at the expense of our Democratic friends. Many of the stalwarts of the old Democratic era have joined us, fleeing the hypocrisy of "reform." They are more than welcome.

We Bronxites, whatever our party, will miss Charlie. We will miss his rugged candor, his character, and his integrity. The Bronx will not be the same without him.

Mrs. Fino joins me in extending our deepest condolences to the family of the late Charles A. Buckley. The Bronx will not forget him.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Monday's news stories informed us of the passing of a distinguished former Member of this body, beloved by many Members of the House who served with him at some point during the 30 years he represented the 23d District of New York City. Charles A. Buckley, as has been said many times, was a politician of the old school, who placed loyalty to country, to constituents, to friends and political party, at the top of his list of personal values.

Mr. Buckley rose from humble circumstances to positions of prestige and leadership. He served his district with devotion over many years, years during which he also formed friendships and bonds of affection with his colleagues.

I deeply regret the death of my old friend. I was happy to number him among many fine and loyal friends I have made as a Member of this House. As chairman of the great Committee on Public Works he was a friend of many Members—he favored us in many ways.

Charles Buckley was a strong believer in party. He was a strong supporter of President Johnson and of President Kennedy, for whom he was a tireless worker and of whom he was a dedicated friend.

Mr. Speaker, I shall miss our old friend. To his wife, his children and loved ones, Mrs. Albert and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT], for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT], in his deep sense of loss upon the occasion of the passing of our former colleague, Representative Charles Buckley, of the Bronx.

I had the honor and the fond memory of serving with Representative Buckley from 1960 until he left this body.

I recall as a young Member, and as a new Member of this body, that Charles Buckley took a very great interest in the career of those coming to this House from the State of New York and was helpful to them in every respect.

I feel at this time that we should extend to the members of the staff of the Committee on Public Works who served with our departed colleague our condolences upon their loss, because I believe that those who knew him best will recall that he was a fair and a good employer and one who used his committee power in a most judicious way for the good of the State of New York and for the good of our country.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I know, as has been said here earlier, that he had much to do—perhaps more than any politician we can remember—with the making of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as our President. If he had done nothing else, that would stand to his memory as a great mark in history.

I feel it should be said that Charles Buckley brought to this position of great trust good judgment and a special quality. Mr. Buckley's wit was as laconic and as sharp as a whip's crack. He was as succinct as a sphinx with lockjaw. He never used one more word than was necessary to convey his message. His language was also very clear. It is my opinion that those who serve today in this, the 90th Congress, on this side of the aisle, should recall what that message was. It was:

Be Democratic; vote Democratic; live Democratic; and die Democratic.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, he has gone but I feel that in the celestial heavens the Democratic Party departed today finds a new gem in its diadem in the person of Charles Buckley.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Representative GILBERT, in saying a few words today in extending my feelings and reactions upon the passing of a good Democrat and my former colleague, Charles Buckley.

Mr. Speaker, I knew Charles Buckley well. He was a forthright individual. His word was his bond. He was admired not only by his colleagues, but by all whose privilege it was to know him.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to his family my sincere condolences.

I think it was Jim Farley who made the immortal observation that "one man's boss is another man's leader." Charley Buckley was called a lot of things in his long life—most frequently a "boss." I prefer to remember him as a leader, because he was truly a leader. He was democratically elected to all the posts which he held and he conducted himself well in each of them.

We here in the House particularly remember him as an excellent chairman of the Public Works Committee. While Charley Buckley was being denounced for alleged indifference to his congressional responsibilities, we in this body knew he ran an excellent operation on the committee level. The members of the committee, as well as its staff, respected him and held his judgment in high esteem. He was no tyrant, no boss in his committee. On the contrary, he delegated authority skillfully and to good purpose. Under Charley Buckley, the Public Works Committee passed much landmark legislation. When it came his time to leave this body—as indeed it must for all of us—he left his committee in such good shape that the transition of leadership was, as I understand it, effected without the slightest trouble. Perhaps that is the best testimony to his effectiveness as a Congressman.

But may I note something else, for which Charley Buckley deserves to go down in history. He was among the very first to recognize the leadership capacities of John F. Kennedy and to

support him for the Presidency. In his capacity as county leader of the Bronx, Buckley used his influence to help bring the nomination to Kennedy. This was not bossism; it was the legitimate use of his leadership prerogatives. It was more. It was his responsibility. Charley Buckley saw the making of a great President in John Kennedy and he helped to put him on the road to the White House. For that, we can all, as Americans, feel grateful.

Charley Buckley lost his place among us in a fair fight. He hated to give up the seat he loved so much, and it is very understandable that he did. When he left, Congress was a less colorful, less friendly and, I daresay, less effective place. Now Charles A. Buckley, after a long and honorable career, is dead. We remember him fondly and we shall miss him.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I yield to my distinguished colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my distinguished colleague from New York in expressing my deepest sympathy on the passing of the former chairman of our great Committee on Public Works, Mr. Buckley.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the great interstate highway system, the development of the Nation's rivers and harbors, will be monuments to the dedication, devotion, and ability of this great American. Charles Buckley was an outstanding committee chairman. He earned the love, respect, esteem, and admiration of those of us who served with him. Though from the very heart of the great city of New York Mr. Buckley was just as interested in soil conservation, water conservation, recreation, and development throughout the Nation as in the development of his own district. This Nation is a better country and the cause of freedom more secure because of the service to his fellow countryman of this great American. Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Buckley, to his wonderful family, and to his people, whom he served so ably and well.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a man who served his God, his country, and his constituents to the best of his ability. To all of these he was loyal and devoted. I refer to our late colleague Charles A. Buckley, who served as a Member from New York in the House of Representatives for 30 long, long years.

His devotion to God, to his country, and to his constituents was well known. His devotion to his family and friends was of equal renown. Last night I joined with his many friends in paying my last respects to him and at that time, I expressed my sympathy to his devoted wife, son, and daughter. There were thousands of mourners at the funeral home. This carried evidence of the fact that he was good to many, many people. His goodness was challenged by some, but—like many others—the challengers often did not understand the man.

Charles Buckley, it is true, was strong willed and determined. He expressed these qualities in his efforts to seek the objectives in which he believed, and which were the culmination of his just judgments. Right or wrong, Charles Buckley was a devoted member of the Democratic Party. Is there anything wrong with this when our forefathers based the system of our Government on a party system? He was a political strategist who had great concern for the common good which he felt was the standard of all worthy politicians. Among the mourners who surrounded him last night were many whom he assisted in public service because of their merit and the devotion to their country and party.

As the national committeewoman of the Democratic Party, I add—to my personal tribute—a tribute to him as a loyal leader of the Democratic Party of the State of New York. We will miss our friend—Charles A. Buckley.

Even the New York Times had to give the late Charles A. Buckley a few words of praise, but those few words sum up the tribute that we owe to the man whose passing we mourn today. He earned a coveted reputation, said the editorial in today's Times:

> He was loyal and he kept his word.

He had a natural aptitude for politics and came to positions of party leadership early in life. When he was only a 21-year-old, a district captain, he formed a political club in the Bronx. Soon he was a precinct captain, then a Democratic county committeeman. When he was only 26 he was elected an alderman of the city of New York.

In 1953 he became the Democratic leader of the Bronx.

He won his congressional seat in 1934 and remained in the House of Representatives until 1964. His long service in the House brought him to the chairmanship of the Public Works Committee. He was credited with obtaining for New York City and the State of New York no less than 255 projects for the construction of Federal buildings, rivers and harbor improvements, highways, and other useful and necessary undertakings. Yet in his roll of Public Works Committee chairman he never discriminated against other parts of the country.

He was outspoken in a way that is not often encountered nowadays, and once laid down the challenge:

> I'd like to have you point out one item that Buckley put through for New York that could be called Pork-Barrel Legislation. I think we might as well spend money in this country as give it to countries all over the world that turn out to be ingrates.

On another occasion, when asked why he raised horses he replied that at least when he took good care of them they did not talk back to him. Outspokenness like his will be missed in a day when public relations have become a matter of casting spells and creating images.

He was extremely helpful to me as a fellow member of the New York congressional delegation. I feel genuine grief at his passing.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

It was indeed a sad announcement that I heard the gentleman from New York make this morning. Until that time I was unaware of the loss of a friend of mine. I did consider him a friend. He was a controversial figure, but most men who render great service, and who take strong points of view are controversial figures.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a tribute indeed to the man himself, when one considers that he served for 30 years in the Congress of this country—during 30 years of very turbulent times.

Mr. Speaker, we in Texas have had the privilege of having his charming daughter and family reside in the city of Houston. They are a great asset to their community.

I wish to join the gentleman from New York and our other colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy to the family of the great late Charles Buckley.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I yield to our distinguished whip, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my many colleagues in expressing my deep regret at the passing of our late distinguished former Member of this body.

Charlie Buckley was a straightforward man. He was a man who stood by those things in which he fervently believed. He was a man whose position was always well known on every issue. He always sought to uphold the dedication which he had to this body, to his country, and to his party. I found in the years that I served here with him that he was invariably on the side of progress. In his magnificent work on the Committee on Public Works, he was the architect of such programs as the vast Interstate Highway System, land reclamation, flood control, navigation, beach erosion prevention, hurricane protection, and countless other programs of inestimable value to all of the people of our country.

The State of New York has indeed lost one of its great leaders and our country has suffered that loss as well.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Boggs and I extend to his devoted family our sincere sympathy.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the tribute that the gentleman from New York is paying to our distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Charles Buckley.

The House Committee on Public Works was headed for many years by Charles Buckley. I had the opportunity of serving with him on that committee and observing the fine qualities of leadership which he brought to that position as chairman of the committee.

He was a keen judge of men. I think his judgment in that respect is demonstrated by the fine members of the staff

of that committee who were brought to the service of the House of Representatives by Charles Buckley.

As chairman he played a major role in some of the great legislative developments of this century.

Our rivers and harbors, our highways, our public buildings were substantially improved during his period of service as chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

He was not a grandstander—he was not a man looking for headlines in connection with different pieces of legislation which were handled by the House of Representatives during the period of his chairmanship of the great Committee on Public Works. He was a man who preferred to work behind the scenes advancing legislation which was solid and constructive and progressive.

I think this was his trademark as a member of the House Committee on Public Works and as its leader.

He was an effective and able leader of men—a loyal and dependable friend and a man whose word was his bond.

Mr. Speaker, my deepest sympathy is extended to his beloved wife and to his family in their great loss.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Charlie Buckley and I were very close to each other. Our friendship was very deep and intense—a sincere friendship and, yes, a permanent one.

Charlie Buckley was one of those rare men you meet in the journey of life who took advantage of the opportunities in America and who against great difficulties went ahead and succeeded.

He was a man with an understanding mind—a man with an intense love of his fellow man. He was a man who always wanted to help someone else—a man who was always trying to do something good. He was a man of rough exterior—and some people misinterpreted that—but he was a man who was warm in his feelings toward his fellow human beings. This was particularly evident on many occasions where the sick, the afflicted, the poor, and the underprivileged were involved.

Charlie Buckley possessed a quality of loyalty that is indeed rare. How often is that quality lacking in the world of today as we encounter evidences of lack of loyalty in the minds of some people?

Charlie Buckley was loyal to his friends, to his district, to his party, and to our country. Loyalty is always modern. It was only in the minds of some who do not appreciate or understand the meaning and significance of loyalty who thought that a man like Charlie Buckley was old fashioned. Because one who is loyal to his friends and loyal to those things that he believes in and stands for is always modern.

Charlie Buckley served for 30 years approximately in this great legislative body. He was always present on important votes—and we had many tight votes—on important progressive legislation during the years he served. On progressive legislation he had a favorable 100-percent voting record going back to the Roosevelt days.

Mr. Buckley has left a heritage in that respect that Mrs. Buckley and her loved ones can well be proud of. It was his sense of loyalty to the things he believed in and to his friends that endeared him in the minds of those who knew the meaning and significance of loyalty.

Charlie Buckley will always be remembered not only for the other wonderful traits he possessed but particularly for that strong and intense feeling of loyalty of which he was possessed.

Charlie Buckley was also a man of deep faith. He lived by the spiritual truths in which he believed. He never did so for the purpose of attracting attention, but out of a deep sense of belief in the spiritual truths that actuated his mind and his life.

So we are talking about a human being who took the journey of life and who is now dead. He had his friends and he had his enemies. I think he will be well remembered for the friends he had rather than his enemies. I am inclined to believe that if those who opposed him bitterly had only paused for a moment and thought about Charlie Buckley and what he stood for, they would have felt entirely different toward him.

In any event, Charlie Buckley was admired and respected by his colleagues in this body. I admired him very much and entertained for him a strong feeling of friendship. I extend to Mrs. Buckley and her loved ones my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. GILBERT. I thank my distinguished Speaker.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, my colleague [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York. It was in the very early days of the 20 years it has been my privilege, honor, and responsibility to serve on the House Public Works Committee I got to know Mr. Buckley, and later came to know him extremely well.

At the outset I felt he was a rather contradictory person. On the surface he looked gruff; he even sounded gruff. His was certainly not the demeanor that would encourage familiarity on the part of a freshman, a relatively junior member of that committee. But it did not take us young men very long to realize that here was a man of tremendous understanding, with deep insight and a warm heart. He was always ready to extend a helping hand.

Interestingly enough we found him to be a shy man, a fact that may seem hard to believe in view of some of the publicity that focused on him later on.

As our relationships continued, he became chairman of that important committee. We found that inevitably his judgment on fundamental issues was the right one, and that after listening to his aids and lieutenants, to senior Members of the House and the leadership, and consulting with the President, when Mr. Buckley gave the green light and determined a course of action, it was "All systems A-OK; go ahead."

He did, of course, make a tremendous contribution to his own State, and justifiably so, because he came from one of the most populous, and perhaps wealthiest, States of the Union. Programs he sponsored certainly improved New York Harbor and the Hudson River, among others.

Nationwide we can scarcely point to a major watershed or public works area in the entire United States where we will not find the imprint—and a large print—of Chairman Buckley, because it was his belief that any undertaking that helped any part of the country in any way at all—that contributed, by proper utilization, to the upgrading of the public resources and facilities of that area—contributed in turn across the board to the general upgrading of the United States as a whole.

For example, he was one of the first to support the St. Lawrence Seaway, at a time when it was not politically advisable or expedient for him to do so, when perhaps on a parochial or regional basis he should have opposed it. He brought to reality, under a Republican administration, one of the largest waterway systems of the world on the seacoast of the United States. He initiated the straightening out of the Mississippi Delta in the South, helping those in Minnesota, where the Mississippi begins and those in the South where it terminates, as well as those in the Ohio and the Missouri Basin areas that feed the Mississippi. He helped with projects for the west coast, for the Southwest, throughout the New England area, the Great Lakes area which I have mentioned, the gulf coast in Florida, the southeast coast, Sea Island, Ga.—name it, and we will see the footprints and fingerprints of a man who knew his job and who was dedicated, who had a sense of conviction and duty and who did his job in a most modest and phlegmatic way.

He was not a talker. I remember the scarcely two or three speeches, very brief ones, that he ever made in the well of this House. Equally seldom did he speak in the committee. But he was a doer. Thinking back to the many conferences we had on the monumental undertakings of our time, I can recall so vividly his leading role in the restoration of the entire White House, the extension of the east front of the Capitol, the St. Lawrence Seaway which I have already mentioned, the Great Lakes channels and harbors, river improvements and flood control projects, irrigation, and the Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. Buckley's truly great, courageous, and visionary leadership was never more effectively demonstrated than in the development of the Niagara Falls power project. At a time when a majority of Members on both sides of the House had honest doubts that perhaps this was only a local issue, Mr. Buckley could see the need for a public facility for future generations and he gave it his full go ahead, a full green light. Though it was twice defeated in committee he reopened the issue yet a third time, and his thoughtful and considerate but firm and persistent manner he persuasively advocated the proposal and by one single vote it passed that committee. Today the Niagara Falls power project is one of the

most popular and widely supported public programs in the United States, holding tremendous significance not only for the State of New York but for the entire power-starved New England area.

He was dedicated to Long Island, and to the resolution of that area's problems, among which was the ocean's merciless gnawing away of the beaches. Out of this concern came his leadership in initiating beach erosion projects as part of the rivers and harbors program. These projects are now universally supported by both parties, and recognized as a valuable and necessary part of our public works facilities.

When we came to consider programs for the more than 1,200 distressed areas throughout the United States, this so-called big-city man, a big contractor, a millionaire—although one would never guess it by looking at him—understood the problems and responded with great feeling and determination, leading the fight to bring hope to the disadvantaged of America. He realized and remembered what it meant to be poor, and up to the very closing months of his great tenure in Congress he was concerned about people in need, no matter who they were or from where they came.

Nor did Mr. Buckley shirk when he served on the New York City Council, back in earlier years, and through his great skill and ability became one of the lieutenants of that bright shining star, the then Governor of New York, Roosevelt, who later became our beloved F.D.R., President of the United States.

I am truly privileged, and frankly deeply moved, to be permitted to join the delegation from New York, our Speaker, and Mr. Buckley's many, many friends in paying tribute to a great American.

To his widow, to his daughter, and to his family I extend my heartfelt condolences.

Mr. GILBERT. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] for yielding to me at this time so that I may briefly but nonetheless sincerely express my sympathy to Mrs. Buckley and their son and daughter on the passing of our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Charles A. Buckley, of New York.

Charley Buckley has been very accurately described here on the floor this afternoon in the many beautiful eulogies. As has been pointed out the outstanding thing about Charley Buckley was that he was a man whose word literally was his bond. Today, it is sad to note, this is a tribute not held by so many as it was in the years gone by.

Charley Buckley had the respect of every Member of this House, and as chairman of the great House Committee on Public Works he carved a niche for himself in the history of the United States insofar as many and highly important public works and public improvements are concerned.

When he passed away last Sunday, New York City lost one of her great men who for 30 years was a Member of this body. And for those 30 years he was, to many of us, New York City personified—hard and cutting when need be, warm and affectionate if given the chance, and always loyal. We, his friends, will sorely miss him as will our city, State, and Nation.

My heart goes out to Mrs. Buckley. I well remember the time, in the House Public Works Committee room, with Mrs. Buckley present, there was unveiled a beautiful oil painting of her husband.

I extend my deepest sympathy and prayers upon the passing of my friend Charles Buckley.

Mr. GILBERT. I thank my colleague.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of our former colleague from the 23d Congressional District of New York, Charles A. Buckley, a man who could rightfully and truthfully be called a diamond in the rough.

In certain political circles and appearances, Charlie probably would have been considered rough and tough, but he also had a great love of the arts and was a great lover of nature and animals, being one of the foremost breeders of trotting horses in the country. He always spoke lovingly of his horses and his farm. His brilliance was also shown through his great foresight, for he shall long be remembered as the man who first saw greatness in our beloved President, John F. Kennedy, being one of the prime movers of President Kennedy's candidacy.

There are living memorials to Charlie Buckley's foresight in the great public works he has given to this Nation during his chairmanship of the great Committee on Public Works. New York City and New York State, as well as many other States and cities, are better places in which to live because of the foresight of Charlie Buckley in giving life to new roads, new waterways, and other public works projects.

I shall long remember Charles Buckley, and I think history will also remember him. Mrs. Addabbo and I extend to his wife and family our deepest sorrow and prayers for their comfort in their and the Nation's great loss.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Charles A. Buckley, of New York, a former U.S. Representative who, as we all know, served for many years as chairman of our House Public Works Committee.

While I had occasion to differ with him politically and on many issues of the day, Charles Buckley was my friend and I cherish his memory. He served his Bronx constituency well. He was a strong personality, a man of conviction and integrity. The political history of the day will reserve for him a large place, and rightly so.

I have always prized individuality. Each Member of the House is unique in his own way, and stamps our institution and its procedures with his personal style and outlook. Charles Buckley was no exception.

I wish to extend my profound sympathy to the family of our late colleague. Our words, of course, cannot assuage their sorrow, nor fill the void he leaves. I value Charles Buckley's service in the House, to New York, and the Nation at large.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it was with sad hearts that we learned of the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable Charles Buckley.

For a period of some 10 years, I had the privilege of serving under Mr. Buckley while he was chairman of the House Committee on Public Works.

He was consistently fair and considerate of his colleagues in every way, helpful to me and to others who worked together with him on the committee, and uniformly devoted to his principles of right and wrong.

With his passing from the American political scene, we mark now an almost complete transformation in the mores and habits of American politics.

Charles Buckley was of the old school. The Bronx of New York was his love, and toward it he felt a special kind of responsibility. The sidewalks of New York produce a vastly different political environment than the plains of Texas, and in the days when Charles Buckley first began as a practitioner of the democratic arts, that environment was much different than it is today.

One of the rich and rewarding experiences of serving in the Congress is the knowledge which one slowly gains of the vast panorama of the American scene which, even with its marked and vivid contrasts, produces an amalgam, an alloy which is stronger and more resilient than any of the metals we individually pour into the caldron.

Through my association with Charles Buckley, I have been enriched, as many others from my general environmental origins have been, to discover that beneath the superficial differences in style and mode of practice, there pulsates a sameness in love of country and devotion to its weal.

Charles Buckley truly loved America. He loved his State, and he loved the Bronx. His life, like a thread woven into a fabric, is part and parcel of its tradition, inseparable from its history and integral to its future.

To his survivors, we would express as best our inadequate words can our sorrow at his passing, our sympathy for them in their bereavement, and our gratitude for the privilege of having known and worked with him in the constructive works over which he presided in this continuing job of building the public infrastructure of the Nation.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the local press of New York City reports an outpouring of grief, affection, and admiration by many thousands of persons at the passing of our former colleague Charles A. Buckley, of the Bronx. Even there surprise is evident because these many thousands of men, women, and children stand in line to pay last tribute to a fallen leader, but more so to an engaging personality and a genuine benefactor to uncounted numbers of citizens.

In an era that tends to suppress individualism and puts a premium on conformity to some questionable standards, Charles A. Buckley reared above the horizon in public life for 57 years. He became a public figure, simply by being him-

self, honest, outspoken, forthright, and proudly proclaiming himself a politician. The man simply refused to use language to cover meaning. Charley Buckley was a man who did things, but he never shied away from explaining in colorful, forceful words why he did them. Such a phenomena in our day was bound to attract critics.

It is not known now, and I doubt if it ever was here in Washington what a power for good, Charley Buckley was in New York City. He was a politician of the old school, which meant that the two offices he maintained in his Bronx district, opened their doors early in the day and remained open until late at night, until the last person seeking some kind of help was gone. It was not alone those who wanted help in some dealings with governmental bureaus, but the poor, the deprived, and the bewildered who came for counsel and often some ready cash.

The best his critics could come up with is that it paid off in votes. It certainly did, but is not there a place in politics for simple gratitude? Nobody can deny that New Yorkers are among the most astute and politically aware among our national electorate. To those of his Bronx district he was "Charley" to all of them and they returned him to this House for 14 terms. Some called him "The Boss," in his completely honest fashion he admitted he was and he was admired for his candor.

I spent many years as a coworker with Charley Buckley on the Public Works Committee and served under him as its chairman. From his private life and business he brought to this Congress a wealth of practical knowledge and experience which carried over into public affairs. He was an expert in construction of all types, real estate, insurance, and transportation, which made him especially qualified for membership and his later chairmanship of our committee. He pioneered in effecting great public works everywhere and these are monuments to his memory.

But he has a greater memorial in the affections of hundreds of thousands in his own New York City, who really knew the man and loved him. It may surprise some that this affection is now being revealed in last rites for a great and good man, but not us here who discovered that the affection we gave him was well placed.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad privilege to join our colleagues in expressing our grief upon the passing of our most able and distinguished former colleague, Charles A. Buckley.

I was happy to number Charlie as one of my dear and longtime friends. He served his city, State, and Nation long and well. His hallmark was loyalty—loyalty to God, to country, to family, and friends—in fact to all mankind. His word was his bond. He was never a doubletalker. If he did not agree with you, you knew it very quickly. If he pledged you his support, you could bank on it. His loyalty was exceeded only by his love for his family.

Charlie will be missed by all who knew him but most of all by his loved ones. I join our colleagues in extending to his wife, Marie, and to his children and grandchildren my heartfelt sympathy.

May his memory be for a blessing forever.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing profound sorrow at the loss of my good friend, Charley Buckley, with whom many of us were privileged to serve in this House.

I knew Charley for over a quarter of a century, and was always greatly impressed by one of his most outstanding virtues, which shone like a beacon in the often cynical world of politics: his word was his bond.

Although he achieved a large measure of success in the business world, he worked longest and hardest in mastering the art of politics. He was recognized as a professional in an era of amateurs, and attracted a large and loyal group of supporters who sent him to represent his constituency in Congress for 30 years. Historically, it is likely that he will longest be remembered as one of the three or four men most responsible for the election of one of this Nation's greatest Presidents, John F. Kennedy.

We have lost a good friend, an able legislator, and a great politician of the old school. An age passes with him. I join his many, many friends in expressing sentiments of deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in the House and particularly those of us who had the honor of serving with Charlie Buckley, the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, from New York, in paying our deepest respect at his passing. Charlie Buckley was a kind and gentle man. Although he wielded great political power, he was always ready, willing, and able to sit down and talk to any Member about their problems. All of us who knew this great man from the Bronx, will indeed miss him, and I want to join my colleagues in expressing our deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in honoring the memory of a departed former Member of the New York State delegation to the House of Representatives. While I served but one Congress, the 88th, in the company of Mr. Buckley, I always have been aware of his prominent role in politics and government. He made his mark not only by dint of his position as a Congressman and political leader, but also in terms of the countless public works projects that he helped to nurture and which now are providing benefits across the length and breadth of our Nation. To his family, I extend my sincere sympathy in their hour of loss.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know Charles A. Buckley, of New York, from the first day I became a Member of this body. I knew him as a distinguished colleague, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works and as a dear and close personal friend. Charles A. Buckley was an unusual man. There was no pretense about Charlie Buckley. One always knew where he stood with him. He was a man of his word, a man who got things done, a man who stood on the side of his friends and worked vigorously throughout his long and illustrious political career for what he believed was right. For many years in the Committee on Public Works, I worked shoulder to shoulder with Charley Buckley and I am proud to say that serving with him, the Committee on Public Works created one of the greatest records of accomplishment in the history of the Congress of the United States. The long list of achievements that can be credited to the chairmanship of Charlie Buckley, the highways that were built, the dams constructed, the polluted rivers cleaned up, the public buildings erected, the economic aid through public works given to our needy citizens throughout the country are a real memorial to his work as a Member of the Congress. He was a man whose like we shall not see again. His accomplishments are many but I think his greatest accomplishment is the fact that on this day through all sections of this great country from the Nation's Capital to the streets of New York all of us who knew him mourn most sincerely and deeply one we could call a true friend and, above all, a man in the real sense of the word.

May I on behalf of Mrs. Fallon and myself and his colleagues on both sides of the aisle of the Committee on Public Works who knew him, extend to Mrs. Buckley and his children our heartfelt sympathy on his passing.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress were saddened when they learned of the death of their former colleague, the Honorable Charles A. Buckley, of New York, who served his State and the Nation so ably from the 74th Congress through the 88th Congress.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I was helped greatly by this able Representative because my first committee assignment was to the Committee on Public Works, under the chairmanship of Mr. Buckley. Through his leadership and his guidance I learned the ins and outs of committee procedures, at the Federal level.

With his knowledge of operations and techniques in construction and real estate, Mr. Buckley as a member of the House Public Works Committee is credited with bringing order out of chaos in the consideration of legislation which guided the vast programs of public works, including private housing, which were launched under the New Deal. This was possible because he was able to discuss with builders and contractors the pending projects in their own terms and language. No problem was too great or too small for him to be concerned with and at all times he was considerate of and helpful to the members of his committee and his colleagues.

Congressman Buckley as chairman of the Committee on Public Works always took a great interest in the problems of California and especially as they related to flood control development and I was proud to serve with him at a time when the committee and the Congress recommended construction of the New Melones project which now is actually being funded. California is indeed deeply indebted to Chairman Buckley for the enlightened flood control program which was developed and authorized under his leadership.

Chairman Buckley's interest and ef-

forts, of course, were extended to all types of public works and included one which is of tremendous value to California's national forest areas. This relates to the roads and trails program. Through the leadership and encouragement of Chairman Buckley we on the Public Works Committee were successful in correcting a very serious deficiency in this area and I am very pleased to say that this legislation was accepted and the road and trail development has broadened into a major program which is returning substantial dividends to the Nation.

The Nation and the State of New York have suffered a great loss, as have all of us who were privileged to serve with him in the Congress of the United States. He may have left us but his memory will linger on in the many fine programs which he sponsored and worked for during his long years of service. These are living memorials to a great man.

To the family of this dedicated servant of the people, Mrs. Johnson and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, soon after my coming to the Congress my acquaintance with the Honorable Charles A. Buckley commenced and it ripened into a close and treasured friendship. I have missed our frequent chats together since his retirement from the House and now that he has gone and those times of warm companionship have passed forever mine is a poignant realization of the void.

Charlie Buckley and the late beloved Tom O'Brien of Chicago were of the same mold. Neither ever broke his word or forgave when another had broken his word to him. Loyalty was the creed of Charlie Buckley as it was the creed of Tom O'Brien as well as of other leaders of a colorful political era, now closing, during which America marched forward. Loyalty to party and loyalty to friend, such as Charlie Buckley and Tom O'Brien and their kind practiced, surely are not the least of the virtues in a democratic society.

To the loved ones of Charlie Buckley go my deep sympathy.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from New York and I mourn the loss of the late and beloved Charles A. Buckley, who for 30 years served in this House as a Representative from New York's 23d District. He served with distinction representing not only his constituents most ably but guided the Public Works Committee as its chairman.

One of his longtime friends and associates, Mr. John Hagan, has written a very fine letter about the Honorable Charles Buckley, and I wish to call it to the attention of my distinguished colleagues by having it inserted in the RECORD.

HAGAN PAYS TRIBUTE TO CHARLES BUCKLEY

Hon. LESTER L. WOLFF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLFF: I know that you, just as I, received the sad news of the death of a longtime friend and associate, the Honorable Charles Buckley, who for 30 years represented the good people of New York's 23d District.

Through his efforts our harbors, our waterways, parks and beaches, have been improved; we have the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Niagara power project, and Hudson River improvements, the Major Deegan Expressway and New England Thruway. He worked hard for these and many, many more projects which benefited not only the citizens of New York but all Americans.

Charley was a truly loyal and dedicated American. His loss is mourned, and his family has my deepest sympathy.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. HAGAN.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I read with great sadness of the passing of our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Charles A. Buckley.

It was my distinct personal privilege to be able to serve with Congressman Buckley on the House Committee on Public Works for several years.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Works for 12 years, Charles A. Buckley earned the gratitude and respect of all the people of this Nation by his sincere and devoted interest in the building and development of all sections of the country.

He very ably represented a district from New York City, but his outlook and his energies were directed toward a better and stronger United States.

Through his chairmanship of the Committee on Public Works, he was responsible for an impressive array of vital Government activities.

He was sincerely interested in and worked to promote improvement of the Nation's rivers and harbors for the benefit of all the people.

He took a special interest in flood control projects which protect the life and property of people in our vast river basins. These projects also provided hydroelectric power and recreation benefits throughout the land.

Mr. Buckley showed great concern for the multibillion-dollar Federal highway program and through his leadership the Committee on Public Works authorized the 41,000-mile Interstate System—the greatest single public works program in the history of the world—which will link all our major cities when completed. This program provided billions of dollars into our economy at a time of need and has provided jobs for untold numbers of men in all sections of the country. It has also revitalized the vast automobile industry and its companion industries such as steel, concrete, asphalt, and rubber.

Charles Buckley showed a special interest in my section of the country—a thousand miles from his home in New York. He was forceful in his leadership for the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority which has continued to bring prosperity to the Tennessee Valley and has been essential in providing electric power for our great space center at Redstone Arsenal in Huntsville, Ala., as well as for new and developing industries from one end of the valley to the other.

His concern and leadership was also responsible for developing a program to prevent beach erosion and create thousands of new beaches along our Nation's coastline.

A detailed account of the vital work of Charles A. Buckley for the development of his country would require pages. He exhibited foresight and determination in presenting innumerable worthwhile improvements throughout the country.

For this, Americans in all States owe Mr. Buckley a large debt of gratitude.

We will continue to benefit from his leadership and direction for years to come.

It was a great personal privilege for me to be able to know Charles A. Buckley and to serve with him on the Committee on Public Works.

My deepest sympathies go out to his family in this time of their great loss.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life and service of the Honorable Charles A. Buckley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A RESPONSIBLE SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE PROPOSAL

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill designed to promote a positive, responsible approach to the immediate needs of our elderly citizens through an increase in social security payments by 8 percent, and provision for an automatic increase in the future in relation to the rise in the cost of living.

This is not the first evidence of concern over the impact of inflation upon elderly citizens, either by myself or by other Republicans. Last year, together with more than 60 Republican House Members, I introduced a bill which would have provided for automatic increases in social security benefits in accordance with the rising cost of living. A 3-percent increase in the price index, reviewed quarterly, would automatically raise social security benefits. It is significant to note that had this bill been enacted last year, these increases would have already been triggered into action. Since passage of the last social security increase in 1965, the Consumer Price Index has shot up by 5.3 percent. Yet the administration prevented action on my bill, and on other Republican efforts last fall to provide additional social security benefits.

Instead, the President contented himself with making a suggestion last October of a 10-percent increase that would not go into effect until 1968. Under the pressure of a concerned Republican minority in Congress, the President has now upped the figure to 20 percent in his state of the Union message; a figure repeated in his message on older Americans yesterday. To finance this proposal, which he suggests should go into

effect on July 1 of this year, he asks for an increase in the amount of annual earnings used as a base for the tax up to $10,800 in 1974 and an increase in the scheduled tax rate itself. Neither the income base nor the higher rate, however, will go into effect before 1968 or 1969.

Social security taxes already are scheduled to go up this year by 11.3 percent. It is my understanding that preliminary estimates by the House Ways and Means Committee staff indicate a tax rate of more than 14 percent and an increase in the tax base to $9,000 or more immediately, to finance the President's proposal. This is in contrast to the President's approach. It should also be remembered that a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Kennedy, testified during the 88th Congress and seriously questioned the wisdom of increasing social security taxes over the 10-percent level.

The need of our elderly is immediate. Nevertheless, this does not excuse Congress or the administration from taking a reasoned and deliberate look at the financing necessary for the President's proposal. Based on information previously furnished by the chief actuary of the Social Security Administration, it is possible to have an immediate 8-percent increase in benefits without any need for increased taxes.

My proposal, therefore, has several advantages. Its enactment need not be delayed pending a study of the financing of it, since no new taxes would be needed. The automatic increase provision would protect the elderly against future inflationary excesses, a problem the President has repeatedly ignored. At the same time, its enactment would provide Congress with the time to give measured consideration to the President's proposal and the means to finance it. We have reached a point in the history of the social security system where calm deliberation, not politically expedient action, is necessary to preserve the soundness of the system, meet the needs of our elderly citizens, and avoid undue impact on the tax levels of our younger citizens who are paying the bill.

Similar legislation has already been introduced by the ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, my Republican colleague from Wisconsin, Representative JOHN BYRNES, who is an acknowledged expert in this field. The provision on cost-of-living increases is patterned after similar provisions already contained in the civil service and military retirement laws. There can be no doubt of its practicality. I hope that such legislation will be the first order of business for the committee this year.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, to provide a means of improving the structure and procedures of the Congress, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 52, which would extend the life of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

Congressional reform is needed. Modernization has come to nearly every place in our society except the Halls of Congress. The volume of legislation has greatly increased in recent years; the number of constituents each of us serves is growing rapidly; and the Federal bureaucracy over which we must exercise legislative oversight and review is expanding even more rapidly. Only by the temporary continuation of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress will we be able to achieve passage of the needed reforms which developed from the joint committee's work during the 89th Congress.

I join with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] in urging prompt passage of this resolution.

CONSCRIPTION AND COMMITMENT

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the existing Selective Service System is defective in many respects. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], and I have sponsored a proposal to create a joint committee to consider all methods of meeting U.S. military manpower requirements. I believe that the study of the feasibility of a voluntary system by the proposed joint committee may prove fruitful, and could result in major changes in the present Selective Service System.

The following article concerning the draft, which was authored by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, discusses this important question:

CONSCRIPTION AND COMMITMENT

(Article by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS)

The American Military Establishment is blessed with a vast array of the most sophisticated weapons that the world has ever seen, yet it persists in processing its most important weapon—manpower—through a system that has proved itself inefficient, inequitable and undemocratic.

The draft, with its 4061 local and autonomous draft boards and its antiquated machinery, is an anachronism in the Cold War era, a relic of an earlier time when vast quantities of raw manpower were thrown onto the battlefields of Europe and Asia to overcome by their very numbers the killing power of cannon, machine gun and tank. In the age of the skilled technician, the Armed Forces of the United States still rely on the Selective Service System, a World War Two expedient, to supply them with bewildered, untrained, often poorly educated youth. Immune to technological change and changing population structure, the draft has become the weakest link in our national security system and an unnecessary burden on our society. It is within our means to eliminate compulsory military service; that we have not done so, or begun to do so, is an announcement of our failure to adapt to the changing conditions of modern society.

Criticism of the draft, from parents, students, educators, civil rights workers, veterans' organizations and Congressmen, has reached crisis proportions in recent months; but the symptoms of obsolescence appeared long ago. The population explosion, which has affected every facet of our society, has taken its toll on the Selective Service System as well. The number of draft-eligible young men has grown from about 20,000,000 in 1951, when the present system went into effect, to 39,000,000 today, an increase of 95 percent. As a result, the proportion of men who are actually called upon to serve has declined sharply—from 70 percent in 1958 to 46 percent today. Assuming normal peacetime military strengths, it will drop to about 34 percent by 1974. Thus, many more men are allowed to escape from service altogether, and those compelled to serve feel they are being screwed by an uncaring, invisible and often unapproachable bureaucracy that calls itself "selective" but usually isn't.

The two major sources of the inequities that plague the draft are this failure to realize the effect of the manpower boom and the almost total autonomy of the local boards. Manpower procurement is a national problem; the supply of skilled manpower is limited and must be carefully allocated between the military and our booming civilian economy. Yet local boards, usually manned by "patriotic" retired veterans, see the problem only from the narrow perspective of their often idealized military experience and their often capricious assessment of national needs and priorities. The national Selective Service headquarters has attempted to promulgate some vaguely defined standards for classification and deferment, but these standards are merely advisory, and the local boards can ignore them, modify them or interpret them as they see fit.

As a result, deferments are not granted on the basis of equity but on the degree of pressure placed on the boards by Defense Department demands for manpower. When draft calls were low, as they were before the current build-up for the war in Vietnam, deferments were easy to come by. A man taking one night course was given a "student deferment"; married men were deferred across the board by Presidential order; and "occupational" deferments were liberally handed out to anyone who could claim even a faint relationship with the national security program. Today, with calls nearly at the Korean War level—46,200 for last October—standards for deferment have been reduced until the squeeze has been felt by the student, the father and the less-educated, who were previously placed low on the priority list. Many who thought they were free from the draft's reach now find their lives disrupted.

Loosely drawn standards and local autonomy produce widely varying interpretations of Selective Service regulations. One worker at a St. Louis defense plant is drafted, while his working partner, registered with a New Jersey board, receives an occupational deferment. A farmer, whose father is totally blind and whose mother supports a family of five on $350 a month, is drafted—while a Hollywood actor receives a "hardship" deferment on his $200,000 annual income. The cases are legion.

In addition, where one lives is often more important than what one does, because draft calls are distributed among the states on the basis of the number of men actually classified 1-A, not on the number of potential draftees. Thus, Michigan, with 4.2 percent of the nation's draft-eligible men, was called upon to supply 17,006 draftees in the first six months of 1966, while Texas, with 5.4 percent of the potential draftees, was tapped for only 14,990 men, according to figures ob-

tained by Michigan Senator Robert Griffin. Obviously, Michigan draft boards are more conscientious in classifying registrants, and its young men are thus unwillingly more "patriotic" than their Texas colleagues.

Many of the problems created by local autonomy could be alleviated by automating Selective Service procedures and centralizing the selection process; but Lewis B. Hershey, the glib, folksy retired Army general who has headed Selective Service since the 1930s, refuses to trust the computer. He was willing to put up with the mistakes of the local board, he told the House Armed Services Committee last June. Despite the disparity in draft-board criteria and the paper log jams that kept 522,472 men out of 641,958 in the 1-A pool unavailable in January 1966, because their records were not processed. General Hershey insists that computers have no "compassion." For the married man or graduate student who was forced into uniform because his draft board had too many men in this "paper mill," Hershey's words have an ironic ring.

An oft-heard charge that the draft is racially and economically discriminating comes from the Negroes and the poverty-stricken, who see the wealthy (and usually white) and college-educated deferred while the poor are drafted. This argument, however, is not entirely supported by the facts, which show that 56 percent of the men who have attended college eventually see service, while only 46 percent of noncollege men serve (Selective Service statistics, June 1966). Noncollege men have a far higher rejection rate for mental and physical reasons than college men and thus are more likely to be exempted from the draft altogether.

The charge that Negroes are drafted at a higher rate than whites is also unsubstantiated. While it is true that there is a higher proportion of Negroes in the Army—14 percent as opposed to a Negro population of 11.7 percent nationally—this is due to the higher enlistment rates among Negroes, who see more job and educational opportunities in the military than they can find in civilian life. The re-enlistment rate for Negroes in the Army is 49.3 percent, compared with an 18.5 percent rate for whites. Advocates of the racial-discrimination argument point to Selective Service statistics that show that 13.4 percent of inductees in May 1966 were nonwhite—a higher percentage than their proportion in the national population—to document their charges. But the statistics fluctuate; in June 1966, the nonwhite induction rate was down to 10.4 percent.

Last June, Representative William F. Ryan told the House Armed Services Committee that there were no Negroes on any draft boards in Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi, and revealed that one member of a New Orleans draft board was "the head of the local Ku Klux Klan." Despite this indication of possible discriminatory draft selection in the South, Ryan could not cite any figures that would show that Negroes were being drafted at a higher rate in the South than they were elsewhere.

However, draft standards, common to most local boards, that set a minimum of 15 hours of classroom study for the 2–S student deferment do discriminate against the young man who is forced to work his way through school. The part-time student, supporting a family and going to school at night, is not deferred; therefore, money does have its advantages in dealing with the Selective Service's college deferments. Also, the much-maligned College Qualification Test, a six-hour "comprehensive" examination given to over 1,000,000 college students last spring as a "guide" to local boards in granting 2–S deferments, is slanted toward the scientific-minded student. General Hershey admits that science and mathematics students would have an advantage on the tests because questions in these fields "are easier to grade." Combined with a rank-in-class standard, which gives the student at a poorer-quality school an advantage over his intellectual equal—or superior—at one of the more prestigious schools, the College Classification Test must be rated a farce, a farce that is denounced by almost all of our nation's distinguished educators, including Yale's Kingman Brewster and Princeton's Robert Goheen. Brewster said the result of this deferment system had been "to encourage a cynical avoidance of service, a corruption of the aims of education and a tarnishing of the national spirit."

A group of 142 Midwestern university professors began a campaign last April "to discourage the use of the institutions of higher learning as instruments of the Selective Service System," and student sit-ins at Oberlin, the University of Chicago and City College of New York, among other places have dramatized the dissatisfaction of both students and faculty with the college-deferment system.

The social costs of the draft include far more than an inequitable distribution of the military obligation among our nation's youth. Professor John Kenneth Galbraith stated these social costs succinctly when he said, "The draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer, who benefits by lower taxes, to the impecunious young draftee. This is a highly regressive arrangement that we would not tolerate in any other area. Presumably, freedom of choice here as elsewhere would be worth paying for."

The draft has served as a crutch for the military services, a means of avoiding the development of sounder personnel policies. As Professor Galbraith states, the young draftee is forced to suffer relative poverty in order that the Army can procure cheap labor. Yet our modern Army requires specialists and technicians, not automatons with rifles; so the military services must then waste millions of dollars training these draftees in skills they will never use in later life and skills they will forget once their tour of duty is over.

Military pay in the lower grades is lower in the United States than in any of the other NATO powers, including those, such as France and West Germany, that have compulsory service. According to Bruce Chapman, whose book *The Wrong Man in Uniform* documents the case against the draft, an Army private's pay is "less than that of a peasant on a collective farm in Communist Rumania." A private E–1 in the United States makes approximately $90 a month—hardly enough to support himself, much less a wife and family, even considering allowances. With an increasingly lower average age for marriage in this country, it is not surprising that many married draftees are forced to depend on relief payments to support themselves. For example, in 1964, the Air Force alone found over 5000 cases of men who are receiving relief support. Such economic facts hardly encourage volunteering and certainly discourage re-enlistment.

Department of Defense figures reveal that only about 8 percent of draftees stay in the service and only 25 percent of first-term volunteers re-enlist. In 1964, the re-enlistment rate for inductees was down to 2.8 percent, and it has never been greater than 20 percent. Thus, approximately 80–95 percent of all the manpower obtained by the draft is temporary—and the skills of these men, which took about $6000 per draftee to develop, are wasted in the process. The cost, in wasted training and lost skills alone, is approximately $2.4 billion a year—for the privilege of depending on compulsion to secure manpower. This cost must be borne by Professor Galbraith's "well-to-do taxpayer"; it is the penalty we pay for our inefficient manpower-procurement system.

In addition, the draft ignores the basic changes that have occurred in the technology of war during the past two decades. Back in 1957, a report prepared by a "blue-ribbon" commission, headed by Ralph Cordiner, former president of General Electric, observed that "It is foolish for the Armed Services to obtain highly advanced weapons systems and not have men of sufficient competence to understand, operate and maintain such equipment. . . . The solution here, of course, is not to draft more men to stand and look helplessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the Armed Forces the incentives required to make them want to stay in the Service long enough and try hard enough to take these higher responsibilities, gain the skill and experience levels we need and then remain to give the Services the full benefit of their skills."

But it is precisely these skilled personnel who leave the military services for higher-paying, more satisfying jobs in civilian life. The Cordiner Report showed an inverse relationship between degree (and cost) of skills obtained and re-enlistment. "Reduced to its simplest terms," the Report stated, "the personnel problem appears to be a matter of quality as opposed to quantity." By relying on the draft, we have sacrificed quality for manpower and reduced the effectiveness of our military establishment.

This sacrifice becomes more obvious when we consider the misuse of skills and talents that permeates the current military, personnel policies. On August 30, 1962, Senator William Proxmire read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a study prepared by a former Army engineer that showed that "the effective utilized time of the enlisted scientists or engineer spent on work commensurate with his qualifications is ten percent." This waste of scientific talent was confirmed by the Army's Adjutant General's Office, and illustrates the inability of the military services to use civilian-trained skills in a system where 80–90 percent of college-trained men remain in service for only the minimum two to three years.

In addition, the military has a unique talent for trying to fit square pegs into round holes. A General Accounting Office study, noted by Senator Gaylord Nelson in 1964, revealed that at least 35,000 soldiers were employed in the wrong jobs, wasting some $48,000,000. Helicopter pilots were serving as dog handlers, and airplane mechanics as military policemen. The GAO described the Army's handling of men as a "personnel system that generates misassignments."

This talent drain can be more clearly seen if it is compared with the personnel policies of the Navy Seabees during World War Two. In the Seabees, it was the practice to take trained bulldozer operators, engineers and other skilled personnel and place them immediately in jobs with which they were familiar. This resulted in large savings in training time and costs—and encouraged enlistments, because the enlistee was guaranteed the opportunity to make use of his previous skills in a job he wished to perform. Unfortunately, even the Seabees have dropped this policy today.

Instead of utilizing the vast number of job-training programs available in the civilian sector, many of them financed by Federal funds under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the military establishment persists in maintaining duplicate training facilities. Even though 80 percent of military jobs are congruent with jobs in the civilian economy (according to the Department of Labor statistics), the Armed Forces continue to ignore the skilled civilian labor market in favor of untrained youths who can be "molded" into military material. These attitudes, products of the ingrained tradition of the free world's biggest bureaucracy, are motivating factors behind the military's

strong reluctance to consider alternatives to the draft.

The draft's inefficiency has equally profound effects on the civilian economy, effects that are often ignored by draft boards composed of retired veterans with little or no training in economics. The current military build-up in Vietnam has intensified these pressures, as revealed in a June 1966 survey in *Personnel Management—Policies and Practices*, a trade journal published by Prentice-Hall. The Prentice-Hall study of 192 American business firms showed that 35 percent of these firms faced serious employment shortages because of the draft. A large number of companies have initiated new job-training programs but now cannot find young workers to train. Even in peacetime, the draft constricts the labor supply by forcing many companies to restrict their hiring to men over 26, or men who have fulfilled their draft obligation. Thirty-nine percent of draftees between the ages of 22 and 25, reported the Department of Defense during the June House hearings, were refused jobs in the civilian economy because of their draft liability. Even when manpower is plentiful, the draft restricts hiring and contributes to unemployment in the draft-liable 20–26 age group.

The final area of military mismanagement and inefficiency that can be attributed to military reliance on the draft is the patent neglect of the Reserve and the National Guard. Originally established by Congress in 1955 to serve as a ready source of trained manpower in the event of a build-up, the Reserve has become a repository for overaged ex-Servicemen and young men seeking to avoid the draft. For the most part, Reserve units are untrained—a study prepared by the Governors' Advisory Committee on the National Guard indicated that 90,000 men, or 30 percent of the total strength of the Guard, had never received training. General Hershey stated to the Armed Services Committee in June that 50,000 Reservists were in "control units" and had never received training. The Army recently completed a program whereby selected Reserve units were given updated training in order to bring them to combat readiness. These Selected Reserve Force Units were produced by "a redistribution of the personnel and material resources of the remaining approximately 70 percent of the Army National Guard," said the Governors' Committee. To get a few Reserve units ready for call-up, the Army let all other Reserve and Guard units deteriorate.

There is a reason for this mess, and it again exemplifies the total lack of coordination between the military and the civilian sectors. In 1961, the Reserve was called up to meet the Berlin Wall crisis. The result was chaos in many communities; essential employees and fathers were called away from their jobs. The same situation would result today; for example, at Lambert Airport in St. Louis, many of the key employees are Reservists. A call-up would shut down this important military and civilian airport. The same deadly results would occur in many industries across the nation. Thus, the Reserve is relegated to the backwater of military planning, and the Army is content to draft and train 500,000 new men to fill its expanded rosters.

This long history of inept handling of men and inequitable distribution of the burden of military service should lead us to welcome and encourage moves to end the draft and work toward a modern, career military force. Such a force—sustained by volunteers through increased pay and other benefits—would have a higher morale, would be better trained and more able to meet immediate military threats to our security.

The essential elements of a career force would include the following:

1. Better pay, better housing and other benefits that would make military life comparable with civilian jobs employing the same skills.

2. Coordination between military and civilian sectors in the training and use of available manpower, including using civilian personnel in military jobs as much as possible and making full use of civilian training and educational establishments in producing military technicians, scientists and skilled workers.

3. Lowering physical standards where appropriate to utilize less than A–1 physical specimens in noncombat jobs.

4. Improving the capabilities of Reserve units so that they may serve as a means of retaining and maintaining needed skills for potential military usage, and coordinating Reserve organizations with the civilian society.

5. Revising the Uniform Code of Military Justice to include only those personnel engaged in combat or training for combat, and restricting its application to combat occupations.

These factors can produce a vastly different and—I would argue—superior military establishment. And yet they have never received the detailed study necessary to initiate them. The Defense Department, steeped in the traditional resistance to change that marks every bureaucratic establishment, stops short on the first point. The Department claims it would cost too much to rely entirely on volunteers. Its latest cost estimates—taken from a report offered by Assistant Defense Secretary Thomas D. Morris at the June draft hearing—range from 4 billion dollars to 17 billion dollars. However, the Department bases its figures, which are almost so vague as to be ridiculous, on its estimates of what it would cost to "hire" 500,000 new men annually without any other changes in military policies. The Department later wrote me that "no estimates were made for the draft study of the combined effects of improvement in fringe benefits upon the rate of volunteering . . . since these benefits—with the exception of training and educational opportunities—were not found to be effective inducements for *initial* enlistment" (emphasis added). Thus, the military establishment has erected an artificial monetary barrier to a volunteer Army, for it has failed to consider the large increase in re-enlistments and concomitant savings that would result from improvements in pay and other benefits.

Bruce Chapman, using 1965 figures leaked from the Pentagon study, has estimated that a pay increase totaling three billion dollars would reduce—through higher re-enlistments—the number of new Army personnel needed each year from 500,000 to 150,000. Greater fringe benefits and other improvements in military life could bring the number down even further. At the same time, the military would save at least 2.1 billion dollars in annual training costs by retaining the 350,000 men who otherwise would have left after their first hitch.

Further savings would result from using existing civilian training establishments, including college campuses, vocational schools and on-the-job training programs, to train military personnel. As nearly 90 percent of the technical skills used by the military are also employed by the civilian economy, military training programs could be reduced to the training of only the 10–20 percent of combat and combat-support jobs (field maintenance, ordnance, battalion-level supply, etc.) that need military, as opposed to vocational, training. The resultant savings for the military could be extensive. Such a program would also be a stimulus to increased business investment in our manpower resources and could produce a greater number of skilled workers for the civilian economy.

A career military force would open up more job opportunities for those in our society who are now most disadvantaged—the Negro, the less-educated and those who are presently unemployed as a result of automation. The Department of Defense statistics used in the draft study reveal that the highest rate of enlistment under the present system is found in Southern and South Atlantic states where median annual income is only $2,441 and $2,849, respectively, and unemployment rates are the highest in the nation. Improvement of career opportunities would further increase the rate of enlistment among the disadvantaged and would provide real opportunities for those youths now unemployed because of their inability to get the vocational and technical education our automated industries require.

Furthermore, civilian personnel could be substituted for military personnel in many cases. Under a program begun by Secretary of Defense McNamara in 1965, 74,300 military jobs were replaced by 60,500 civilian positions. This substitution resulted in an over-all decrease of 13,800 jobs—since trainees and trainers could be eliminated entirely for the civilian positions. The military is limited in a replacement program of this type by the requirement that many military positions be retained in order to rotate combat troops into Stateside jobs, but extensive reductions can still be carried out.

Improving the Reserve should be one of our first priorities, since the Reserve provides a way to retain crucial skills for military use. An effective Reserve program would be coordinated with the civilian economy, so that a call-up would not endanger important industries, and Reservists under such a program would be supplied with the latest equipment and training. Such a ready Reserve could be employed in time of crisis much more rapidly than a conscript Army, which takes a year or more to develop and train. American military theory has always centered on a relatively small standing Army with a strong Reserve, and this strategy could be achieved through a voluntary Army of the present peacetime size of 2,700,000 men, plus a well-trained Reserve of 1,000,000. The neglect of the Reserve is one of the major reasons for today's enlarged draft calls.

The question that must be asked, of the military and of Congress, is, "Why not such a system now?" The answer lies in the resistance to change that is entrenched in the military services, and the ingrained prejudices about the draft that have developed in Congress and in large segments of the public. In part, this is a generational difference; the draftees and volunteers of World War Two are now the decision-making generation in America, and their experiences are the basis from which current attitudes on the draft have developed. Changing social and economic conditions have rendered these experiences obsolete, but the old attitudes persist.

Chief among these attitudes is the feeling that "If I had to serve in the Army, then everybody else should have to, also." General Hershey summed up this feeling when he told the House Committee, "I enlisted in the National Guard in Indiana when I was sixteen years old, and there were a thousand kids that didn't, and there was nothing fair about the fact that I assumed voluntarily a responsibility they ought to share." This attitude is reflected in the opinions of the Congressmen and veterans' organizations advocating "universal military training." The feeling is understandable in a generation that fought World War Two, but it is not in tune with technological and demographic changes that have reduced the need for raw manpower while making more of it available. The persistence of this feeling has created a wide gulf between our nation's youth—who face the draft firsthand—and the older generation that is living with memories of the past.

Similarly, the attitude that military training is good for everyone, that it makes better

citizens, reduces juvenile delinquency and, in fact, is a panacea for all the ills of our society, is rooted in the experiences of the World War Two generation. Those days of sacrifice and heroics are fondly remembered, and all the horrors and follies of those experiences are erased by time. The experiences of World War Two gave birth in 1951 to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which was intended by its proponents to lead to actual UMT. However, after the National Security Training Commission brought forth its report on UMT in 1951, Congress decided not to accept it, and UMT has been largely discredited since then. Nonetheless, the attitude remains, and men such as Hershey still believe in it. Hershey again advocated UMT at this year's draft hearings, and L. Mendel Rivers, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, expressed his support of the principle. It is the persistence of this feeling that has been a primary factor in the opposition to a volunteer, career Army.

Universal Military Training and its "liberal" substitute, "universal national service"—which would allow Peace Corps work or similar service to satisfy the military obligation—are abhorrent to our democratic society. Senator Robert A. Taft said in 1940, "The compulsory draft is far more typical of totalitarian nations than of democratic nations. The theory behind it leads directly to totalitarianism. It is absolutely opposed to the principles of individual liberty which have always been considered a part of American democracy." America has long mistrusted military authority and has rejected compulsion in favor of individual freedom. The draft has only been justifiable as a measure of necessity; now that it is no longer necessary, it is no longer justifiable.

Yet the proponents of UMT, intent on realizing their past experiences in the younger generation, fail to see that these goals transgress the American value system. When General Hershey says, "I think we have gone hog wild on individual rights in this country," or when Chairman Rivers adds his "God bless you" to Hershey's advocacy of drafting Vietnamese war protesters, we must be concerned about the maintenance of our system of values. Solutions, such as UMT or "universal national service," inappropriate to our value system may pose a greater threat to our way of life than the dangers they are expected to dispel.

The voluntary system I have proposed has as one of its purposes the reduction of military authority over the lives of our citizens. The military establishment, of course, strongly objects to such concepts as replacement of military with civilian personnel, limitation in the scope of military law and the use of civilian training establishments for the Armed Forces. It is in the nature of bureaucracies, especially military bureaucracies, to attempt to extend their control over as many people as possible. This tendency exists in a democratic society, as well as in a totalitarian one, and should be resisted as strongly as possible.

Unfortunately, the civilian chiefs in the Department of Defense and the Administration are not in a position to resist. The Defense Department is a part of the bureaucratic structure, and the Executive is limited by bureaucracy. There have been many studies of military manpower procurement—the National Security Training Commission in 1951; the Cordiner study in 1957; the Gorham study in 1964; the recent Department of Defense study of the draft; and now the Presidential Advisory Commission on Selective Service, headed by Burke Marshall, former Assistant Attorney General. Each of these committees has suffered from the same lack of democratic procedures—open hearings, free testimony, rebuttal and surrebuttal opinion and published records—that characterizes all special executive committees. These commissions and study groups are also captives of the department they are created to serve. Senator Richard Russell, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said of a proposed draft study in 1959, "Usually we end up getting the same recommendations from the commissions that we have had from the Department of Defense on the same subject. It is really a new way of asking for the views of the Department of Defense."

The President's involvement in the draft is also political, as military policy is an offshoot of foreign policy. President Johnson, committed in Vietnam, will not allow the draft, associated in the public mind with the war effort, to be debated in Congress. In 1964, three days before 24 Republicans presented their demands for a Congressional draft study, the President announced the formation of his Defense Study Group. The results of this executive study were kept secret until last summer, when the House Armed Services hearings forced the subject into the open. Then, Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas Morris released the results of this study in a brief and nonfactual report, and immediately the President named a new commission to study the same subject. The results of the new commission's work will be ready early this year; but it will be too late for any independent study by Congress before the draft law expires at the end of June 1967.

Executive efforts have been inhibiting factors in reforming and modernizing the draft, but Congress' failure in this area is even more reprehensible. Senator Russell said in 1959 that "Congress cannot dodge or eliminate that responsibility [to study the draft]," but Congress has done just that. The current draft law has been extended three times since 1951 with only cursory debate. Vigorous attempts by Republicans such as Robert Ellsworth, Bradford Morse and myself, and Democrats such as Robert W. Kastenmeier and William Ryan to get Congress to take up this responsibility have been in vain. The draft has been a political football, booted back and forth between Executive commissions and Congressional committees. It is revealing that the draft-extension bills have always come up in nonelection years. General Hershey remarked in 1955, "Let us hope, pray or what not that this thing expires in a year that is not divisible by two." Politics, not sincere concern for the welfare of our draft-age youth or the development of a modern Army, has motivated many Congressmen to oppose changes in the draft.

The principal responsibility for the failure of Congress in this area must rest with the Armed Services Committee, in whose jurisdiction military manpower procurement falls. Members of the Armed Services Committee have usually acted as if they were spokesmen for the military services themselves, fighting the eternal war against the civilian heads of the Defense Department. As such, they listen only to the military point of view and resist "encroachments" on their jurisdiction from other members of Congress or from the public.

The problem of manpower procurement is more than a military one, and the arguments I have advanced over the past 15 years for a voluntary Army affect the civilian sector, our American value system and the whole universe of military and civilian life. Therefore, it is imperative that the draft issue be studied in its broadest aspects before we decide on concrete proposals. I have insisted that a Congressional draft study must include members from the House Education and Labor and Senate Labor and Public Welfare committees, as well as members whose specialties and interests are more general. Only in this way can we focus on the totality of the manpower-procurement problems. The parochial jealousies, narrow viewpoints and political fears that mark the attitudes of some of our Congressional leaders toward the draft are tragic. Congress is the only body that can evaluate the draft, informing and involving the public in its hearings and debate; its failure to act is an indictment of the whole Congressional process.

The draft is obsolete and can be dispensed with; but politics, misty visions of a 20-years-past experience, ingrained bureaucratic obstinance and a refusal to face the changed condition of an automated, overpopulated society continue to give it life. For the sake of what we have labeled "security," America has sacrificed some of its liberty, has subjected its youth to the confusion and irrationality of a system long past its prime and has neglected its opportunity to streamline and modernize our military forces. We should ignore labels and prejudices to seek viable answers to a problem that affects so dearly the life of our society. We can no longer afford to be complacent, because a new generation, charged with an idealism and a purpose we have often forgotten, will not wait. If we must send this generation to war, we in Congress and in the public at large must also meet our responsibilities to make our society and its institutions as democratic, as equitable and as strong as we can.

QUESTION IS NOT WHETHER TO WHACK, BUT WHERE

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, last November the President ordered a $1.1 billion cutback in the Nation's federally aided highway building program effective for the remainder of the fiscal year ending next June 30. State highway departments were told it was necessary to cut back the amount of Federal highway funds which can be obligated by the States during fiscal 1967 to reduce inflationary pressures caused by Government spending for the war in Vietnam.

In Minnesota, this cutback represents over $40 million or 28 percent of the program that was originally planned. It means delaying many worthy roadbuilding projects throughout our State, including the completion of Interstate Route 90 in southern Minnesota. It also means postponing work on State Trunk Highway 60 in Blue Earth County.

Mr. Speaker, I must take exception to these extensive cutbacks because the question is not whether to whack, but where. Like many others, I am committed to reduced Federal spending to control inflation and in preference to a tax increase. However, in selecting the highway program, the President has chosen one of the worst possible areas to wield the budget ax. Here is why:

Virtually everyone uses our public roads while few Americans benefit from certain other Federal programs of immense cost, such as our space effort;

The National Highway Users Conference has stated because of the long lead-time between obligations and expenditures, the highway funds cutback will have little effect on current inflationary trends.

Federal roadbuilding is done with the

proceeds of gasoline and other highway users' taxes which go into a special trust fund and not with the appropriated money in the regular budget. Therefore, the President's action does not reduce our huge deficit by so much as a penny.

The cutbacks will retard construction of better, safer highways at a time when highway fatalities are at a record high in Minnesota and elsewhere in the Nation. Minnesota Good Roads, Inc., reports one life per year is saved for every 5 miles of interstate completed. It has been reported the Interstate System is experiencing 50 percent less accidents and 25 percent less fatalities than the routes it replaces.

The cutbacks will adversely affect the construction industry, already in a state of decline. Unemployment may well be worsened.

For all these reasons, I am introducing a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal-aid highway program should proceed as rapidly as available revenues to the highway trust fund permit. The resolution also makes it clear that the integrity of the highway trust fund should be preserved. In introducing this measure, I believe we are really only asking for something we have already paid for.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to point out that these highway cutbacks could easily be foreseen to create the public furor which has resulted. The press has widely speculated that there likely was a political design involved—namely, to build up public resistance to further cutbacks in pet White House programs, and to pave the way for an unpopular tax increase.

Whether this speculation is correct or not, I hope this Congress will fully exercise its authority to reduce spending in nonessential domestic programs while resisting misguided efforts to cut back sensible programs in the public interest. Congress should not allow itself to be put in the position of straining at a gnat while swallowing a camel.

BUDGETARY FLIMFLAM

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, every year around this time the American public is subjected to the annual fiscal shell game in which economic sleights-of-hand are used to make the budget more palatable. For years I have been protesting the various devices used to hide the anticipated spending program of the Federal Government. Back-door spending and other fiscal gimmicks have been employed in the past, with a new arrival, the sale of participation certificates, adding to the list.

The David Lawrence column which appeared in the Columbus Dispatch on January 18, 1967, is a good case in point, and for this reason I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

ACTUAL U.S. BUDGET DEFICIT LIKELY TO BE $18.8 BILLION—TWICE L.B.J. ESTIMATE

(By David Lawrence)

If the head of a business saw that his financial operations were going into the red and he then included money derived from the sale of assets as a part of profit, the stockholders would call this misrepresentation and the auditors of the Securities and Exchange Commission would throw it out as inaccurate.

But this is what the government itself is doing today in estimating the actual deficit for the fiscal year that ends on June 30.

For instead of the red figure of $9.7 billion which President Johnson used in his "State of the Union" message to Congress, the real deficit appears to be at least $18.8 billion.

This sum includes some of the items to which GOP Sen. John J. Williams of Delaware—a member of the finance committee—called attention.

Here is the list taken from government sources:

	Billions
Deficit estimated by President after new taxes	$9.7
Accelerated tax payments by corporations	3.2
Speedup of individual withholding tax payments and excise taxes	4
Graduated individual withholding taxes	4
Income from reduced silver content of coins	1.0
Sales of "participation certificates"	4.1
Real deficit	18.8

What are "participation certificates"? They are, in effect, a form of government security.

When sold to the public, the funds can be classified as the same as money received from the sale of savings bonds or any other government securities.

These certificates are tied definitely to assets on which originally there were mortgage loans issued by banks or by savings and loan associations.

Also by speeding up tax payments of corporations and individuals, the Treasury takes in money this year from sources that will not be available for the same purpose next year.

The administration must have known three years ago that it would have a hard time balancing the budget, and yet income-tax rates and excise taxes were substantially reduced.

The question now is why the administration cut down the taxes and created a boom while it kept on spending at higher and higher levels, and as a result now finds itself today actually with the biggest red figure in recent years.

What will the situation be, moreover, in the fiscal year 1968 which begins July 1, 1967? How many devices, such as the sale of "participation certificates," will be used again?

One of the supposed advantages of borrowing through these federal certificates is that this doesn't have to be shown as a part of the "public debt" and hence Congress doesn't need to raise the existing debt limit just to cover such borrowings.

It's bad enough to run deficits of $8 or $9 billion based on acknowledged liabilities and on sums that under proper bookkeeping can be legitimately called "income," but when there are "gimmicks" used that hide the true nature of the red figure, confidence in the dollar is bound to be affected.

Maybe that's why the stock market suddenly rose after the President delivered his message.

It was probably assumed that high spending by the government and indifference to the wage-and-price spiral would be continued, that the inflationary curve would go still higher, and that the value of the dollar would be further diminished.

MANCHESTER'S BOOK IS TAINTED

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the much publicized book on the assassination of President Kennedy, "The Death of a President," by William Manchester, is currently the subject of much debate both in the press and, it is assumed, in private circles. The average American reader is at a decided disadvantage to appraise Manchester's work, for he has neither the time nor the facilities to devote to such an exacting job. Consequently, the column which appeared in the Columbus Citizen-Journal of January 16 of this year entitled "Manchester's Book Is Tainted," by the syndicated columnist, Henry J. Taylor, provides much food for thought. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

FABRICATION?—MANCHESTER'S BOOK IS TAINTED

(By Henry J. Taylor)

In Look Magazine's first extract from "The Death of a President," Author William Manchester is guilty of presenting the most distorted picture of Lee Harvey Oswald I ever read—utterly inexcusable if you respect the truth.

Manchester relies absolutely on the public's ignorance. Can I, for one, expect that not to be the pattern of this whole commissioned opus?

Let me start with an example and tell you what I mean.

Manchester pictures Oswald on the eve of the assassination: "We know that the fire storm in Lee Oswald's head ignited on the evening of Nov. 21."

Actually we know nothing of the kind.

". . . He was going mad . . . the total eclipse of his reason occurred shortly before 9 p.m. that evening," writes Manchester.

On the record, this is completely false. Manchester has no proof of this—exactly the reverse. Yet look how he dresses up his fabrication to make it sound factual and impressive.

I recently wrote three documented articles about Oswald, two from New Orleans, one from Dallas. And if I could get the truth, so could Manchester.

Oswald's long and unremitting Communist record in New Orleans continues to the end in Dallas, documented not by opinion, not by debatable testimony, but by Oswald himself.

Oswald's own written declarations during the fall that he killed the President, the fact sheet he provided (Sept. 27) the Cuban embassy in Mexico City, his memorandum to "Comrade Kostin" at the Soviet embassy there, his letters to the Soviet embassy in Washington as late as Nov. 9, the forgeries and innumerable incriminating documents in Oswald's own handwriting—all show this assassin was a drilled, dedicated, obedient, cool and canny Communist.

Yet Manchester has the unmitigated gall to pass up all the evidence and call Oswald crazy!

In order to create that false picture, and also to blame Oswald on Dallas, Manchester has some trouble with known dates. He'd painted himself into a corner. Let me show you how Manchester gets out of it. No wonder he had to work so hard on his book.

Obviously, Oswald wasn't crazy in New Orleans in August. Chief of Police Joseph I. Giarrusso, who reopened Oswald's Aug. 8 arrest file there for me, simply would laugh off Manchester as Baron Munchausen. And, obviously, Oswald was not crazy at the time of his WDSU radio debate in New Orleans Aug. 21, fully recorded and easily available from the Information Council of the Americas by writing P.O. Box 53371.

So Manchester contrives a neat little picture of "paranoia," of which he says "madness does not strike you all at once" and then elects to have it strike Oswald on the eve of the assassination.

That leaves Manchester faced by the evidence of Oswald's condition after—after—the assassination. Remember, Oswald was quizzed night and day after he allegedly killed the President. Manchester fixes that by completely ignoring the testimony of the U.S. postal inspector, FBI, CIA, Secret Service and other interrogators.

U.S. Postal Inspector Harry D. Holmes' words summarize the interrogators' statements, not alone those I talked with but the others whose official testimony is in the appendices of the Warren report:

"Oswald had a disciplined mind and reflexes. He unhesitantly answered questions he wanted to, skillfully parried the others, and lied instantly whenever cornered."

Here we have Manchester's so-called research revealed to be utterly phony and selected to serve his purpose.

More than a hundred times Manchester cribs minutely and at length out of the Warren report without attributing the detailed pretense of his text to the report. He knows the public has not read the immense record with its 17 appendices and surely has not encountered the testimony of Holmes, et al. That typifies what I mean by Manchester relying on the ignorance of the public.

The Kennedys should never have commissioned a book about the assassination in the first place. There are more acceptable ways to keep our memories active about President Kennedy. And when more and more people who are informed read what was produced for the Kennedys—suing selectively as they did about "personal and sentimental matters" when the whole pitch of the book is a self-serving travesty on history—this fabricated literary chicken will come home to roost.

Both the Kennedy purpose and the Manchester product are tainted from start to finish.

TEN REASONS AGAINST UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. CONSULAR TREATY

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week the astute Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has resumed again his attempt to railroad through the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union, to which the Senate will be asked to give its advice and consent.

It is interesting to note that in the summer of 1965 a treaty containing such vast implications slipped through after one executive hearing, one public hearing, and one executive session of the committee. The only witnesses to be heard at both the executive and public hearing were the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, and his legal adviser, Mr. Leonard C. Meeker. To the best of my knowledge, no other Government officials were invited to appear, and individuals and organizations of citizens were denied the opportunity to express their opinions before the committee. This episode is being repeated by the current maneuver.

There are significant threats to the United States in the acceptance of this treaty, the most obvious being the Soviet practice of using consulates for espionage purposes. In addition, Communist governments have been known to use their consular activities for forms of bribery and pressure on U.S. citizens who have relatives in Communist lands or who have inherited property therein.

Furthermore, the question of establishing consulates obviously jeopardizes the policy whereby our Government does not recognize the forcible incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the U.S.S.R. If we should, for example, establish consulates in any of the Baltic States, it would represent a de facto recognition of Soviet control which would be an international triumph for communism. Two other major cities in the U.S.S.R. where the Russians might suggest we would establish a consulate are Minsk, the capital of Byelorussia, and Kiev, the capital of Ukraine.

These two states have voting rights at the United Nations. It would be a mockery of justice to consider consular offices there. I call the attention of the House to the bill I am introducing to express the sense of the Congress that the U.S. Government should establish direct diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, as a means of dramatizing the Soviet captivity of those lands.

Furthermore, during the hearing staged in 1965, it was disclosed that the Soviet Union does not maintain any consulate in the Western Hemisphere. The acquiescence of the United States to Soviet consulates would set an obvious precedent that would soon find the Communist rulers of Moscow spreading their influence in Latin America by means of consular activities. What Latin American Government could refuse the request for a consulate after the leader of the free world has extended this benefit to the rulers of the Kremlin?

Mr. Speaker, although the ratification of a treaty is the prerogative of the Senate, this is no valid reason for concerned Members in the House to sit back and watch a treaty being railroaded through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for blind ratification by the other body. For over 2½ years the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee avoided the obligation of public hearings on the vital consular convention with the U.S.S.R. and then, in an arbitrary and undemocratic manner, curbed the hearings and railroaded the convention through the Senate committee in 1965. He is attempting to do it again now.

There is far more to this treaty than hits the eye. Senate objections so far voiced in opposition to it have been largely marginal in substance. In railroading the treaty proponents have been negatively counting on such marginal objections to obtain a quick Senate ratification. For over 2 years they feared exposing the treaty to open public hearings where more substantial criticisms of this Moscow-pleasing treaty could be heard.

There is still a chance to correct this wrong, if, in the event the Foreign Relations chairman has his way, the responsible Members of the Senate vote to return the treaty to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for an open and frank discussion of this poorly drawn and ill-conceived convention. Without all aspects of this defective treaty carefully discussed and debated, a blind ratification by the Senate would only compound the wrong already committed.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the very perfunctory manner in which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee studied this consular convention, I am asking the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct a full-scale inquiry into the impact the ratification of the treaty might have on United States-Soviet relations, as well as the complications it would cause in the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I further point out that the Soviet Union is aggressively engaged in aiding the Communist war effort in South Vietnam. We are aware that Soviet-manned missiles are in North Vietnam and presumably are responsible for shooting down American aircraft.

Evidently in return for direct Soviet involvement against our boys in Vietnam, we will reward the Kremlin by permitting them to establish consulates in this country, and, may I point out, grant their consular officials diplomatic immunity.

This is the wrong time for this treaty. There is much less emphasis from Moscow these days on peaceful coexistence. Moscow's features, as far as they face the West and specifically the United States, are obviously an unconcealed scowl. Moscow's voice—except, so far, on economic and commercial matters—is becoming harsh and growling.

We further recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there cannot be any legitimate trade as we know it with the Soviet Union. Their persistent disrespect for patent and copyright laws, their desire for items to help their military and heavy industry, their disregard for the consumer demands of their own citizens, their willingness to dump items at a loss on the world market—all give evidence of the impracticality of basic trade relations with the Moscow dictatorship. Obviously, this consular convention cannot be of commercial value to us.

May I point out to the House that millions of Americans have close relatives in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, Armenia, Ukraine, Byelorussia and other non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. All Communist governments have shown a disrespect for property and inheritance rights of U.S. citizens. The failure to extract effective concessions or to obtain a guarantee of a change in policy by the U.S.S.R. in this consular convention renders it meaningless in this area. The

possibility of coercion, bribery, even blackmail are evident if Soviet consular officials have the freedom to roam throughout the United States.

Let us recall that in the brief hearing held in the Senate in 1965, the Secretary of State naively explained that the location for possible consulates had not been discussed. I found this statement impossible to believe. According to Mr. Rusk, preliminary discussions were held in 1961 and serious discussion must have been held as to where the Soviets hoped to place their consular offices. Now we are told that Leningrad is the first likely spot. The treaty does not even specify strict reciprocity in the number of consular locations. It appears that a credibility gap exists here, too.

It might well be, Mr. Speaker, that the Soviets will request permission to establish a consulate in Cocoa, Fla.; Columbus, Ga.; and Los Alamos, N. Mex., where they could not only conduct "commercial activities" but be adjacent to our facilities at Cape Kennedy, Fort Benning, and Los Alamos Proving Grounds.

Mr. Speaker, may I quote the Secretary of State:

> And to the extent, sir, that we can build some peace in the world and establish normal relations, the problems raised by espionage diminish. It is in periods of tension and crisis and controversy and rivalry and armed confrontations where the problem of espionage grows.

If I understand administration explanations properly, the problem of armed confrontation and the controversy in Vietnam grow as Soviet support of the Communist forces there increases. Therefore, by Secretary Rusk's own words, this is the wrong time for us to enter into this consular convention.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent background to this issue is furnished by the National Captive Nations Committee which has consistently called for open and honest hearings on this treaty. The committee again appealed to Mr. FULBRIGHT for open and fair public hearings. I insert an incisive article written by the committee's chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, titled "Ten Reasons Against the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty," to be printed as part of my remarks:

TEN REASONS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. CONSULAR TREATY

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

There are ten solid reasons why the U.S. Senate should emphatically not ratify the US-USSR Consular Treaty which the Committee on Foreign Relations reported out favorably last August. Most of these reasons were scarcely touched upon in the somewhat superficial public discussion that was precipitated by the committee's sudden action. This condition, however, should be no cause for wonderment. Since the signing of this Second Treaty of Moscow on June 1, 1964, every attempt has been made to keep the convention out of the arena of public discussion as much as possible.[1]

When the consummate attempt was made to railroad this seemingly innocuous pact through the Senate, numerous legislators and organizations joined in a strong protest against its blind ratification. Interestingly enough, some of the press distorted this fact into some sort of right-wing opposition. One paper, for example, painted it in terms of a deluge of letters inspired by the "Liberty Lobby and other right-wing organizations," though these groups expressed themselves marginaly and in the final phase of last summer's episode.[2] An editorial in another organ supporting the treaty observed with guarded overtones, "most of the opposition seems to be made up of organized letter-writing members of such ultra-conservative groups as the John Birch Society and the Liberty Lobby."[3] Employing this same smear tactic, a third proponent of the convention showed little esteem for the general intelligence of the Senate when it recklessly charged that the Senate was scared off by the Liberty Lobby which "saw to it that the Senators were bombarded with protest letters . . ."[4]

Anyone who has followed closely the developments surrounding the treaty even before it was signed, cannot but view such reporting and editorializing as crassly inaccurate and misleading. As early as March, 1964, the National Captive Nations Committee publicly opposed this pact, three months before it was signed in Moscow.[5] In June of that year several national ethnic organizations declared their opposition to the pact. When a number of Senators and others joined this growing chorus of bi-partisan protest to the pact's ratification, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee decided not to consider the convention until the next Congress.

With the new 89th Congress in being for its first session, periodic inquiries were made as to the scheduling of open, public hearings on the treaty. Some serious discussion of it was being fostered by interested parties.[6] The consistent reply given to the inquiries was that no hearings were as yet being set.[7] As late as July the same position was maintained.[8] In that month, however, citizen groups observing the Seventh Captive Nations Week Observance throughout the nation registered their strong opposition to the treaty, and again the call was raised for public hearings. At about this time it was announced that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had authorized the chairman to schedule public hearings.[9] The now-on-now-off treatment caused one committee member to assert that this latest action came "as a complete surprise to me."

Contrary to the quoted press reports and editorials, the opposition to the treaty was markedly cross-sectional, including liberals as well as conservatives, Democrats as well as Republicans. Objectively speaking, the reasons offered by so-called ultra-right-wing groups should be evaluated on their own merits rather than substituting for them labels of invidious distinction. The same rule in objective reasoning would apply to any stand taken by their counterparts on the left. Moreover, what was not generally known about the 1964 summer episode was the quiet effort of a concerned Congressman who apprised 57 Senators of the defects in the treaty and even threatened to have the House Foreign Affairs Committee conduct open and fair hearings on the issue.

Examples of the replies to the Congressman's initiative make for perspective reading. Thanking him for his critical observations, one Senator adds, "I have not as yet had an opportunity to study this treaty carefully, but my present inclination is to vote against it." Another prominent Senator states, "You find me in complete agreement with your views on this most important subject. It is my intention not only to vote against the Convention when it is considered by the Senate but to do all that I can to persuade others to vote against it." Concerning the critical material given him, a third Senator reflects the aroused interest of scores of others in the Senate when he comments, "It will help me to better evaluate the Treaty when it comes up for a vote in the Senate."

These facts should be adequate to convince one of the slanted reporting indulged in by a few newspapers that clamored for the treaty's ratification without even open and fair public hearings on the issue. Evidently, they were stunned by the outcome last August and had no other recourse but to wade in the muck of invidious labelism. Now for the ten reasons.

I. NO PUBLIC HEARINGS

Viewing this whole development in all its aspects, any objective observer would have to conclude that the deliberate attempt to preclude open, public hearings on the issue is cause enough for the rejection of the convention. Every significant treaty requiring Senate ratification has been accorded this normal, democratic procedure so that legislators may weigh the various arguments surrounding it. Those who claim that the consular pact is an ordinary and insignificant treaty are either unaware of its basic significance and thus would profit from such hearings or employ this contention to abet the possibility of a blind ratification. By all evidence the proponents of the pact have displayed a morbid fear of public hearings and wide discussion on the issue.

The evidence also shows quite clearly that an attempt was made toward the close of the last session of Congress to railroad the treaty through the Senate. Fortunately, the maneuver was thwarted by the alert action of numerous groups and individuals. For example, in a press release the National Captive Nations Committee called for "open and frank public hearings" on the convention and protested against "the maneuver of ramming this ill-advised and harmful treaty down the throats of our people without fair and open hearings."[10] Representative Edward J. Derwinski of Illinois performed an invaluable service in his persistent charges against the railroading of this treaty.[11] A striking editorial in one critical paper began "Details are now at hand concerning the swift railroad job, with Senator Fulbright as chief engineer, which was done to get the Soviet Consular Treaty out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee some days ago."[12]

Not to have the maneuver appear too crude and arbitrary, the committee heard testimony from Secretary of State Dean Rusk and several State Department associates. The committee print that followed contains all the marks of swift maneuver and haphazard publication. For example, the title of the pamphlet is *Consular Convention With*

---

[1] For a detailed background on this see Lev E. Dobriansky, "The Second Treaty of Moscow," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 2, pp. 2160–2163.

[2] E. W. Kenworthy, "Rightists Oppose Pact With Soviet," *The New York Times*, August 19, 1965.

[3] "The Consular Treaty," *The Evening Star*, August 24, 1965.

[4] "Scared Off," editorial, *The Washington Post*, August 23, 1965.

[5] Communication to Chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, March 10, 1964.

[6] "New Myths, Old Realities," editorial, *The Richmond News Leader*, February 16, 1965.

[7] E.g. "No Hearings Set On U.S.-Soviet Consular Treaty," *The Evening Star*, February 15, 1965.

[8] "Senators Delay Consular Pact With Russians," *The Evening Star*, July 12, 1965.

[9] "Hearings Due On Russian Consular Pact," *The Washington Post*, July 22, 1965.

[10] "Fulbright Urged to Hold Open and Frank Hearings on Consular Convention," August 3, 1965.

[11] E.g. William Moore, "Derwinski Hits Plan for Russ Consulates," *Chicago Tribune*, August 10, 1965.

[12] "Normal Relations," *The Richmond News Leader*, August 13, 1965.

The Soviet Union, but on page 3 a caption reads "Consular Convention With Russia." If at this stage of American understanding the concepts of Soviet Union and Russia are held to be synonymous, then we are in real trouble with respect to some reasoning on this issue.

To mention another example among the many, the dialogue between the chairman and Senator Hickenlooper makes for absorbing reading. In his opening statement Senator Fulbright lets the cat out of the bag by stating "The committee met in executive session July 20, 1965, to consider the convention and *decided* at that time to take it up formally and submit it to the Senate for its advice and consent."[13] Senator Hickenlooper follows by stating, "I want to correct a misunderstanding. I understood you to say in the opening statement that the committee had decided to submit this to the Senate for confirmation."[14] Contrary to his opening statement, the chairman covers himself by replying "The committee would have to vote on it after we have had *committee hearings.*" Then, in the print, the dialogue is interrupted by the insertion of the President's message and the convention itself, and fifteen pages later Senator Fulbright further contradicts his original, plain statement by saying "We had decided to proceed with hearings if the committee so voted. That is what I meant to say."[15] His words scarcely reveal such meaning.

Despite much talk about hearings at this point, only one staged hearing was held. Secretary Rusk was heard on points emphasizing the protection Americans in the USSR would receive, the little difference between this treaty and other consular conventions, the risks of espionage we have to assume in our open society, the inadequacies of our embassy in Moscow, the need for normalizing relations, mutual understanding, the improvement of communications, and other equally vague generalities. As the writer stated in a letter criticizing one of our papers, "by virtue of his antiquated and misleading conceptions of the Soviet Union, which even the late Adlai E. Stevenson tactfully repudiated in November 1961, Secretary Rusk can scarcely be regarded as the sole, adequate witness."[16] These salient points in the Rusk testimony will be answered in the remaining reasons against the ratification of the treaty.

How much of all this was pitifully misinterpreted can be gleaned from this statement of a Senator supporting a blind ratification of the pact: "Those writers are ignorant of the fact that hearings were held."[17] The official publication of the committee is accurately titled *Hearing,* but the Senator insists hearings, governmental or public, were held. He also believes the treaty is with Russia. Moreover, some verbal legerdemain was detected in the distinction drawn between the treaty and the actual opening of consulates. According to the State Department, one shouldn't be too concerned with the treaty because "the question of opening consulates . . . will be the subject of separate negotiations."[18] Why then all these pressure tactics concerning the treaty's ratification? Actually, the formal and legal basis provided by the treaty is most essential to the question of opening consulates. It is also worthwhile to note the haste on the part of the Department in exacting appropriations from Congress for a consulate in Leningrad with several $500 water coolers, extra bedrooms for single girl secretaries and what have you.[19]

Again, this first reason is reason enough to justify a rejection of the treaty. Its proponents apparently fear a full and open examination of it in the public forum. Without open, public hearings, a ratification of the pact would be an arbitrary and blind one. The democratic staging of such hearings would necessitate thoughtful consideration for the nine remaining reasons.

II. A DIPLOMATIC AFFIRMATION OF MOSCOW'S INNER EMPIRE

The second reason for rejecting the treaty is that it constitutes a diplomatic affirmation, a stamp of approval and acceptance of Moscow's inner empire. I'm aware of the fact that most Americans cling to the myth that the Soviet Union is Russia, that the USSR is a country like ours, indeed, that this inner empire of many nations is a nation like ours. One superficial account of last August's episode misleads readers in this fashion, "If ratified, it would be the first bilateral treaty between the two nations."[20]

We can allow for such ignorance in an ordinary newspaper article, but for our leaders of state to believe that the USSR is a nation is plainly unpardonable. If we should ever lose the Cold War, it would be basically because of this fundamental gap in our understanding of the USSR as an empire-state, a prison house of many captive nations, the inner and basic sphere of the present Soviet Russian Empire. Despite other objectives and purposes, both Napoleon and Hitler lost hot wars in this area of Eastern Europe because of substantially the same gap in understanding.

This fallacious notion of the USSR as a "country" and other basic myths are reflected in the convention, which of course cannot but satisfy the propaganda and psychopolitical efforts of Moscow to the utmost. The treaty is founded on the mythical conception that the USSR is a nation-state comparable in character to ours. American consulates in any of the non-Russian nations in the USSR would tangibly reinforce this myth, needlessly abet Russian policies aimed at unifying this primary imperium, and thus nullify any leverage for peace we may have in at least recognizing the freedom goals of the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR.

In the past forty-five years the United States has committed many shortsighted errors bolstering and strengthening this inner empire of Soviet Russia. Ratification of this treaty would add another chapter to this sordid record. In a letter to Senator Fulbright, the writer emphasized this point when he stated, "a blind ratification of the Convention would form another chapter in our long, inept dealings with the Russians and expose us to the charge of being a nation of hypocrites when the President and others proclaim our 'devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.' This treaty is a confirmation of Russia's imperio-colonialism within the USSR and further evidence of our diplimatic ineptitude in the Cold War, not to say our grave lack of understanding of America's prime enemy."[21] In terms of power and ambition, we delude ourselves if we think Peiping rather than Moscow is the prime enemy.

Before taking action on the treaty it would profit each Senator to read a recent official study prepared for one of the Senate's own committees on the empire within the USSR. "Western scholars of Soviet affairs," it observes, "agree on the imperial-colonial character of the USSR."[22] Commendable as it is, even this study doesn't cover all aspect of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in the USSR. For succinct, deep insights into this inner empire each Senator would do well to read Adlai Stevenson's remarkable memorandum on the subject in the United Nations.[23] After reading these he would have to ask himself, "Could I as a Senator, representing people in a democracy and republic dedicated to principles of national independence and self-determination, vote for a treaty which explicitly and implicity misrepresents a state and in effect places a stamp of approval on a tyrannical empire?" Each in his own conscience would have to answer this question.

This reason for not ratifying the treaty is basic to all others. It hinges on the most fundamental issue of the contemporary struggle—Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism versus freedom and national independence. It offers us another opportunity to fill in the gap of American understanding of the USSR. The first was Congress' Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86-90) in 1959, which for the first time recognized the freedom aspirations of all the captive non-Russian nations in th USSR. Ratification of the treaty would contradict the very essence and spirit of the resolution. Also, Secretary Rusk and others argue that the treaty would improve communications between the two "countries." Aside from the rudimentary fact that it is hardly within the purview of consular activity to communicate or negotiate between countries, what improvement in communications could be achieved between the U.S. and the many nations in the USSR under a treaty which slights and ignores the presence of all but one of these nations? To our own detriment, the very opposite would be achieved.

III. LEGAL INVALIDITIES OF THE TREATY

A third substantial reason for rejecting the treaty is its numerous legal invalidities. If some of our lawmakers in the Senate still find the second reason difficult to grasp at this point, surely the legal contradictions and invalidities of the pact would fall more readily within their immediate attention. In a court of law any patent misrepresentation of parties to a contract or blatant contradictions to fact would be sufficient to throw the case out of court. The consular treaty is pitted exactly in this situation.

Throughout the text of the treaty one reads about "a national of the sending state."[24] This makes sense in the case of the United States, a citizen of a nation generally called about the world "an American." Who is the national of the Soviet Union? A Russian, Lithuanian, Georgian and so forth? If language and words have any meaning, a "national" is an individual member of a given nation. On the impregnable basis of all evidence provided by Moscow itself, the Soviet Union is no nation but rather a so-called union of many nations. Legally, there is no such animal as a "Soviet national" other than a fictional image in the minds of some who wallow in the myths of the USSR being a nation or anyone in the USSR—worse still "Russia"—being a "Soviet," which is a council of workers and peasants.

---

[13] *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union,* Hearing, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 1965, p. 1.

[14] Ibid. p. 2.

[15] Ibid. p. 17.

[16] "Consular Convention With the USSR," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 16, pp. 21093–21094.

[17] "Proposed Consular Convention With Soviet Union More to Advantage of United States Than to Russia," Mr. Young of Ohio, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 15, p. 20606.

[18] John C. Guthrie, *Communication,* May 14, 1964.

[19] Daniel Rapaport, *UPI* story, May 8, 1965.

[20] Murrey Marder, "U.S.-Soviet Treaty," *The Washington Post,* August 20, 1965.

[21] *Communication,* August 4, 1965.

[22] *The Soviet Empire,* Committee on the Judiciary, 1965, p. 166.

[23] U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Memorandum to U.N. Delegations, *The United Nations,* November 25, 1961.

[24] E.g. *Consular Convention With The* Soviet Union, p. 8, 9, 10 etc.

Clearly, if some can extricate themselves from the unreasoned, semantic mess indicated here, they would begin to see that the convention contradicts the very essence of the USSR Constitution, which though largely semantic is nonetheless a nominal compromise with the non-Russian nations in the USSR. By this kind of misrepresentative language the pact violates also the authenticity of every official map of the USSR and contradicts reams of official Moscow pronouncements on the multi-national composition of the USSR. In their desire to reap the psycho-political advantages of the treaty the Muscovite rulers would prostitute anything and, as in everything else, accuse the other party of the perversions. By allowing this to take place we exhibit our own psycho-political immaturity.

Further examples of legal invalidity are, in the case of the Soviet Union, provisions for "the national flag of the sending state" and "the national coat-of-arms of the sending state." [25] Of course, in objective circumstance there is no such flag or coat-of-arms for the USSR. Each republic has its own flag and emblem. The flag and coat-of-arms of the USSR shown at any Moscow-established consulate in the United States would be another perversion of fact permitted by the legal invalidity of the treaty.

Speaking of legalities, no one has raised the question of accumulated legacies left by Russian emigres and others in behalf of known or unknown parties in the Soviet Union. How many millions of dollars is colonialist Moscow seeking to acquire under Article 10 of the treaty? The Russians are employing every trick, including "the economic independence of the satellites," to build up their stock of foreign currencies; the treaty is another means. It would be interesting to see what the Department of State can furnish on these accumulated legacies. Mr. Rusk and others vaguely argue that the pact would abet "mutual understanding." With whom? The imperio-colonialists in Moscow? What of the various nations and peoples in the USSR? How would all these allowed perversions and open risks mould our bonds of mutual understanding with them? In the long run, they will prevail, not the ruling Russian totalitarians.

IV. AN AMERICAN ASSIST TO RUSSIFICATION

The fourth objection to the treaty is that its provisions engender an American assist to Russification within and outside the USSR. The provision in the pact for the use of the Russian language to process the fictitious Soviet national is in every sense an inadvertent assist to the well-known Russification policies of Moscow.[26] In effect, here too we would be buttressng Moscow's colonialist policy of enforcing the use of the captor's language among the non-Russian nations in the USSR.

Here, too, before he casts his vote on the treaty it would do well for each Senator to scan another recent Congressional study on cultural Russification and linguacide in the USSR.[27] Do we want to be placed in the position of confirming and abetting this vicious genocidal tendency further? It is bad enough that functional necessity compels us to accede to it on the ambassadorial level, though this could be rectified, too, by a diplomatic alternative of a more realistic nature.

With a premium on verbal generality Mr. Rusk and others argue for the treaty because it would "normalize relations." What are they seeking to normalize? The inner Soviet Russian Empire, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, or Moscow's Russification policies? The treaty would abnormally relate us to these ugly phenomena in the seeming position of even accepting them as "normal." Aside from the essential factor of comparative advantage in the Cold War, what a political posture we are asked to assume by ratifying this treaty. The nation of the American revolution and all the perennial principles this implies is urged in the name of normalization to place stamps of diplomatic approval on the worst institutional hallmarks of its basic enemy. Also, what is most curious is that those who talk loudly today about "the liquidation of the Communist monolith," "growing nationalism in Eastern Europe," "a world of diversity," and "good Communists and bad ones" are normally those who, for whatever reasons, stop at the borders of the USSR, the determining inner empire itself, with these supposedly new notions.

V. THE VERY DIFFERENT DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY

The preceding three reasons for non-ratification of the pact received far less attention last August than the next two. Yet in the broader context of understanding the contemporary struggle, its prime sources of tension and long-run dangers to world peace, they carry greater weight than the next two objections, which by themselves, of course, are adequate to justify non-ratification. It is noteworthy how much more adept and knowledgeable the Chinese Reds are in utilizing essential facts concerning the inner Soviet Russian Empire, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, Moscow's Russification program, and the captive status of the non-Russian nations in the USSR than we are.[28] Their ends are different, but they at least do not accommodate the Russian totalitarians in their worst features.

Contrary to the baseless contention that this consular convention is no different or is even slightly different from other conventions, the pact is very different not only in its relation to our prime enemy in the Cold War but also in its incredible provision of diplomatic immunity to consular personnel for all crimes, including espionage.[29] It is sad enough that the treaty's assumptions and contents seriously depreciate our general political posture as a democratic Free World leader, but this provision is an open invitation to Red subversion of our nation. Every other existing convention grants immunity only from punishment for misdemeanors. The reader can now understand why I entitled an article on this subject "The Second Treaty of Moscow." The pact was made to order—in Moscow. Even our allies don't enjoy this unprecedented consular privilege.

In view of the concentrated discussion on this point last August, it is unnecessary to belabor it further. Mr. Leonard C. Meeker, the State Department's legal adviser, admitted in unqualified terms that this immunity from criminal jurisdiction "is not present in other consular conventions to the same extent." [30] Mr. Meeker, who is under the illusion that some "Soviet national" animal exists, tried to moderate the immunity provision by pointing out that it "will extend only to those consular officers and employees who are agreed to by the two governments." [31] As though in actual practice this would make any significant difference.

The views expressed by opponents to the treaty in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are quite firm on this immunity provision.[32] Publicized discussion of the point led many to the conclusion which one Senator put in these words: "It is this last section that is inimical with the best interests of the United States. It is the last section that clearly indicates that this convention was negotiated by the Soviets, not as a bilateral pact for improving Soviet-American relations, but as a cold war maneuver to enhance and expand the intelligence gathering network of the USSR." [33]

Mr. Rusk and others argue that the treaty would offer greater protection for Americans touring and visiting in the USSR. This protection argument, covering some 12,000 Americans annually, is supposed to counterbalance the lapse in it as concerns the immunity provision. Much is made of the notification and access provisions regarding arrests. Actually, this so-called Russian concession should have been demanded long ago on the purely ambassadorial level, and should be so demanded on the simple principle of reciprocity. USSR representatives and tourists are accorded the privileges and benefits of our democratic criminal code; pure reciprocal relations would demand the same for our people. To hook the notification and access provisions as a notable Russian "concession" to the consular treaty indicates that our negotiators had already walked into the bear trap. It is as much a concession as a thief giving up stolen property.

VI. INTENSIFIED POLITICAL WARFARE IN THE UNITED STATES

Espionage was the leading word for the next popular objection to the treaty last August. Our FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, was quoted at length in support of this criticism. In earlier testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. Hoover had emphasized that USSR "consulates in many parts of the country . . . will make our work more difficult." [34] A later statement by him stressed the following: "One Soviet intelligence officer in commenting on the agreement spoke of the wonderful opportunity this presented his service and that it would enable the Soviets to enhance their intelligence operations." [35] So effective were these points that the President subsequently issued a directive to officials to support Administration policies, aiming it particularly at Hoover.[36]

There are several aspects to this sixth reason for non-ratification that need some clarification. First, though public hearings were barred, it obviously behooved the Foreign Relations Committee to invite Mr. Hoover, as another government witness, to testify on the pact. Surely he is far more qualified to discuss the likely espionage effects of the treaty than is Secretary Rusk. Second, it is certainly no strain on one's imagination to envisage the expanded opportunities for Soviet Russian espionage with consulates ranging cross-country from New York to Chicago and San Francisco.

However, considering the huge spy apparatus now maintained by Moscow in this country, one can rationally allow for only a relatively small increase in overall effectiveness with the presence of consulates. The economic law of diminishing return applies in this field as in others. Doubtless the establishment of consulates would make Hoover's work more difficult, but it is doubtful that the condition as concerns espionage

[25] Ibid. p. 11.

[26] Ibid. p. 8.

[27] See *Nations, Peoples, and Countries in the USSR*, Study of Population and Immigration Problems, House Committee on the Judiciary, 1964.

[28] See "Sino-Soviet Border Potential Powder Keg," *The Ukrainian Bulletin*, New York, April 1–15, 1965, p. 35.

[29] *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union*, p. 12.

[30] Ibid. p. 22.

[31] Ibid. pp. 34–35.

[32] *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union*, Minority Views, August 10, 1965.

[33] Senator Norris Cotton, "The Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 16, p. 22000.

[34] *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union*, Minority Views, p. 2.

[35] Ibid.

[36] "LBJ Policy Edict Tied To Hoover," *The Washington Post*, August 21, 1965.

activity would be unmanageable. Moreover, as I argued elsewhere, spying is a two-way street. On the other hand, since alternatives for different diplomatic arrangements exist, there is no reason whatsoever to accommodate the Russians in this risky respect.

Especially is this so when a broader view is taken of Soviet Russian activity in this country. The problem entails more than just espionage. It can best be described as one of intensified political warfare, signs of which have already appeared in civil rights riots, campus agitation, peace demonstrations, overt USSR embassy propaganda on the Watts riot,[37] and a variety of actions striking against civil and political authority. Strategically situated consulates would not only be additional spy nests but also active sources of conspiracy, propaganda, blackmail and intimidation against those with relatives in the Red Empire, and media for undermining ethnic and other anti-Communist groups. With the type of immunity offered them, they should make bold efforts along these lines.

Mr. Rusk and others talk glibly about our "open society" and the espionage risks we have to take. They fail to see the broader problem involved here, with longarm ramifications extending to our actions in Viet Nam, the Dominican Republic, and almost everywhere else. Regarding espionage solely, a more naive observation by the Secretary cannot be found than when he testified, "I do hope that the Convention will reduce misunderstandings and particularly be of assistance in not letting private citizens, tourists, businessmen, exchange people, and others get caught up in the atmosphere in which this other type of problem arises."[38] Projected into the future, this type of uncritical thinking would virtually guarantee the closing of our open society.

VII. BASIS FOR INTENSIFIED POLITICAL WARFARE IN LATIN AMERICA

Speaking of ramifications emerging from a short-sighted ratification of the treaty, the next four reasons for non-ratification indicate what we can expect from this further appeasement of Soviet Russian desires. It should be evident now to the reader that all of these reasons against ratification are integrally related, though any one is sufficient cause for rejecting the treaty. To the recurring distinction made between the treaty as a body of guidelines for consular activity and the actual establishment of the consulates, which some even suggest the State Department might act upon devoid of any treaty, one can reasonably maintain the virtual inseparability of the two and the political certainty of no consulates if these many reasons, individually, in combination or as an integral whole, lead to a Senate rejection of the pact.

Thus, the seventh reason for non-ratification is that a Senate confirmation of this treaty would open up a Pandora's box of Soviet Russian pressure against every free government in Latin America. The immediate objective would be similar consular conventions; the ultimate objective would be a really intensified political warfare in the area. This at a time when many of our own officials have been warning us to expect stepped-up Red subversion throughout the continent!

Strangely enough, this reason against ratification was scarcely brought up in the August discussion. Few even knew that as of now no USSR consulates exist in the Western Hemisphere. In a cogent rebuttal to a newspaper editorial, Congressman Derwinski stated the case eloquently: "Acquiescence of the United States to Soviet consulates would set an obvious precedent that would soon find the Communist rulers of Moscow spreading their influence in Latin America by means of consular activities. What Latin American government could refuse the request for a consulate after the leader of the free world has extended this benefit to the rulers of the Kremlin?"[39]

Need more be said on this point of consular proliferation for extended Red subversion in the Western Hemisphere? The ratification of the treaty would create a solid basis for intensified Russian political warfare in Latin America. As in the area of trade with the Red Empire, our lack of firm and consistent policy will be another government's rationalization for its actions under pressure.

VIII. A TRADE WEDGE

Another reason for not ratifying the pact is the obvious use made of this treaty as a diplomatic wedge to liberalize and increase trade with the Soviet Union and the Red Empire in general. Time and time again in his testimony Mr. Rusk spoke of the prospect of "increasing trade between our two countries."[40] At times it appears this argument of dollars and cents carried more weight with him than the argument of humane protection for Americans in the USSR.

The issue of increased trade with the USSR and the Red Empire is a controversial problem in and of itself. This writer has pointed out in testimony and in emphatic terms that any such liberalized trade would not be the first time the United States has contributed myopically to the economic strengthening of the Soviet Russian Empire—always, of course, in the interests of "peace," "normal relations," "relaxation of tensions" and other self-legitimations.[41] Up to now those seeking such East-West trade have been careful to distinguish between our trading more liberally with the captive states in Central Europe and that with the USSR. The former is supposed to unlatch these Red totalitarian states from the chains of Russian domination, though for years Moscow itself has pursued the Empire policy of division of national labor.

Now, curiously enough, we see Secretary Rusk injecting the trade issue into this consular one with evident abandon of the distinction mentioned above. Our fighting men in South Viet Nam should take great comfort in this switch since economic-trade support of the USSR should in turn bolster Moscow's support of Hanoi for an even more challenging conflict in that area.

The fragmented policy of our government conduces to many blatant contradictions. This tactic of arguing for the treaty on the basis of trade prospects which in turn would facilitate the economic means of Moscow's global cold war operations against our interests is a gem of policy-making fragmentism. It's cause enough to reject the treaty as a trade wedge.

IX. THE MOST-FAVORED-NATION SIEVE

As in the area of trade with the Red Empire, the most-favored-nation sieve exists in consular agreements. This ninth reason for not ratifying the treaty was emphasized by several scrutinizing Senators who wisely oppose the extension of the immunity privilege to twenty-seven other nations and states, including Yugoslavia and Rumania.[42] As they pointed out, as many as 400 consular personnel would be eligible under the treaty and their covering conventions with the most-favored-nation clause for immunity from prosecution for all crimes.

On this point Secretary Rusk affirmed that "others would have the right to raise with us establishing various privileges, but only on a basis of reciprocity."[43] It is interesting that this concern for reciprocity shows itself here but not with the protection of American citizens in the USSR on the ambassadorial or full diplomatic level. With this sieve the risks mentioned earlier become all the more magnified. Also, Red governments with no consular agreements at present would seek the inclusion of the most-favored-nation clause in any future conventions.

The snowball effects of the treaty's provisions are thus not difficult to determine. They all point to a substantial net disadvantage for us. Recently, for example, our officials have uttered some tart remarks with regard to Japan's apathy toward the Viet Nam war and its warm behavior toward the Red Empire. Encouraged by our action, Japan, too, is on the road to signing a consular agreement with the USSR.[44] If in short time it judges the USSR to be a far greater threat to the Free World than Red China could possibly be in the next decade, it would have a self-legitimating basis for establishing similar and probably closer relations with Peiping.

X. THE BALTIC DILEMMA

A final reason for non-ratification bears on the Baltic dilemma to which the treaty exposes us. This reason is logically a derivative of the second reason we considered, as well as being based on an act of U.S. policy. The United States does not recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia in the USSR. Yet despite the silent treatment proferred by the State Department's legal counsel, any consular activity in these republics cannot but in practice and in time constitute de facto recognition.[45] With the allowable establishment of consular districts there, this condition would become crystal clear. At least Secretary Rusk admitted, "We do have a bit of a dilemma there, Senator."[46]

In conclusion, there are many dilemmas, contradictions, and risks posed by this consular convention. From Moscow's viewpoint, as an instrument of the Cold War it is fraught with innumerable advantages—imperial legitimacy, propaganda, legacies, political warfare penetrations, espionage and so forth. Our viewpoint is already so beclouded that many cannot see a real diplomatic alternative to this disadvantageous arrangement which would satisfy most of the reasons given for ratification of the convention, including the inadequacy of our embassy in Moscow, and yet realize a substantial net advantage.

Before alternatives can be examined, the treaty itself should be subjected to full, critical examination. This has not as yet been done. The question is a simple one: blind ratification or open public hearings?

QUALIFICATIONS FOR SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

---

[37] "Top Soviet Intellectuals Castigate U.S. on Riots," *The Washington Post*, August 22, 1965.

[38] *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union*, p. 29.

[39] Edward J. Derwinski, "The Consular Treaty," *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., August 27, 1965.

[40] E.g. *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union*, p. 33.

[41] Lev E. Dobriansky, "Five Perspectives on East-West Trade," *East-West Trade*, Hearings, Part II, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 1965, pp. 94–104.

[42] *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union*, Minority Views, p. 4.

[43] *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union*, p. 23.

[44] "Japan, Russia Are Negotiating," *Reuters*, Moscow, June 10, 1965.

[45] *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union*, p. 26.

[46] Ibid. p. 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, every American has the right to expect that he will be represented and governed by the most qualified and responsible people that this great land has to offer. Through the legislation that I am introducing today, I seek to insure that our expectations do not end in disappointment.

The joint resolution that I propose calls for an amendment to the Constitution requiring that Supreme Court Justices have prior judicial experience, and further, that they be chosen from the best qualified of both political parties.

While the people elect both the President and the Congress, the courts are in the unique position of being appointed. Having faith in the President, the founders of this country trusted in his wisdom to chose astute and intelligent jurists. They left him relatively free to appoint as he saw fit.

It is a difficult task to steer a steady course in the name of justice. It requires minds free to prejudice, of varied backgrounds and viewpoints, and well disciplined in the workings of the law. It takes men of principle and conviction, but men who are also farsighted enough to see the potentials of new ideas. Although we cannot expect a man to be void of political belief, we can assure an objective court if there is a reasonable balance of viewpoints represented by its members.

The American people have a right to expect that the Justices who serve them on their Supreme Court be more than old political cronies who have never before served on the bench. We have in our lifetime seen the Court packed in favor of a particular political philosophy. It has been our misfortune to see Presidents who were not so wise and just as those envisioned by the framers of the Constitution.

Under the language of the amendment I propose, a Justice must have had at least 2 years of service on a Federal or highest State appellate court, or 4 years on a Federal district court. In addition, appointments must be made in such a way as to maintain a balance of political affiliation. No party should have a majority of more than one Justice. This would give us a court with a 5-to-4 split.

Although this will not guarantee that the President will choose the wisest men possible, it will at least require, by law, that he meet certain essential criteria.

I am hopeful that the Congress and the American people will join in support of this measure to strengthen our federal system by assuring that the Court will not become a political tool.

NATIONAL CARIH ASTHMA WEEK

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 1, 1967, as National CARIH Asthma Week, inviting the Governors of the States, and territories of the United States to issue proclamations for like purposes and recognizing the outstanding contributions being made in asthma treatment, care, and research by the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital—CARIH—which is located in Denver, Colo.

The Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital—CARIH—is the only institution in the United States carrying on a combined program of clinical care and research in the field of allergenic diseases, of which asthma is the most severe. Only children with intractable asthma are eligible for the free care and treatment offered at CARIH. Selection of applicants is based on the severity of the disease and a number of other factors, including need.

The research center at CARIH is attempting to solve many of the still unanswered questions surrounding asthma and allergenic diseases. It is carrying on a basic research program exclusively devoted to asthma. Nearly five and a half million Americans suffer from asthma. The answer to their suffering may be found at CARIH.

The fine work carried on by CARIH deserves our strongest support and encouragement.

PROPOSAL TO EASE REQUIREMENTS FOR PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today proposing legislation which would ease the requirements for a pension for widows of veterans of the Civil War.

It may come as a surprise to many to learn that there are a number of these widows yet with us. As of the end of September 1966, more than a thousand in the United States were receiving pensions. There are others who are not eligible because they did not marry the veteran prior to June 27, 1905, or were married for less than 5 years.

Under my bill, Mr. Speaker, the date requirement would be removed and the 5-year period would be reduced to 3.

It is my hope that we can help these ladies with this legislation.

PROPOSED HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPORT CONTROL

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to establish a House Select Committee on Export Control. This resolution is a companion to House Resolution 67, previously introduced by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB]. I commend for reading to all the Members his well-documented remarks as set forth in the January 17, 1967 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Even a cursory reading of his remarks cannot help but cause any thoughtful Member to pause and consider our Nation's current policies on trading with Communist countries.

Although I am in favor of improving communications and cultural exchanges with Communist nations, I fail to see how the enhancement of the Soviet Union's warmaking potential by aid to that country and its satellites would decrease world tensions. Even if we were assured that the Fiat automobile plant that is being sponsored by the Export Bank would be used for peaceful purposes, which we are not, the net effect of this transaction and others is to provide additional capital to Communist countries for arms and munitions to be used against American fighting men in Vietnam.

Based on the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, the need for the speedy implementation of this resolution is self-evident. If the Members of this body are true to the oath we all took on the opening day of this session, then I submit that expeditious action on this resolution should and must be taken.

FOR THE RELIEF OF THEODOR AVITAHL

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a private bill for the relief of Mr. Theodor Avitahl, conductor for the Philharmonic Society of St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. Avitahl, a native of Rumania, became a stateless United Nations refugee in 1961. He then spent a year in Belgium and then came to the United States on April 23, 1962, with a parolee-refugee visa. When Mrs. Avitahl came to the United States the latter part of 1963 as a permanent resident, she requested an adjustment in status for her husband. However, since this adjustment was March 2, 1964, he is not eligible for naturalization until March 2, 1969.

In order to supplement his income as conductor for the Philharmonic Society of St. Louis, Mr. Avitahl has accepted guest conductor engagements in Europe.

However, he would like—and in many countries feels the need for—the protection of an American citizen's passport. He would indeed be an excellent representative abroad for this country and I respectfully submit this bill for the consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE IRONY OF UNEMPLOYMENT: MANY CAN'T FIND WORK, WHILE JOBS GO BEGGING

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we must hold Government spending down, and some call for cuts in the "war on poverty," it is important to note that there is a relatively inexpensive way the Government can assist in the total effort of the society to reduce unemployment and alleviate economic hardship. I am speaking specifically of a program to gather statistics across the country on job vacancies. The rationale for such an approach to unemployment and poverty is simple: if we can identify the need for manpower by skill or profession, and by area, we can find workers to fit the vacant jobs or, alternatively, train them to qualify for such employment.

As old as this idea is, and as appropriate to our present inflationary predicament, the administration continues to drag its feet. Despite the fact that the 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act called upon the Secretary of Labor to develop a system of job vacancy statistics, little progress has been made beyond the experimental stage. Although private organizations, such as the National Industrial Conference Board, have had encouraging success developing job vacancy data, the Federal Government has hardly got its project off the ground.

The importance of collecting job vacancy statistics has been recognized by the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee. In a unanimous subcommittee report released last June the subcommittee recommended that "the program of regular collection of vacancy data proceed as rapidly as possible." The subcommittee added, "it is time to expand the program further."

An article in the September 1966 Nation's Business is a good explanation of where we now stand in this area and why more should be expected than has been so far produced. Under unanimous consent I place the article in the RECORD at this point:

AMERICA'S POOR: WHERE THEY CAN GET JOBS

We could virtually eliminate unemployment in America.

But politicians and union leaders are keeping the unemployed from filling hundreds of thousands of jobs which you and other employers have open.

The policies of this political-union coalition, in fact, have helped create a costly new leisure class of nonworkers.

The federal government, in statutes and statistics, focuses its concern on the nation's unemployed. But repeatedly over many years, Washington policy makers have shunted aside the idea of gathering data concerning job vacancies.

The whole issue is especially important today when jobs of all kinds are going begging all over the country. Instead of launching a massive program to collect, analyze and make available to the unemployed information on job openings, organized labor and some Administration officials still wring their hands over the "millions of unemployed" who can't find jobs and who must be supported with antipoverty subsidies.

Certainly there are many unfortunate persons in America today who have no job skills or education and are discouraged and handicapped. However, many Americans are jobless not only because they don't know what jobs are open but because they have heard over and over again from their government that they are among the unemployed, the "disadvantaged." They feel permanently assigned to that tragic leisure class.

Once a month the Bureau of Labor Statistics holds a press conference at which it releases data on employment and unemployment. No data concerning job vacancies are released.

The AFL–CIO doesn't want any mention of job openings and apparently neither does the Democratic leadership in Washington.

To examine this large and almost unbelievable situation, you have to step back for a full view.

It's well known that most Americans, even unskilled unemployed, in large numbers have declined to accept stoop-labor jobs in agriculture.

Much more complicated is voluntary joblessness in the nonfarm area of the work force. How many jobs stand open today? We cannot be sure. The U.S. Employment Service admits there are 1.3 million openings, and says that this figure is about 30 per cent of the total. Private job-finding agencies would add many more to the list of vacancies, and still more openings are not listed at all. Congressman Tom Curtis of Missouri, who has studied the subject, estimates that whenever there are 3 million unemployed in the U.S., there are probably 3.5 million jobs that could more than absorb the unemployed.

No knowledgeable economist would pretend that there is a job vacancy for every potential job applicant. But a favorable job market does exist.

So does the opportunity for all but eliminating the specter of unemployment in America, along with the fears and accusations that free enterprise doesn't provide enough livelihoods.

Our national policy, in good times and bad, is to have a full employment economy. In 1956, which was a good time, Chairman Arthur Burns of the Council of Economic Advisers urged the Bureau of Labor Statistics to find out whether companies kept records on their job needs. The Labor Department was immediately aware of hostility from the AFL–CIO and the United Auto Workers, which want all attention placed on unemployment, not job opportunities. The Department did not extend the inquiry.

But President Kennedy in 1961 was curious enough to appoint a committee under Professor Robert A. Gordon of the University of California to look into the feasibility of open-job statistics. Gordon reported back a year later that the demand for such data was "frequently voiced" and indicated that valid information could be obtained.

But the foot-dragging continued under Labor Secretary Goldberg, formerly a labor union attorney. In fiscal 1963–64, the Labor Department contented itself with studying only foreign experiences in the collection of job vacancy data. Amid this atmosphere of official do-nothing, in June, 1964, the National Industrial Conference Board obtained a Ford Foundation grant and went to work on a survey of Monroe County (Rochester), N.Y. Pressed by this solo example, Secretary Wirtz, in August, ordered his long-delayed troops into action.

The NICB sampling covered 400 employers in the period of February to August, 1965, and produced some arresting results. The job-vacancy rate at three percent was higher than the unemployment rate at 2.7 percent, and 8,000 jobs were open.

Over half were open to persons with no related work experience, though 12 years of schooling was desirable. From 36 to 45 percent of the jobs, however, were available to persons without a high school diploma, and from 16 to 22 percent did not require either the diploma or experience. Astonishingly, 27 percent had been open for three months and 12 percent for six months.

Moreover, the public response to this sort of probing was highly affirmative.

One third of the companies felt the information was directly useful to them; 72 percent felt it was valuable to the community. And the community, through its schools and other civic organizations, "stated emphatically" that job vacancy data would help carry out the local programs, the report found.

What about the opposition? Congressman CURTIS, who has been pushing the project for years, says that it has been balked by two closely related vested interests. One is a combination of labor bosses and urban political bosses. The other is a hard-core liberal "experiment" group who believe that Government action is the only means of assuring full employment.

The labor bosses like to keep public attention focused on unemployment figures. Any notion that jobs are lying around loose would be bad for their membership drives, and might force the craft unions to instigate more apprenticeship programs. The political bosses need the Federal welfare programs for the unemployed as a form of patronage.

The liberal intellectuals, typified by Americans for Democratic Action, are the expansionists. They argue that unemployment should be attacked by continuously raising the Federal investment, so that it will create more money and more demand for goods and services. The expansionists regard inflation as a necessary evil in job-making. They are opposed by those who favor painstaking and continuous research to find where the economy is hurting and to apply an appropriate remedy.

Rep. Curtis put Walter Reuther, Secretary Wirtz and R. Sargent Shriver, the poverty war czar, in the expansionist category. He charges: "They don't really want to succeed at job-finding because it would kill all their arguments. Shriver and company have been no help to all in trying to find where the jobs are. If they'd analyze the situation that exists today, they'd see that it's impossible to conduct a war on unemployment without collecting the intelligence and making use of it."

Pending legislation, the Manpower Services Act of 1966, tells the Labor Department to:

Scour the nation to locate job openings and relay this information to job seekers.

Make it easier for the unemployed to go to other areas, or other states, where work awaits them.

Actually, this authority is not all brand new. Congressman Curtis points out:

"The 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act called upon the Secretary of Labor to develop a system of job vacancy statistics.

"In 1966, four years later, I asked the Sec-

retary of Labor where these statistics were. He responded that Congress had not yet appropriated the $2.5 million necessary to get this data.

"I asked him then, and I still wonder, why an Administration that spends $110 billion a year is unwilling to spend $2.5 million in this vitally important area."

Rep. Curtis rattles off many examples where private enterprise (including a few unions) has taken opportune note of job vacancies.

A few years ago the Pacific Bell Telephone Co., in automating from operators to dial, set up training for soon-to-be-displaced girls. Several airplane companies, forced into cancellation of government contracts, have entered into arrangements with other firms for the location of jobs. Rep. Curtis feels that the government could work out an effective job location system if it would publish a running index on job vacancies.

Instead, he maintains, government keeps getting in the way of persons who do seek jobs.

The Labor Department dallied 16 years (1949–65) in bringing out a new edition of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, although the needs for specific skills are constantly changing.

Rep. Curtis has a bill that would grant deductions to job hunters and job changers, thereby encouraging a needed unemployment remedy—mobility of workers. He has proposed a loose-leaf edition of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles to record instantly changes in skill demands.

The limited statistics available from private and local sources bear out the need for mobility. Vacancies are reported at every skill level, but these vary from area to area.

Some months ago, for example, Charlestown, W. Va., and Providence, R.I., had unmatching problems. In Charlestown, 50 per cent of the vacancies were for professional-managerial workers and only five per cent for semiskilled workers. In Providence, the reverse was roughly true. About half the open jobs were for semiskilled, and five per cent for professional-managerial personnel.

A national clearinghouse for this information could have helped to transfer nonworkers between these cities.

Belatedly the government has undertaken some mobility projects under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Last year some 1,200 workers and their families were moved where the jobs were. But in the Department report which discussed the success of mobility, Secretary Wirtz complains that "up till now, information of comparable detail about job vacancies has not been available. . . . With information about both job vacancies and job seekers, the Department of Labor could serve more effectively. . . ."

What goes on here, anyhow? The supposed friends of the workingman squabble while Americans sit around and jobs go begging. And why aren't these job opportunities made known to the public? Help-wanted ads in daily newspapers are there to read. The U.S. Employment Service has offices in all the big cities.

Certainly it can be no secret in California that field work could take up most of the unemployment in the Watts district, and the existence of 8,000 relatively easy-to-get jobs in Rochester must have been known to some people.

The Labor Department recently conducted an opinion survey among its job trainees and found this amazingly frank revelation:

"When asked to comment on the unemployment problem, more trainees blamed unemployment on unwillingness to work than on the lack of jobs, bad luck or discrimination."

That candid admission throws much light on the motivation of many nonworkers. Americans do not seek jobs they consider disagreeable or stigmatized as socially undesirable.

The Labor Department, in a survey of 16 labor areas covering 20 per cent of the nation's employment, discovered that about half the openings for semiskilled workers had been vacant for at least a month. These were hard-work openings in transportation equipment, warehousing and construction. More than half of the unskilled jobs went unclaimed for a month. These were service jobs, such as waitresses, kitchen workers, porters, hospital attendants.

Why aren't Americans more skeptical about the buildup of a mammoth anti-poverty program in times of prosperity? Why do we permit welfare-squatting and other outrages against the public purse? If there is any excuse for voluntary unemployment, it is at least partially ignorance. If any large number of people, over a long period of time, are unaware of the work opportunities, it is because public officials have apparently suppressed job information.

A once-a-month revelation of work opportunities, spread as it would be in the newspapers and over the airways, would either abolish most joblessness or expose it to public scrutiny.

Sen. William Proxmire (D., Wis.), a comember with Rep. Curtis on the Joint Congressional Economic Committee, has noted that his subcommittee's interest in data on job vacancies goes back nearly five years. In a report on "Employment and Unemployment" of January, 1962, the unit said:

"Research should be undertaken toward development of a regular monthly survey of job opportunities or vacancies. . . ."

The Labor Department finally did begin making a survey of job vacancies on a limited basis "to get some experience and insight" as the project is explained by Irvin Wingeard, special advisor on job vacancy statistics with the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The department now is seeking $2.5 million to expand the meager operation.

But the unions so far have managed to block the job vacancy index by cutting off its funds. When the request for $2.5 million to continue the survey reached the House Appropriations subcommittee, Rep. John Fogarty (D., R.I.), a former bricklayer, apparently talked his fellow Democrats into killing it. The Democrats, bolstered by information that President Johnson reportedly approved their move, voted to strike down the fund.

Someday, perhaps, we will be able to compile this valuable information. Then voluntary unemployment will have less excuse to exist.—HOLMES ALEXANDER.

FOR THE RELIEF OF JAMES M. YATES

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am again introducing a private bill for the relief of James M. Yates, a former officer in the U.S. Army.

The occasion for the introduction of this legislation is the alleged overpayment of Mr. Yates by the Department of the Army during his second and third years of training in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps while Mr. Yates attended Washington University as a graduate student. The Army maintains that when the sophomore and junior years of ROTC training are compressed the student shall be considered as only a second year student and therefore not eligible for commutation of expenses as if he were considered to be a third-year student. After his second year of training without payment, the student advances to the fourth year, where he is eligible for such commutation of expenses.

The first point for consideration is that Mr. Yates was neither a sophomore nor a junior, but was in fact a graduate student in a program of 3, rather than 4, years. Second, Mr. Yates indicated that there was no reduction in ROTC class time or assignments as a result of this so-called compression. Third, the Army has since changed the regulations—AR 145–350, section 31—so that the regulations regarding "compression" are no longer worded in terms of junior and senior years, and so forth, but rather in terms of the "period of concurrent training." This change went into effect on May 15, 1963, and does not affect Mr. Yates who at the time of his "compression" was under the previous provisions in terms of junior, senior years, and so forth.

The amount paid to Mr. Yates during the period of his "compression" was $238.50. The Army withheld $39.75 per month from Mr. Yates' monthly salary of $222.40 as a second lieutenant. I am now introducing legislation to relieve Mr. Yates of this alleged indebtedness of $238.50 to the Department of the Army, and to have the Army return any sums which may have been deducted from Mr. Yates' monthly salary.

PARTICIPATION SALES AND THE BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear that one of the major issues to be resolved by the 90th Congress will be the administration's continued use of "participation certificates" under the Participation Sales Act of 1966 as a means of financing more and more of its programs without direct recourse to the Treasury and outside normal budgetary controls.

Ever since it was railroaded through the Congress in the spring of last year, my minority colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee and I have continued to express the opposition we first exerted during our committee's too-brief consideration of the legislation. We have warned that the sale of participation certificates was driving up interest rates and drying up scarce capital. And our fears were confirmed when these very conditions forced the President last fall to suspend temporarily the sale of these certificates.

Regrettably, the President has reversed this wise decision. And, speaking for Republican Members of the House, our distinguished minority leader [Mr. FORD] has reiterated the minority's strong opposition to the Participation Sales Act and has demanded its repeal, a demand in which I join wholeheartedly.

With the submission today of the President's proposed budget for fiscal 1968, the significance of the budgetary juggling in which the administration is engaging is once again apparent. By planning to sell $5 billion worth of participation certificates in fiscal 1968, the President is enabled to show an estimated administrative budget deficit of $8.1 billion instead of the more accurate estimate of $13.1 billion and a cash deficit of $4.3 billion instead of the more realistic $9.3 billion.

The effects of this deception are nearly all harmful, Mr. Speaker. In addition to its impact on interest rates and capital markets, the sale of participation certificates tends to mislead the Congress and the public about real trends in Government spending, limits the effectiveness of normal budgetary controls, and results in a significantly higher cost of financing Government operations.

In anticipation of congressional action in this area, Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks one of the most comprehensive and convincing assessments of the participation certificate device which I have seen, and I earnestly recommend it to our colleagues. The article was published in the October 1966 issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey.

WHAT FUTURE FOR FEDERAL AGENCY PC'S?

In the brief span of just 34 days last spring (from April 20 to May 23), the Participation Sales Act of 1966 went through the full cycle of Presidential recommendation, Congressional action, and Presidential signature into law. As enacted, this measure authorized six federal credit agencies to sell private investors a multi-billion dollar total of "participation certificates"—debt instruments that enable agencies to reduce their dependence on U.S. Treasury funds and that give a purchaser a "beneficial interest" in an earmarked pool of agency assets, such as a grouping of mortgages or loans.

The six agencies made eligible to participate in the PC program were: the Small Business Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (including the Federal National Mortgage Association), the Veterans Administration, the Export-Import Bank, the Farmers Home Administration (only for land acquisition loans, rural housing loans, and crop production loans), and the Office of Education (only for loans made for the construction of academic facilities).

The Administration had initially proposed that all federal agencies be authorized to participate. Congress, however, narrowed the coverage, thereby excluding the possibility—at least for the present—of having PC's sold, for example, against the government's large portfolios of foreign-aid loans and farm price-support loans.

The speed with which the law was completed was remarkable even if full allowance is made for the fact that in the years from 1962 through 1965 there had been considerable experimentation with sales of participation certificates by both the Export-Import Bank and federal housing agencies. The 1966 proposal was much broader in scope than previous authorizing legislation of this kind. It also involved much larger sums of money potentially. And it came at a time when the nation's capital markets were in radically different condition than in the earlier years of experimentation.

Under these circumstances, the ordinary expectation would have been for extended deliberation and debate. This was especially true because of a suspicion in many quarters that the principal motivation behind the Administration's desire to step up the scale of participation sales was grounded in the purely statistical effect of such sales in reducing the reported size of the administrative budget deficit. Last January's official projection of the fiscal 1967 budget deficit was $1.8 billion. But had it not been for the inclusion of planned PC sales in the calculation, the figure would have been $6 billion. The difference comes about because under long-standing accounting procedures the proceeds of agency flotations in capital markets are offset against agency drawings from the Treasury and thus have the consequence of reducing the reported total of agency budget expenditures.

That the measure sailed through both the House and the Senate with the speed that it did despite such considerations appears to be testimony primarily to the Administration's skill in winning the advance cooperation of key Congressional leaders. The House Banking and Currency Committee, for example, over the strenuous objections of minority members, conducted a total of only three hours of public hearings on the proposal (on the day immediately after the Administration sent its formal proposal to Capitol Hill) and listened to no opposition witnesses.

Frustrated though a number of critics were last spring, they now have had the satisfaction of seeing the Administration declare a temporary moratorium on federal agency flotations of the kind authorized by the Participation Sales Act of 1966. The call-off, announced by President Johnson on September 8, was a direct response to the mounting evidence that the PC technique was contributing in a major way to price weakness for debt issues generally. Sales of such certificates had totaled $1.7 billion during the first half of 1966 and were scheduled at $4.2 billion for the fiscal year which began July 1. Such a volume of actual and prospective flotations by federal agencies, involving a type of debt instrument relatively new to many investors, was bound to be a major depressant in capital markets—especially so in the context of exceptionally heavy borrowing by others.

The moratorium declared by the President on September 8, however, clearly does not signal a permanent end of agency financing via the PC route. Rather, Administration spokesmen have made plain that sales of PC's will be resumed as soon as capital market conditions are more propitious. Officials in fact are now at work trying to figure out ways to improve the design and marketability of such instruments so as to smooth their market impact and reduce their interest cost when sales begin again.

A TIME FOR REASSESSMENT

The question of whether PC's are a sensible and prudent means of helping to finance the activities of federal credit agencies is thus very much alive. And the period of their dormancy provides a good opportunity for a less hurried look at both their rationale and their budgetary implications than was possible when the authorizing legislation was rushed through Congress last spring.

Basic to an understanding of the issues involved is an appreciation of the working of federal credit programs. These, of course, have assumed very large dimensions in the postwar period, reflecting an enormous expansion of both the federal government's loan insurance and loan guarantee activities and its direct lending programs. As of June 30, 1965, private loans insured or guaranteed by federal agencies stood at more than $91 billion, while direct federal loans outstanding amounted to about $33 billion, exclusive of loans made by federal trust funds, mixed ownership enterprises, and other public agencies operating in whole or in part with private money. The credit activities of these latter agencies (examples being the Federal Land Banks, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, the Federal Home Loan Banks, and the Federal Reserve Banks) are typically excluded from direct loan totals because these bodies operate outside the administrative budget framework and ordinarily do not receive funds from the U.S. Treasury. One of the largest and most important agencies in the federal credit field—the Federal National Mortgage Association—does not fit neatly into any single category, since some of its programs involve the use of Treasury funds and some are financed by the sale of notes, debentures, and stock to private investors. In making up the $33-billion total of direct government loans, only those Fanny Mae loans made with Treasury funds were included.

The government's role as insurer and guarantor, although of tremendous economic importance (particularly in the area of housing), has had minimal impact historically on the federal budget. This, of course, is because the funds received by borrowers are extended by private lenders, with the government's role essentially that of a catalyst. The only budget costs arising from these activities are restricted to administrative expenses and to excesses of realized losses over insurance and guarantee fees.

By contrast, direct lending by federal credit agencies (other than the quasi-public bodies referred to above) can have a significant impact on the budget. How big that effect is in any particular fiscal year depends on the extent to which agencies draw on the U.S. Treasury in order to finance their loan operations. Typcally the budget impact is likely to be less than the total of new loans extended, since a flow of repayments to agencies from loans made in prior years will be available for relending. Agencies also can make outright sales of portions of their loan portfolios to private parties, thus further supplementing their total of operating funds.

BUDGETARY BLUR

The opportunity which federal credit agencies have to finance some portion of their activities from non-Treasury sources complicates evaluation of over-all budget trends. This can be so even if the volume of new lending activity remains relatively stable from year to year. Confusion can be introduced simply if federal agencies collectively vary their financing mix as between Treasury and non-Treasury sources. If, for example, after several years of substantial reliance on self-financing by means of the sale of assets and the use of loan repayments, federal credit agencies suddenly shift to major reliance on the Treasury as a source of funds, the effect will be to push up the budget's expenditure total. Conversely, a sudden increase in the proportion of loans which are self-financed will result in a downward push on budget expenditures. Neither of these occurrences will necessarily be of much significance in terms of government's over-all spending and lending impact on the economy. But that fact is not generally appreciated. It is quite likely that the average citizen, whose knowledge of budgetary trends comes chiefly from general news coverage of simple budget totals, will often gain an erroneous impression as to the economic impact of the government's financial operations.

It is obvious that the PC technique has added significantly to the possibility of confusion—and on a major scale, since of the

$33-billion total of direct loans that were outstanding on June 30, 1965, approximately one-third were in the portfolios of agencies presently eligible to participate in the PC program. The PC technique represents a further means by which agencies can acquire funds without going to the Treasury, one which is free of some of the important limitations that attach to present methods of self-finance.

Except in the case of federal housing agencies, attempts to sell private investors individual loans held in agency portfolios have not been notably successful in the past for two principal reasons. Agencies, first of all, have faced a formidable marketing problem in seeking out buyers who would have an interest in the specific terms (maturity dates, paydown rates, and so on) associated with a particular loan. More importantly, the very fact that many of the direct loans made by federal agencies fall short of meeting customary standards of creditworthiness has caused private buyers to be relatively disinterested in them.

The PC device, which doesn't involve the sale of assets as such but only a "beneficial interest" in them, suffers from neither of these handicaps. The marketing problem is easier because there is no comparable need to match buyer preferences as to terms with thousands and thousands of dissimilar loans in agency portfolios. Participation certificates in effect standardize the differences among the individual items in a pool of assets, since the terms on which PC's are offered are not in any significant way conditioned or limited by the terms attached to the underlying loans. This standardization obviates the need for individual negotiations with potential buyers and instead opens up the possibility of mass distribution via the established underwriter-dealer facilities of capital markets.

HOW PC'S ARE BACKED

Moreover, the quality of the loans in any particular pool—something that would be crucially important if the loans as such were being sold—is not of practical importance to the buyer of the PC. This is because the "timely" payment of every participation certificate's principal and interest is guaranteed by the Federal National Mortgage Association, which has been designated by law as trustee in the sale of all PC's. And Fanny Mae does not have to rely on its own resources in making good on this guarantee, since under law it in turn can borrow—and indeed has pledged that it will borrow—from the U.S. Treasury to effect timely payment of either principal or interest if that should become necessary. The Attorney General of the United States has in fact formally stated that Fanny Mae's guarantee of a PC "brings into being a general obligation of the United States backed by its full faith and credit." PC holders, according to the Attorney General, are in a position to reach beyond the assets of Fanny Mae to the United States for payment, if necessary. The Participation Sales Act of 1966 specifically anticipates that the Treasury will ordinarily have to subsidize interest payments to holders of those PC's that are issued against pools of low-interest rate loans.

An alternative to increasing agency self-finance by the PC route would have been for the Administration to have requested Congress to grant a range of federal agencies authority to sell notes or debentures in capital markets in the same way that quasi-public credit institutions now do. Getting Congress to grant issuing authority where none exists, however, probably would have been a far more difficult and cumbersome procedure than was the achievement of more generalized borrowing authority in PC form. Moreover, even if Congress had acted case-by-case, formidable marketing problems would in all likelihood have been encountered by agencies such as the Office of Education that have had no previous borrowing experience. The problem of achieving investor familiarity and receptivity would have been more serious than in the case of PC's, which—despite their relative novelty—gain some stature with investors from the fact that they are marketed through Fanny Mae, an agency that has had considerable exposure in capital markets. The decision to channel all PC offerings through Fanny Mae also avoids the marketing disorder that might arise if a variety of federal agencies all tried to step up their offerings without a coordinated sales effort.

All these factors emphasize that the PC device—particularly because of the full faith and credit consideration—is a powerful new tool for enabling agencies to achieve a degree of self-finance that has not been possible in the past. Actually, individual agencies have the potential for taking in more funds from PC sales in particular years than they utilize in loan extensions. Such excesses would be employed to pay off previously incurred agency indebtedness to the Treasury, thus creating a situation in which the agency was helping to finance the Treasury rather than vice versa, as is usual. These things mean that, whenever PC sales are being made in appreciable volume, the task of evaluating trends in the regular administrative budget will be even more difficult than in the past. The fact that projected PC sales made a difference of $4.2 billion in the original estimates of the fiscal 1967 budget deficit emphasizes the leeway that exists for misinterpretation. Indeed, a good many critics have charged that in reality the PC device is nothing more than a gimmick by which officials can manipulate the budget deficit to make it seem smaller than it actually is.

THE PRIVATE-CREDIT RATIONALE

Administration spokesmen sharply deny the validity of this contention and assert instead that the motivation for PC sales is of entirely different nature. Essentially, they justify the new technique with a claim that they are seeking to substitute private credit for public credit in the financing of the federal government's lending activities. Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr and Budget Director Charles L. Schultze, who spearheaded the Administration drive in Congress for the PC legislation, both emphasized over and over again that the government should be an "intermediary" that extends credit to worthy borrowers that can not find accommodation in normal channels but that then disposes of its loans as quickly as possible. The government, they argued, should not function as a "bank," which progressively builds its loan portfolio to a higher and higher level.

In their Congressional testimony, the two officials repeatedly sought to trace the lineage of PC's back to the 1961 Report of the Commission on Money and Credit and to the 1963 Report of President Kennedy's Committee on Federal Credit Programs, chaired by former Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon. Both of these studies argued that the role of public credit in the economy should be primarily residual (geared chiefly to filling "gaps" in the private credit structure) and that in the main federal credit aids should be designed to encourage and supplement private lending activities rather than to substitute for them. And going back even further in time, the Under Secretary and the Budget Director sought to portray the sale of PC's essentially as an extension of the Eisenhower Administration's emphasis on the desirability of selling financial assets, such as mortgages, whenever this could be done at reasonable prices. Indeed, President Johnson in transmitting his PC recommendations to Congress in April contended that he was building not only on the CMC and Dillon Committee reports but also "on the outstanding work" of General Eisenhower's Administration.

Despite this elaborate effort to outfit PC's in orthodox garb, the notion that they really constitute a means of substituting private for public credit becomes exceedingly fuzzy and tenuous when scrutinized at all closely. Whereas the Eisenhower Administration placed emphasis primarily on the sale of financial assets themselves—something that where successful involved an actual transfer of assets to a private buyer—the sale of PC's gives a buyer only a beneficial interest in a grouping of assets. And this distinction is crucial. Legal title to the items in a PC pool remains with the government—specifically with Fannie Mae as trustee—and the originating agency, meanwhile, retains custody of the loans and continues to service them. The total of loans outstanding on the books of federal credit agencies is precisely the same before and after a sale of PC's. The "banking" role of the government in extending and holding loans is in no meaningful way changed. Instead of being sold to private parties, the assets themselves serve essentially as collateral for the PC's. And the importance of even this function can be questioned, since in practical terms the safety of the PC's from the standpoint of the person buying them depends principally on Fannie Mae's guarantee as to the timely payment of principal and interest and on their ultimate backing by the Treasury. What is being sold, therefore, is in realty the credit of the United States.

Presumably no one would seriously contend that a loan extended by a federal credit agency to, say, a small business involved private credit if the funds used had originated with the sale of a Treasury bond to a private investor. Instead, agreement would be general that the lending activity was being carried on with public funds. And precisely the same thing is true if, alternatively, the funds employed originate with the sale of PC's. All the money used by government and its agencies, whether it is tax money or borrowed money, has to originate privately, but that in itself provides no basis for alleging that governmental activities are in any significant sense private activities.

FAULTY TRANSLATION

The point that was made by both the CMC and Dillon Committee reports about the desirability of substituting private for public credit has somehow become twisted in translation. Basically, those documents asserted that, wherever feasible, ultimate borrowers should be accommodated by private credit facilities and that governmental credit aids should be withdrawn or scaled down in areas where impediments to private lending activity eventually disappear. Emphasis was placed in both reports on the "seasoning" role of federal credit aids in producing an evolution in various areas toward conditions where private lending activity, once infeasible, becomes practical. The PC technique, however, has no relevance to any of these considerations. It holds no promise whatever of increasing the appetite of private lenders for loans of the kinds that government agencies typically make.

Stripped of the private-credit rationale, the case for selling PC's—as compared with the alternative of selling ordinary Treasury obligations—becomes very weak. This is particularly so because of the way in which PC sales distort the administrative budget and also because of the fact that they entail interest costs to the government and in turn to taxpayers that are higher than those that would be incurred if Treasury issues were sold. Currently, outstanding PC's are typically changing hands in markets at yields about 50 basis points higher than is true in the case of regular government obligations of the same maturity. This, however, undoubt-

edly overstates somewhat the "normal" yield spread, since the supply of longer-term Treasury obligations has been kept artificially low by the legal prohibition against selling new Treasury issues at an interest rate above 4¼%. A true "normal" probably would be closer to 25 basis points—a figure that Administration spokesmen think can be approached as buyers become more familiar with PC's and as they come to appreciate the strength of the guarantee behind them. In figuring the added cost to government entailed in the issuance of PC's, it needs to be appreciated that any interest-rate differential between PC's and Treasuries is cumulative, that is, it is incurred not just in the year of issue but is repeated year after year as long as the PC's are outstanding. If federal credit agencies for example, succeeded in building up PC's outstanding to, say, the $10-billion level, the added cost to government over the period of a decade would be $250 million, if calculations are made using 25 basis points as the differential There would also be some underwriting costs which are not present in regular Treasury financing. In an era of inflated budgets, the extra expenses involved in PC sales may seem trifling. Nevertheless, it is a sound rule to insist that no cost be undertaken, however small, unless it can be shown to have a meaningful purpose.

And there are two additional reasons for questioning the advisability of issuing PC's. The very attractive yields that investors have been able to realize in acquiring them during the past year have unquestionably contributed to the reduction in the flow of savings through customary channels. Some savings that normally would have gone into mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations have gone instead to government, and, indeed, financial institutions themselves have bought significant amounts of PC's, utilizing funds that might otherwise have been available, say, to finance housing activity. Thus, ironically, Fanny Mae—which exists primarily to strengthen mortgage markets—has in its capacity as the marketer of PC's contributed to the serious strains that have developed in housing over the past year.

Another worrisome aspect of PC financing is that it may tend to make it easier for government credit agencies to expand lending programs, irrespective of their basic merit. This could be so, for example, if the private-credit justification gained acceptance in Congress, for in that circumstance there would be a tendency for the legislators to measure the scale of a particular agency's activities not by total loans outstanding but rather by total loans minus PC's. Fortunately, at the request of minority members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the Administration's original draft of the enabling legislation was amended to require that all PC offerings gain the prior approval of Congressional appropriations committees. This was the minority's major accomplishment in Congress' deliberations, and potentially it provides the machinery for effective Congressional limitation on PC activity and, in turn, on a major source of funds to lending agencies. How well that machinery works, however, will depend in part on whether the members of the appropriations committees perceive the illogic of the private-credit rationale.

Despite the many points that can be scored against the PC device, there remains one possible justification for its use. It does provide the government with a way around the arbitrary interest-rate limit of 4¼% that Congress long ago placed on regular Treasury issues of more than five years' maturity. To the extent that debt-management considerations point to the desirability of lodging some portion of government's new borrowing in the long-term area, PC's can perhaps be viewed as an expedient made necessary by Congressional intransigence. But this is no reason to close one's eyes to the additional costs that are involved nor to delude oneself that a way has been found to substitute private for public credit in the government's lending programs.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF MEDICARE BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I was proud in 1965 to be the author of H.R. 1, which was the basis for medicare. It was a long fight. And after so many years I am very glad to see this landmark legislation has been put quickly into effective operation. Across the country, older Americans who once faced the prospect of being impoverished by illness are now having their hospital and medical bills paid. For them, life has become more secure; their retirement years happier and more dignified; they need no longer turn to charity or put undue strain upon their families.

I am very pleased to see that the President has now proposed to extend medicare benefits to those who receive social security disability payments.

The present medicare law extends coverage to persons 65 and over. Under the legislation proposed in the President's older Americans message, medicare benefits would be extended to another group in our population just as much in need of this health insurance protection as our Nation's elderly citizens. These are the almost one and a half million people who are receiving disability benefits under social security and who meet the present definition of disability in the social security law. These beneficiaries include 1.2 million disabled workers, 100,000 disabled widows, and 200,000 disabled adults most of whom have never worked because of a disability they have had since childhood. In more than 65 percent of the social security cases involving adults disabled since childhood—the sons or daughters of insured workers—the problem of mental deficiency is a major factor.

Like the aged, the seriously disabled have a higher than average need for health care. They are hospitalized frequently and, in many cases, their hospital stays are long. In addition, totally disabled people, like the elderly, have difficulty in obtaining private health insurance.

As was the case with many older people before medicare, the disabled person often has no alternative but to seek financial help with his medical expenses either from public welfare or from his children and relatives who are usually ill-prepared to meet these expenditures.

The logical answer to this situation is to extend medicare coverage to the disabled. By adding hospital and medical insurance to the monthly benefits these disability beneficiaries now receive from social security, the disabled person could have the assurance that his medical needs would be met without his having to become a burden on his family or the community.

It has also been suggested that medicare be broadened to include prescription drugs. The medicare law presently does not cover prescription drugs used by the patient outside a hospital or extended care facility.

One of the proposals the President has made in his older Americans message is that a study be undertaken of the feasibility of covering prescription drugs under medicare.

As we all realize, however, the costs of prescription drugs can take a disproportionate share of the low-income aged person's meager resources.

In 1965, the elderly are estimated to have spent close to a billion dollars on drugs and related items, of which at least $600 million was spent on prescription drugs.

There are many practical difficulties, however, in broadening medicare to cover prescription drugs. There are, as President Johnson has pointed out, the problems of cost, therapeutic equivalents, formularies, and other complex matters to be considered.

All of these questions need to be explored in greater depth, and for this reason, I urge that we give support to the President's proposal for a special study.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the President on recommending a meaningful increase in social security cash benefits.

Too often we forget that a great many of our older citizens live on small, fixed incomes, at levels which barely meet minimum standards of decency. I am therefore extremely pleased to see that the President has proposed to bring benefits more in line with present-day needs, and that he has proposed a large increase for those people at the low end of the benefit scale.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIS G. LIPSCOMB UPON RETIREMENT FROM PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to 20 years of outstanding service which a distinguished Virginian, Willis G. Lipscomb, has just completed with his retirement from Pan American Airways as a senior vice president. Mr. Lipscomb became associated with Pan American in 1947, having worked prior to that with American Airlines and its predecessor companies and with the tobacco and coal industries. In his initial year with Pan-Am he was elected vice president in charge of traffic and sales. In 1960 he was elected to the board of directors and, in 1964 received the title of senior vice president of the company.

Virginia is proud of Mr. Lipscomb as a native son and I am proud to have been associated with him as a classmate at Randolph-Macon College. Willis Lipscomb's distinguished career in business was climaxed by his achievements in the field of aviation sales. He was a leading figure in commercial aviation for nearly four decades and pioneered the develop-

ment of low fares for international travel. It was largely through his efforts that the low tourist fares and later, the still lower economy fares, were established.

I salute my friend Willis Lipscomb as a champion of the free enterprise system and for his accomplishments in the field of aviation.

SUPPORT FOR OUR TROOPS IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber is—and God grant that it may always remain—a Chamber dedicated to free discussion, to frank debate, and where required, to vigorous dissent.

But there are some issues which are beyond partisanship, and on which this House stands agreed simply because we are all Americans.

Such an issue, indeed, the issue before all others, is the issue of this Nation's security.

That is our first concern in this Chamber. And that is our final concern.

For if we neglect the security of this Nation, what shall it matter what other goal we seek?

If that be true in time of peace, how much more true is it in time of war.

We are today at war, at war half a world away, in a torn and tortured land that seeks only sufficient freedom from subversion and aggression to stand securely on its own feet, and fashion its own future.

It is a war we did not seek, and a burden we do not find pleasant to bear.

But our troops stand today in South Vietnam because we have pledged our word to these beleaguered millions of citizens who have sought our assistance, and who depend in their hour of trial on our integrity in keeping that word.

The war is costly—as war always is. Costly in material. Costly in effort. But most of all, costly in casualties.

Indeed, it is beyond cost itself. For who can put a price on the limbs or lives of our young Americans who so valiantly risk both to carry out their duty?

That they are doing their duty with a degree of dedication unsurpassed in the entire military history of this Nation is the testimony of their superb commander: General Westmoreland.

That their morale matches their mission is evident to every visitor, including many from this Chamber, who have toured the battle areas of South Vietnam.

That their determination stands undiminished in spite of every difficulty of terrain and tactics is undisputed even by the critics of this conflict.

What, then, is to be our response to the President's urgent request that we support in full measure the material requirements of these magnificent fighting men?

Is there any one in this Chamber, whatever his political or partisan persuasion, who can doubt for a moment where our duty lies with respect to this request?

Our troops require, and deserve, the fullest measure of our material support to carry on with their task.

We cannot and we must not deny to these brave men in uniform the means they require.

We have pledged them our support. And they expect it.

Our troops do not ask to be relieved from the daily danger that is their lot. They only ask to be given the arms and resources to carry out the task that the Nation has committed itself to perform.

Who will argue that these amounts requested are too high? Who will say that we can find shortcuts to our men's safety? Who will cavil with costs that concern the very life or death of our troops?

Now is the time, by prompt and decisive action, to demonstrate to our men the sincerity of our support.

Now is the time to display the full measure of our pride in their performance.

Now is the time to signify our gratitude for their sacrifices.

But there is yet another task that is ours.

And that is that we must make clear a message to our adversaries as well.

For it is not merely our own men who look to what we do in this Chamber. Our enemies look as well.

And they look to see not merely what we do, but what we say. Not merely whether we vote this appropriation; but in what manner we do so. Not merely whether we give our troops what they require; but how willingly we give it.

For our adversaries in Vietnam can no longer hope to defeat us in the field. But they clearly do not desist in hoping that ultimately they can erode and finally erase our determination and persistence here at home.

They have come to be fully aware of the superiority of our military power. But they continue to harbor doubts about our staying power.

They look eagerly for signs that we are wearying here at home; that debate and dissent have turned to disillusionment and despair; that our perseverance is failing; that our will is weakening.

Let this Chamber's response to the supplemental appropriation before us be our answer to our adversaries' cynical hope that our purpose and patience is faltering.

Let us not merely pass this bill, but pass it in such a way as to show the world at large that our resolve stands unflinchingly firm.

OLDER AMERICANS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MCFALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse President Johnson's message on older Americans. I am particularly impressed by his recommendations for changes in social security, and especially the extension of the program to additional farmworkers.

No area of our economy has seen more changes in the last two decades than agriculture, and no workers in our economy have been more seriously affected by changes than agricultural workers. Yet there are still a great many agricultural workers with no social security protection, and many others who get social security credit for only part of their work.

Farmworkers generally have low earnings and can save little for their declining years. Surely no citizens today are more in need of improved social security protection than those who depend mainly on farm employment for their livelihood. And yet their work, in whole or in part, is excluded from social security protection under present law.

It is possible to provide protection for, or increase the protection of, half a million farmworkers without bringing under the program the bulk of the short-term workers who do some agricultural work but who do not depend on such work for their livelihood.

That is what the President proposes to do.

These changes are needed in addition to other recommended improvements in the program, improvements that will automatically result in increased benefits for those agricultural workers who are now able to qualify for only minimum benefit amounts.

I urge your support for these long overdue improvements in the protection of farmworkers and their families.

EXTENSION OF APPALACHIAN ACT OF 1965

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am preparing for introduction a bill to extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965—a progressive and significant act which is opening doors of opportunity to the people of the 12-State area in the Appalachian region.

This bill will propose authorizing and extending the Appalachian highway development program through June 30, 1969.

The Appalachian program is a significant program, an important program, a vital program in the growth, progress, and development of the areas in the 12 States included under the act.

This program has proved itself in my State of Tennessee and in the Fourth Congressional District which I am honored to represent in the Congress.

I have seen this progress in its beginning stages as the program creates and builds and as it touches our area and provides new opportunities for our people.

The act is only beginning to work and should be extended.

This program is in line with the President's state of the Union message which calls for cooperation by the Federal Government with State and local agencies of Government in regional undertakings. The Appalachian development program is a partnership of shared responsibility.

My bill will propose an authorization of $263,150,000 for the programs extended to June 30, 1968. It also includes authorizations for the Highway development program to June 30, 1971. The initial highway authorization proposed is $110 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

This amendment also will provide for extension of assistance in construction of hospital facilities; the control and prevention of erosion under the 10-year contracts with farmers; timber development, restoration of mining areas, a water resource study, vocational education assistance, sewage treatment assistance, and supplements for various basic Federal grant-in-aid programs, among others.

This act also would establish a more orderly and direct appropriations process with appropriations made directly to the Appalachian Regional Development Commission for allocation for projects and programs, rather than to a number of departments or agencies, as the bill originally provided.

This program already is opening up our Appalachian area for development with new highways and new access roads.

At this time 800 miles of development highway system is under construction.

Thousands of workers have been trained and added to private payrolls.

Fifty-one hospitals have been completed or are under construction and 52 vocational education schools are being built under assistance from the Appalachian program.

New libraries, airports, college classrooms, and water resource projects are underway under this program.

Economic development is accelerating in the Appalachian area as public facilities are improved and more and better access provided.

This is a worthwhile program, a vital program, and a program that must be retained and continued. I urge extension of the Appalacian Regional Development Act by the Congress.

MERGE THE NEW HAVEN

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Interstate Commerce Commission is presently conducting hearings in New York City on the proposed merger of the New York Central Railroad with the Pennsylvania Railroad subject to the inclusion in the new rail system of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

I support this merger and I ask unanimous consent that the text of my statement submitted to the ICC in support of the merger be included in the RECORD, as follows:

In a statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission on January 11, 1966, I opposed a petition by the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad to drop all passenger service due to continued losses. At that time I said, "It is unthinkable that the State of Connecticut with its population of more than 2½ million people should be without passenger train service." While this statement is as relevant today as it was a year ago, we must face the reality that something other than simply shoring up the railroad must be done about the circumstances under which the New Haven Railroad presently exists.

That is why I welcomed the I.C.C. order of April 27, 1966, approving the Penn-Central merger on condition that the new eastern system be required to include the New Haven in its operations. I viewed this proposal as a realistic way of "saving" the bankrupt New Haven Railroad and ensuring adequate passenger service to the citizens of the four state area in which it operates.

The importance of "saving" the New Haven Railroad cannot be stressed too much. The livelihood of countless thousands of commuters depends on adequate passenger service in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and New York. The fact that freight service is lucrative and passenger service is presently unprofitable should not outweigh the public interest consideration involved in this question. If the operation of the free market cannot sustain an adequate passenger service, then governments both state and federal, have legitimate roles to play helping to sustain this needed service.

The Federal Government, Connecticut and New York have recognized the importance of the New Haven Railroad and the vital role they can play in revitalizing it by contributing millions of dollars toward sustaining the operation.

Furthermore, I submit that passenger service need not necessarily be a losing proposition. Technological advances in train and engine design have made high speed rail transportation a reality and have brought with them the possibility of increased consumer demand and large operational savings. In the 89th Congress I introduced legislation authorizing a three-year, $90 million program of research and demonstration projects for development of high speed intercity railroad transportation. The enactment of this legislation marked a step closer to a Washington-to-Boston passenger service with trains traveling up to 160 miles per hour.

Thus, with the advent of high speed trains and their resultant operational economies, and considering the tremendous strangulating burdens already placed on air and road traffic, the prospects for the profitable operation of passenger service are brighter today than previously.

With these points in mind, we cannot allow the abandonment of passenger service. Indeed we must do all in our power to retain such service, not only because it is in the public interest, but also because the economic rewards of passenger service in the future look brighter and the advantages to our economy may be substantial.

Shortsightedness and narrow thinking must be avoided in this situation. I, therefore, urge prompt approval and speedy implementation of the ICC's order of April 27th, approving the Penn-Central merger with the inclusion of the New Haven Railroad in the new system as a prerequisite.

BUSINESSMEN URGED TO USE RESEARCH FACILITY AT UK

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, the University of Kentucky, my alma mater located in my district, is offering increased services to all segments of Kentucky's economy. The latest offer of aid comes from the Bureau of Business Research as the article below from the Lexington Leader indicates. I believe it would be of interest to my colleagues and the universities in their States.

The article follows:

Dr. John L. Fulmer, director of the University of Kentucky Bureau of Business Research, urges Kentucky Businessmen to make more use of the Bureau's facilities.

"Active participation by business firms in the Bureau's program," Dr. Fulmer said, "not only will increase the output of valuable research, but will accelerate economic development while improving the climate for business and industry."

He says there is the businessman who, because of his limited resources or because he has always considered himself as his best idea man, says, "Please, I'd rather do it myself," when he faces problems of new product research and development.

Other executives will say: "I employ an advertising agency because they view my product development program from a divorced point of view."

The UK Bureau of Business Research is a common ground upon which these apparently irreconcilable viewpoints can meet—and have met—profitably, Dr. Fulmer says.

Although the UK agency is one of many practitioners of the "divorced" type of research and development, its many activities are aimed at helping industry and business find answers to present and anticipated problems.

The Bureau includes on its working staff experts in many fields, and is able to call upon other specialists within the University.

"These are eager men and women who consider limitation as a challenge to search beyond the immediate and the obvious," Dr. Fulmer adds. "They are thoroughly trained thinkers who have learned that a stagnant situation is simply the starting gun for a deep probe."

Some of the research titles to emanate from the Bureau in recent months are varied: Analysis of Market Potentials for New Products and Services; New Product Analysis; Market Introduction; Techniques of Sales Organization and Management; Financing Methods for Small Businesses; Reception and Utilization of Data Flow in Companies; Communication Science in Management, plus dozens of others.

The Bureau was organized in 1928 as a part of the UK College of Commerce. An advisory committee of eight facility members assists in determining objectives and research plans. Working with the agency are doctoral candidates and professors from other departments of the University.

Service to state and local governments as well as to the business community has been provided by the Bureau during its 38 years at UK. Much private counsel has been given to industry and business on special problems.

Published studies from the Bureau's own research, as well as a wide selection of studies

performed in other parts of the country, are available in the Bureau's offices.

The library is open to businessmen from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily, Monday through Friday, Dr. Fulmer said. It is located on the fourth floor of UK's Commerce Building.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—VIII

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service System operated fairly well in the 1950's when the low birth rates of the 1930's and of World War II were reflected in the number of youths entering the draft pool. At that time, only about 1 million males reached the age of 18 each year.

Now, however, the Nation is experiencing the effects of the postwar baby boom. As I stated earlier, approximately 1.8 million young men are entering the 18½ to 26 group annually. This pool is currently expanding at the rate of one-third every 6 or 7 years. In the 1970's about 2 million a year will be added. About two-thirds of them will be found mentally and physically fit for military service under present standards. But, the demands of the Military Establishment will not require anything like 1.3 million new men annually. Mathematically, this creates inequity, for when there are twice as many eligible men as needed, the method of selection, by necessity, become more selective, and in the process, deteriorates into a potluck operation.

General Hershey and his associates were very loathe to accept what was occurring. They held to the official fiction that every eligible registrant was bound to be called sooner or later. When, however, only 46 percent of the 26-year-old men had seen military service in 1966, as compared to 70 percent in 1958, the general and his staff were forced to reevaluate the situation.

Not wishing, however, to entirely abandon their position, they then had to devise a suitable rationale for the apparently large discrepancy between those eligible to serve, and those actually serving in the Armed Forces. While still clinging to the anachronistic notion, which in essence has turned out to be a myth, that all men are equally liable for the draft, Hershey, however, began to justify the deferment policy which distinguishes between those men who will serve and those who will avoid military service altogether. One of the important factors in determining whether a deferment is to be granted is, if it will be "in the national interest." The manner in which this term is defined and who does the defining, however, contributes immeasurably to the deterioration of the selective service process, for it is here that the seed of discrimination, in large part, is sown.

The necessity of examining what are our national goals, and who determines them, is yet another reason why the present Selective Service System must be revised.

MEXICO'S ECONOMIC UPTURN HAMPERED BY U.S. IMPORT RESTRICTIONS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress, which produced so much good legislation, made the sad mistake of doing an economic injustice to our neighbor to the south and one of our closest friends in the Western Hemisphere, Mexico. It is ironic that while we still suffer from a balance-of-payments problem in our international trade relations, Mexico is the one nation with which we have a favorable balance of trade. Yet, the 89th Congress tightened up and restricted import regulations for goods coming across the Mexican border. A few of us, myself included, fought the import restrictions and predicted that they would do harm to our trade relations and to the Mexican economy. Unfortunately, this prediction has already proven true.

An article in last Monday's New York Times, January 23, 1967, summarizes the Mexican economic performance for 1966. Generally speaking, the Mexican economy surged forward and showed overall growth of about 6 percent, as compared with a 5.1-percent growth rate for 1965. Both the public and private sectors showed an upturn, and there was some improvement in the Mexican balance-of-payments problem.

But, according to the Times article, the Mexicans had a number of complaints about the United States. Significantly, and in the words of the Times article:

> One of them concerned United States import restrictions.

Mexico is one of the relatively few Latin American nations where we have come to expect political stability and social peace. Yet, although it may be characterized as a progressive and democratic nation, it is still largely an underdeveloped one. The problems of underdevelopment are so great and so far removed from the American experience that most of us cannot even conceive their true nature. There is no foreign assistance program for Mexico, but, it seems to me, the least we can do for our neighbor and close ally is to lend a helping hand across the Rio Grande by helping her and encouraging her to sell us her goods and trade with us. We should not be throwing stumbling blocks at Mexico.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting the article from the New York Times, January 23, 1967, by Henry Giniger:

MEXICO: CONSERVATIVE PLANNERS LOOSENING THE PURSE STRINGS TO SPUR DEVELOPMENT—ECONOMIC UPTURN STIRS OPTIMISM—INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT CLIMBS AS NATION TAKES STEP TO AID LAGGING FARM SECTOR

(By Henry Giniger)

MEXICO CITY.—Having paused for breath in 1965, the Mexican economy put on an impressive show in 1966 and faced the new year in an aura of optimism.

The Government and Government-run businesses, decisive factors in Mexican life, heightened their activities considerably. The result was that instead of a rather mediocre advance of 5.1 per cent in 1965 in over-all growth, all signs point to an increase of more than 6 per cent in gross national product, the sum of all the goods and services produced.

Practically every index in both the public and private industrial and commercial sectors showed an upturn, and even the chronically weak spots seemed a little less weak. The trade deficit, for example, began to show the beneficial effect of the drive to increase exports. Nature contributed abundant rains while the Government and private banks stepped up credits to relieve the poverty of the rural sector.

This sector, however, continued to nag everyone concerned about Mexico's future. The rural population accounts for half of the country, and there is unanimous agreement that it is not getting its share of the country's increasing wealth.

President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz took note of this in his annual report to the nation in September. He promised "priority" consideration to agriculture and a program of regional development that will spread the wealth beyond the few urban centers where it now has a tendency to concentrate.

GROWTH GOAL: 6 PERCENT

The goal of development set forth for the country has been 6 per cent a year. The country's population has been growing at the rate of about 3 per cent a year with no signs of slackening and no signs of any Government willingness to make it slacken. The question arises whether a net growth rate of about 3 per cent, and possibly a little less than that, is sufficient.

The administration has shown itself to be conservative in financial policy, but as it enters its third year it is beginning to loosen up on the purse strings. The Government has indicated great concern about the strength and stability of the peso, its credit position abroad and price stability. In all three fields, the picture continued to be favorable, although there were signs of pressure on retail and wholesale prices that were likely to become aggravated in 1967.

Political stability and social peace also continued to be major factors in internal and external confidence. The picture was not altogether flawless in 1966 as students showed varying degrees of unrest in universities in Mexico City and in the provinces. The Government took a tough stand in some cases, notably where there were indications of extreme leftist subversion.

RECORD FOREIGN INVESTMENT

One result of this confidence was an inflow of over $200 million in foreign investment, a record. The great majority of this was American. Another result was a 10 per cent increase in tourists, whose expenditure of well over $800-million constituted the country's biggest export.

During the first nine months of last year, exports of goods were up 14.7 per cent, according to official figures, while imports rose by only 1.4 per cent. Mexico made significant gains in exports to her partners of the Latin American Free Trade Area and to the United States.

However, the Mexicans had a number of complaints about the United States, their principal trading partner. One of them concerned United States import restrictions, another the increased tendency by American-controlled companies here to repatriate profits and to go to local banks for credit. In cash outflow, the country registered a deficit in the first six months of the year of more than $100-million, compared with not quite $2-million in the same period of 1965.

Much of this reflected the tight money situation in the United States, but Mexicans, particularly those who have to compete for the relatively limited credit resources of local banks, were inclined to believe that the United States was being unfair to a developing country that needed all the capital it could get.

Some of this cash outflow was Mexican money seeking havens or investment opportunities abroad. Former President Lazar Cardenas, at a luncheon in December, denounced "the rich who send their millions abroad." He said that with this money Mexico could solve her economic problems without having to resort to foreign loans.

On the American side, there was considerable questioning about official Mexican investment policy.

In his annual message the President gave direct investment a relatively low order of desirability, and there was increasing pressure to "Mexicanize" foreign concerns, i.e., to give Mexicans majority control.

The budget presented in December for 1967 called for a 6 per cent increase in spending next year. However, total public spending will rise by 20 per cent, according to Finance Minister Antonio Ortiz Mena, through loans from abroad. This is the preferred form of foreign investment in Mexico. An example is a new loan from the Inter-American Development Bank of $24-million for irrigation and rural development in the Northwest, a project that will cost a total of $50-million.

However, the Government is placing the principal burden of investment in the next few years on private enterprise.

BUREAU OF OLDER WORKERS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, during the 89th Congress I introduced H.R. 2062, to establish a Bureau of Older Workers within the Department of Labor. The need for such a bureau was made clear to me at a Conference on Job Barriers Against Older Workers, at which representatives of business and labor agreed that many qualified people as young as 35 or 40 are refused employment because of their age.

The Manpower and Development Training Amendments of 1966 provided for a special program of testing, counseling, selection, and referral of older workers for occupational training and further schooling designed to meet special problems encountered by older workers in the labor market.

However, only a systematic and sustained attack, led by a Bureau of Older Workers, promises hope of eventual solution of the older worker problems. The job of such a bureau would be to sell employers on the desirability of hiring older workers, carry out research and demonstration programs, develop new seniority and pension programs, strengthen training and education programs, and coordinate the activities of all Federal agencies to prevent discrimination in employment because of age. The Bureau of Older Workers would spearhead the drive to lower the age barriers now confronting the older worker in search of a job.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the text of my bill at this point in my remarks for the attention of my colleagues:

H.R. 2062

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be established in the Department of Labor a Bureau of Older Workers.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Bureau of Older Workers to provide leadership in increasing the employment of men and women over forty years of age by formulating standards and policies to promote the welfare of older workers, remove arbitrary and artificial job barriers, and otherwise advance opportunities for profitable employment.

SEC. 3. (a) The Bureau shall conduct educational programs on the availability and usefulness of older workers to industry, by holding conferences for employers, union leaders, and others interested in promoting the employability of older workers, by visiting employers to convince them that hiring older workers is good business, and by other available means.

(b) The Bureau shall investigate and report on the ways in which tax policies, pension programs, wage systems, collective bargaining agreements, and widespread misconceptions about efficiency of workers over forty, may discourage their employment. The Director of the Bureau may from time to time publish the results of these investigations in such a manner and to such an extent as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe.

(c) In cooperation with other agencies of the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Bureau shall—

(i) assist in the reemployment of older workers whenever a major dislocation by reason of plant shutdown occurs, and

(ii) evolve tests for older workers to determine their skills and aptitudes and develop retraining programs for such workers to increase their employability.

(d) The Bureau shall stimulate development by local communities of voluntary, nonprofit, employment counseling and assistance for workers over forty.

(e) The Bureau shall coordinate the activities of all Federal agencies to prevent discrimination in the employment of older workers by the Federal Government. The Bureau shall also encourage employment of older workers by State and local public agencies and private nonprofit organizations.

SEC. 4. The Bureau of Older Workers shall be under the direction of a chief to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect and be in force from and after the date of its passage.

TRADE WITH RUSSIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, while the atmosphere is clearing for commerce with Eastern Europe, American businessmen cannot expect much of an increase in volume without action on President Johnson's trade proposals.

The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin has called attention to a Soviet invitation to U.S. firms to advertise in Soviet journals. It also refers to recent efforts by private groups to promote trade with Iron Curtain countries as a sign of the evolving times.

Russia's interest in trade would not have been expressed without the administration's announced desire to open the doors of East-West business, the Bulletin remarks. But it asserts that unless the administration's most-favored-nation proposals are adopted, U.S. exporters seeking to enter the doors will do so under a handicap.

I include the Bulletin's editorial on trade with Russia in the RECORD:

TRADE WITH RUSSIA

Many are still alive who never thought they would live to see a Communist government lauding the virtues of advertising, the "evil" handmaiden of capitalism. But there it is, two full pages of advertising in the New York Times inviting United States firms to advertise in Soviet newspapers and periodicals and unashamedly stating that there are no bans on commercials on TV or radio.

Complete details on where and how and why one should advertise in the Soviet Union give an inkling of the transformation taking place in the Russian economy, with the introduction of a modified form of the profit motive. Foreign advertising in Russia previously had no purpose, for foreign trade is a state monopoly. It remains that, but now a host of users down the line with an eye to cost accounting and to producing what will sell to the masses are making the prime decisions as to what to buy abroad.

Following President Johnson's big pitch for trade with Russia and Eastern Europe last October, there was a strange silence in Moscow. But it now seems obvious that the silence did not mean disapproval, and the two-page ad would not have appeared without the Administration's plugging for open doors.

Coinciding with this development was the announcement that the Rockefeller-operated International Basic Economy Corporation had joined hands with Tower International, Inc., a Cyrus Eaton enterprise, which has been busy promoting trade with Iron Curtain countries. IBEC which has specialized in underdeveloped countries outside the Communist orbit now will participate in Tower International's east-west trade activities. This also is a sign of the evolving times.

But as Cyrus S. Eaton, Jr., has warned, American exporters should not expect to just walk in and sew up contracts, whether or not they advertise in Soviet periodicals. They will meet stiff competition from British, West German, French and Italians seeking the same business.

Without the most favored nation clause that the Administration is pressing a cool Congress to extend to east-west trade, U.S. exporters seeking to enter the opening door will be under a handicap.

TERROR IN VIETNAM

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] may extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, two recent incidents in South Vietnam give a hollow ring to the pious protests we hear against bombings in the north.

The Baltimore News American, a Hearst newspaper, reports a Vietcong grenade attack in a Saigon cafe that killed a Vietnamese child and an American soldier and wounded five other Americans.

Similarly, the Philadelphia Inquirer tells how the Vietcong used Vietnamese civilians as human battle shields. At least 10 children were killed.

The shame of it is that these acts of terrorism are not out of the ordinary. They have been so frequent as to become routine news. Yet, as both newspapers ask, Where are the cries of protest from those who bewail our bombing of military targets in North Vietnam?

I ask the same question as I offer these two editorials for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Jan. 6, 1967]

ROUTINE TERROR

It happened Tuesday in Saigon, but it was such a routine occurrence in the Vietnam War that the daily news roundups gave it only one short paragraph at the end. Vietcong terrorists entered a cafe and tossed a hand grenade that killed a Vietnamese child and an American soldier and wounded five other Americans. The terrorists escaped.

It was a comparatively small thing, perhaps, but not when hundreds of similar or far worse acts of terror are being committed every week by the Vietcong throughout South Vietnam. Most of these horrors are perpetrated on helpless villages and they have become so standard they are seldom reported at all in our newspapers except in special feature stories.

Thousands of lives have been taken by the Vietcong in their continuing reign of deliberate terror by explosives, wanton executions, and torture . . . lives, mostly civilians, destroyed not by accident but as part of a coldly routine campaign to destroy morale.

Day after day comes the enemy propaganda: The war cannot end until the U.S. stops its bombings. It comes from Hanoi, from Peking, from Moscow. It is echoed by De Gaulle and U Thant. It is spread by our own left-wing war critics with an ever-increasing drumfire of persistency: Stop the bombings in the name of humanity—helpless civilians have been hit!

What do these same voices have to say about the thousands upon thousands of helpless civilians who are being terrorized and murdered by the Vietcong in cold-blooded deliberation? They say nothing at all.

They have said nothing at all and they can be expected to say nothing at all.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 10, 1967]

WAITING FOR THE PROTESTS

Voices of outrage and indignation are raised against the United States whenever there is a report of civilian casualties in Vietnam resulting from American bombs or gunfire, however unintentional and accidental the circumstances producing these deaths or injuries might be.

Will the same voices be raised now in protest against the Communist Vietcong who seized South Vietnamese civilians, mostly children, and used them as human shields in a Red attack on South Vietnamese troops?

At least ten children were killed; some 25 women and children were wounded.

There was nothing accidental or unintentional about this murderous barbarity committed by the Communists against defenseless civilians. It was a coldly calculated atrocity, brutal and unmerciful. It was, in fact, on a par with the kind of cruelties deliberately inflicted upon civilians of all ages by Communist terrorists every day and night in the villages of South Vietnam. Civilians are the main target of the Vietcong.

We are waiting to hear the voices of protest.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to present for the consideration of the Members of the House an inspiring and beautiful poem by one of my outstanding constituents.

This poem is in tribute to President John F. Kennedy:

He stood erect, with youthful smile—
Wise far beyond his years;
His words instilled in young and old
The strength to conquer fears.

He gave his heart and soul to aid
Mankind in time of strife,
And then, as if 'twere not enough,
He gave his only life!

Whisked from our arms, he left his mark
Upon the nation's heart;
Heaven wept, also—tears and rain
Could scarce be told apart.

Of what great magnitude, his love,
That from lands far-and-wide
Came leaders, shedding differences
To stand, bowed, side by side!

All grieved as one, despite their creed
Or color of their skin,
He proved in death his theme in life:
That all men are akin.

His voice, though stilled, can yet be heard
In freedom's vibrant song,
Echoing hope's eternal plea
That Right shall conquer Wrong.

For, like the sun which disappears
Behind the clouds at night,
Great men are never really gone,
But only out of sight.

By MARILYN KRANTZ.

(The above poem was awarded First Prize in the annual Poetry Contest sponsored by the Phila. Regional Writer's Conference)

HELP FOR INDIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's dispatch of Under Secretary of State Eugene V. Rostow on a food assistance mission has drawn the approval of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The President, as we know, has instructed Mr. Rostow to seek the aid of other nations in meeting India's food deficit. To the Inquirer, it amounts to a warning that the problem is too immense for the United States to handle alone.

If America supplies only half of India's need for 11 million tons of grain this year from outside sources, the newspaper reports, we would have very little left for other deserving countries.

As the Inquirer declares in an editorial which I introduce herewith for the RECORD, Uncle Sam cannot be expected to shoulder the world's food requirements by himself.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 16, 1967]

WE NEED HELP IN HELPING INDIA

The President's dispatching of Eugene V. Rostow, Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs, on a fast tour of eight world capitals to solicit assistance in meeting India's continuing food deficit is as clear a signal as the United States can give that the problem is getting too big for us to handle.

It may be hard for some foreigners to believe, nurtured as they have been, on the myth of the perpetually overflowing granaries of America—to which, in times past, we have ourselves subscribed occasionally—but it is time for them and for us to face the hard facts.

India will need 11 million tons of grains this year from other than her own resources. America should be able to supply about half of that, and even then will have very little left for other deserving countries.

We are currently sending 900,000 tons on a "crash" basis to help avert drought-caused famine this spring; Russia has contributed an unusual 200,000 tons (and may be good for 500,000); Canada is sending 250,000. A total of 2.6 million tons by June is our "share."

So Mr. Rostow is on his way, first, to New Delhi to check his figures, then to Tokyo, Rome, Bonn, Paris, The Hague, Brussels and London. Some of these capitals do have surplus food at their disposal, all can at least contribute machinery or fertilizer to help India meet its own requirements. None is notably going out of its way to be generous and it's about time some did—or there will be famine.

One cannot envy Mr. Rostow his trip, but it is essential. Uncle Sam can no longer be mistaken for Hercules; he cannot and should not be expected to carry the whole world on his one and only—and weary—back.

DEVELOPMENT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. POLANCO-ABREU] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress I spoke on several occasions about the remarkable economic transformation which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is undergoing. I am very pleased that over the holidays a good number of my esteemed colleagues in this Chamber had

the opportunity to witness personally the growth and development of our island. I know that they will understand why I talk about Puerto Rico with pride and enthusiasm.

We have come a long way since the initiation of our economic recovery programs in 1940, but the road ahead is still long and arduous. We have not and cannot cease to expend less than our entire human, financial, and governmental resources on our operation bootstrap programs. Nor can we stop searching for new ways and means to bring economic and social well-being to our people. Our fight against economic and social deprivation has been intensified, and will continue to be waged on greater scales until we can safely say that our people are full sharing in the affluence of 20th-century America.

Recently, the executive director of the Continental Operations Branch of the Puerto Rico Economic Development Administration delivered a speech which excellently summarizes the philosophy and goals of the Commonwealth government with respect to our economic recovery program. I request that the text of this speech be printed with my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

WELCOMING REMARKS BY DANILO ONDINA, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION, CONTINENTAL, OPERATIONS BRANCH, COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, AT THE 35TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF FINANCIAL EXECUTIVES INSTITUTE, SAN JUAN, OCTOBER 13, 1966

It is a great pleasure to all of us in Puerto Rico, and a deeply-felt honor, to have such a pre-eminent group as the Financial Executives Institute hold its 35th International Conference among us. And it is a source of personal gratification to me to welcome you to our Island. I am most happy to have this chance to greet you all formally, in the name of the people and government of Puerto Rico, and I hope that we shall have an opportunity to meet more informally, either here or in the States.

Some of you, I'm sure, are associated with firms that have manufacturing operations in Puerto Rico and are already acquainted with the pleasures and profits we like to look upon as being among our prime attractions. I welcome you as I welcome your colleagues who have yet to learn of our Island.

I hope that during the next few days all of you will have a chance to see why the late President Kennedy called the Commonwealth "America's showcase of democracy." I have had the honor of being associated with our Operation Bootstrap program for 15 years now and, if asked to say in one sentence what has made Puerto Rico what it is today, I would have to say it has been our belief in the idea that there is no better way to develop a society than through the full and imaginative application of the free enterprise system.

Because of the way this idea nas worked here, Puerto Rico today has come to assume an importance in the world far out of proportion to its size.

Geographically, it is, as you know, a natural bridge to Latin America and to the expanding markets developing there.

Symbolically, it represents to the underdeveloped nations of the world a hope, a model for, their emergence into the 20th Century.

In a world in which change is necessary for survival, and in which change—on a large social scale at least—is so often accompanied by violence and revolution, Puerto Rico has demonstrated that the transformation from underdeveloped land to 20th Century industrialization can be accomplished peaceably and under democratic processes.

The impact of what has happened here in only a few decades should not be minimized or misunderstood. In the last dozen years more than 24,000 officials and observers from over a hundred countries have visited Puerto Rico to study our development process. In our New York office alone we have briefed officials from lands as diverse as Formosa and Nigeria. Advisory missions have been sent from Puerto Rico to countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and to nations as distant as Scotland and Morocco, and many of our Government people have been granted leaves of absence in order that they might work in other lands.

The importance of the Puerto Rico experience was, I think, underscored by the selection of the Commonwealth as the site of the largest of all the Peace Corps training schools and camps.

This is why I say what happened here—and what will happen here tomorrow—is important to the United States and to the peaceful development of the underdeveloped nations of the world.

What happened—in a very small nutshell—is that Puerto Rico, an impoverished, underdeveloped "sugar island," as the expression goes, by a supreme effort of our entire government and people, shook off the inertia of four and a half centuries and in less than two decades created an economic growth rate second only to Japan's.

We have created 80,000 direct jobs for our people, improved education, raised the standard of living, increased life expectancy from 46 to 70 years. On the industrial side, some 1300 manufacturing operations, with value over a billion dollars, have been established. Most of these, of course, are affiliates of branches of U.S. firms.

All this could not have been accomplished, of course, without the generous understanding of the Federal government in Washington and the confidence of the U.S. industrial community.

Having limited natural resources, we have to offer incentives to industry: free access to the U.S. mainland; an ample, willing, highly productive labor force; training grants and assistance in recruiting workers; availability of industrial buildings at low rentals; development loans; working capital loans; equity participation, among others. And exemption from taxes for periods ranging from 10 to 17 years, depending on location, 100 percent tax exemption—corporate, municipal, property, real, licensing.

Above all, our program is flexible, pragmatic, non-ideological. We need jobs; we need industry to create these jobs. The Commonwealth government will do all in its power to cooperate with private enterprise toward this goal. Our only reservation is that our growth should not come at the expense of communities in the States. Puerto Rican law prohibits the granting of tax exemption and the incentives of Bootstrap to runaway industry.

The results of this attitude, this dynamic relationship between government and private industry, are, in part, visible even to those of you who have been here only one day. And you must remember that it is hardly one decade since net income from manufacturing here surpassed agricultural net income. Since then, since 1955, manufacturing activity has grown to yield two and one half times as much income as agriculture.

This may be cause for jubilation, but not complacence. Progress is not necessarily prosperity. Our problems, our challenges, are very great. We have passed an important milestone, but we stand now at a crucial crossroads.

On the one side, the increasing rhythm of industrial promotion, the amazingly rapid developments in the formulation of new petrochemical projects, the pressures to extend the period of education are all factors which help us to create new jobs. However, our unemployment rate is still three times the mainland level. The new yearly entrants to the labor force—33,000 a year—the increasing mechanization of agriculture, the people leaving farms to seek jobs in the cities, the rapid decline in home needlework industry, the slowdown of outward migration all add up to a need for preserving and creating jobs opportunities at a greater rate than ever before.

In the light of these facts it must be remembered that our industrial revolution is 15 years old, not 150, as is the case in the mainland U.S. Ours is still a developing economy. This has to be understood and appreciated not only here but in Washington, before such measures as across-the-board raises in minimum wages are applied indiscriminately. Without massive monetary aid, we have made progress where it was said progress was impossible and we have moved ahead more rapidly than anyone dreamed, but it would be tragic as well as ironic if our success were to be misunderstood and become an excuse for the destruction of what we have achieved.

The basis of Puerto Rico's progress has been Commonwealth status, which was established under the terms of a bi-lateral compact between the people of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Congress in 1952. Within its framework we were able to meet the problems that confronted us as we changed from an agrarian to an industrial economy. Now, however, there are new problems and for this reason we are seeking to broaden and improve the Commonwealth relationship. In the same way that our unique new status made it possible for us to start our work against great odds, we believe that the perfection of this status, especially in relation to such crucial areas as minimum wages, will enable us to better apply judgment and imagination in the task remaining before us.

As always, we believe that problems are solved by men who are willing to work hard. It is a simple formula, but it has been proved here and will be proved anew.

This is the Puerto Rico I hope you will see and remember and return to.

Once again, I welcome each of you to Puerto Rico in the name of the people. I offer you our hospitality and wish you a successful conference as well as a pleasant and rewarding stay.

Thank you.

RETIREMENT PAY OF MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that will correct a gross inequity in the pay of men and women who served this country bravely and well and have now retired from the military service.

My bill would amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of all members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service.

Under present law military personnel who retired prior to 1962 are being deprived of the benefits of subsequent pay

raises which have been given to other military personnel. The legislation which I have introduced would recompute the pay of military personnel who retired without the benefit of these recent increases. Even though their service may have been as long, and their rank as high, they are now paid considerably less than those who have retired under higher pay scales. Many of the military personnel who will benefit from this legislation are veterans of both World War II and Korea.

My west Texas district is privileged to count many of these veterans among its residents. I would like to join in urging the approval of this measure by the 90th Congress which will show our appreciation in a most practical manner to those who have loyally protected our Nation.

NEWS FROM ASIA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Baltimore News American, a Hearst newspaper, carried an editorial, which, I believe, is worthy of note. It reports a prevailing attitude that North Vietnam will never negotiate a settlement of the war, but that when Hanoi realizes our determination, the war will "just fizzle out."

I request permission to insert this editorial in the RECORD.

[From the News American, Jan. 16, 1967]

NOT NEWS TO US

So-called "news" reports from Asia that North Vietnam will never be forced militarily to the conference table leave us, and many others, singularly unimpressed.

They seem designed to convince us that North Vietnam can take any kind of punishment the United States can dish out, and still keep fighting.

Sorry, but we just don't buy it.

The whole notion about North Vietnam refusing formally to negotiate an end to the war just is not news at all. Long before the current reports were being disseminated, the Hearst Task Force was apprised of such a possibility in Bangkok. There, the leaders of Thailand's firmly pro-West government expressed the view that the Vietnam War would "just fizzle out," principally through Hanoi's eventual realization of the facts of life.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge has long expressed the same view, too, speculating that the end will come with a gradual dwindling of combat as North Vietnamese troops are progressively withdrawn and as infiltration from North to South dries up. This, of course, would still leave the formidable "main force" of the Vietcong in South Vietnam. But with the abandonment of the Vietcong by its patron in the North, there is considerable hope the South Vietnamese Army and other Asian forces could eliminate or contain the threat of Communist conquest.

So statements from—or through—Hanoi that force will never lead to negotiations should be taken with a grain of salt, or maybe rice.

Meanwhile, let's keep applying that force.

EASING THE WAY

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun has added its endorsement to President Johnson's action in reducing the tariffs on certain glass and watch imports.

I am particularly pleased to note that the President has announced concessions in watch imports from Switzerland because this will have a healthy effect on the economy of Maryland. For many years, Switzerland has purchased most of Maryland's best grade tobacco but they have threatened to discontinue such purchases if the U.S. maintained its high tariffs on Swiss watches.

These are highly strategic cuts which should relax the deadlock which has seemed, on occasion, to threaten failure of the Kennedy round of trade negotiations.

In fact, they should ease the way to a happy ending of the Kennedy round.

With hope that the newspaper's assessment is correct, I offer its editorial comment for the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 15, 1967]

EASING THE WAY

Prime time is almost up and the seasoned viewer knows that if the heroine is to be rescued at all then the good guys had better show up now. The Trade Expansion act lapses at the end of June, and unless there is agreement among the commercial nations by that time the fair prospect of more fluid trade may be lost for years. So it is at just this critical point that the President throws two highly strategic tariff cuts into the Geneva debate over trade obstructions. Friends of the one kind of international intercourse which has been uniformly successful will hope they achieve their purpose.

Their purpose, obviously, is to relax the deadlock that has seemed at times to threaten failure of the Kennedy Round—so called because President Kennedy sponsored the soon-expiring trade law. Bearing in mind that the reductions are supported on solidly objective economic grounds, they also radiate political and diplomatic overtones. There are, after all, two major groupings of commercial nations in western Europe which, with Japan and the United States is the main arena of trade in the modern world. Both the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association, are ahead of schedule in reducing trade obstructions between their member states. Both are willing to reduce external tariffs if a *quid* is offered for their *quo*.

Now the President has reduced rates on glass imports of particular interest to the Belgians, whose capital is Brussels, which is also the capital of the E.E.C. (Common Market). And he has announced concessions on watch imports, watches being one of the mainstays of Swiss enterprise, and Switzerland being a member of special influence in the E.F.T.A. These concessions have an obvious good-guy quality and should ease the way to a happy ending of the Kennedy round.

WHY WE ARE THERE

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been reported in the press a good deal of genuine doubt in the minds of professors and students alike, regarding justification for our policy in Vietnam.

The Baltimore News American recently ran an editorial quoting Secretary of State Dean Rusk, which I would like to call to the attention of all Americans who question U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent at this point to have it inserted in the RECORD.

[From the Baltimore (Md.), News American, Jan. 10, 1967]

SUM-UP FOR STUDENTS

A group of college student leaders wrote President Johnson recently questioning U.S. policy in Vietnam and asking how that policy can be justified.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in a letter of response, has now given the answer in one sentence:

"We are involved in Vietnam because we have learned from painful experience that the minimum condition for order on our planet is that aggression must not be permitted to succeed."

Those students would do well to memorize this brief but vital lesson. Millions have died in the course of trying to make its simple truth clear to free men and women everywhere.

FURTHER SUBSTANTIATION OF THE EXCELLENCE OF PERFORMANCE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the controversy that has plagued the Nation's greatest university for several years, not only continues to swirl unabated, but, in recent days because of a precipitous, unwise and politically motivated firing of the president of that university, has accelerated. It is necessary, Mr. Speaker, to continually call to the attention of the public that despite this unfortunate climate of student and faculty unrest, the standards of the university under the administration of its recently fired president, Clark Kerr, have remained exceptionally high. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, though I have great misgivings on this matter, that the recent action of the new Governor in firing President Kerr will not alter this magnificent record of performance.

Mr. Speaker, I submit an editorial from the Independent, a major newspaper in my district, that clearly and compellingly puts this matter of the excellence of the university in performance of its trust, the education of our young adults, in proper perspective.

The editorial follows:

[From the Richmond (Calif.) Independent, Jan. 19, 1967]

PORTRAIT OF TYPICAL UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, STUDENT

At a time when the siege guns have been leveled at the University of California at Berkeley, it might be appropriate to consider what kind of students this embattled campus attracts—the off-beat with his pre-occupation with demonstration or the serious-minded young man or woman who is seeking an education.

One indication of the excellence of the Berkeley student is contained in a finding by the UC Counseling Center that freshmen at Berkeley this year scored the highest of any freshman class in learning-ability tests in the history of the campus.

Nationally they looked good too. They emerged among the upper 10 per cent in aptitude ratings for college freshmen across the United States. The results moved Mrs. Barbara A. Kirk, director of the center, to term the findings: "Remarkable!"

Lest any suspect that the tests were given to a selected few to gain a stacked statistic, the examinations were taken by 2,620 freshmen, nearly three-quarters of the class.

This sober, researched finding distinguishes the Berkeley university.

Recently, the American Council on Education, composed of top education and professional men, declared the university is the "best balanced distinguished university in the country."

The "country" takes in quite a bit of territory. It includes, to name only a few other institutions in competition for that distinction, Harvard, Stanford, Columbia, Illinois, Yale, Princeton, Michigan, the California Institute of Technology, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of Chicago.

With all of the expressed concern over the university—its direction, its leadership, its finances, its politics—it ought to be eternally recalled that the University of California at Berkeley has been singled out, time and again, as one of the great institutions of learning in the world.

Judge it not by its exceptions—deal with these, yes—but by its "average" student, and this could be most any one of the 27,000 on the campus—hard-working, bright, ambitious, as American as apple pie, and a credit to their generation.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which will provide greater productivity for the Federal Government and also will reward those faithful employees who have refused to abuse the sick leave provision in the Federal law.

At the present time Federal employees are allowed 13 days a year of sick leave, which they may accumulate indefinitely against the day when some catastrophic illness may overtake them. Many employees use a considerable amount of sick leave before retirement from the service. On the other hand, there are thousands of employees who are fortunate enough to enjoy good health, and when they reach the retirement age they have a large amount of accumulated sick leave.

Just as an example, when the Daniels bill liberalized the retirement annuity for those who retired by December 30, 1965, approximately 11,000 employees retired from the postal service. The average number of hours lost by these retirees was 885. Many employees turned back more than 3,000 hours of unused sick leave.

This bill would provide incentive for accumulating sick leave by crediting the unused number of hours in the retirement annuity computations, or giving the employee the option of being paid half the rate for the unused leave.

This approach would save money for the Government, especially since it is usually necessary to replace those absent on sick leave. The experienced man is often replaced by another employee who has less experience and this can lead to inefficiency.

Those who really need the sick leave and use it for that purpose would still be permitted to do so. Many employees are extremely conscientious and report for duty on days when they are not in 100 percent health, and it is at times like these when some additional incentive is needed. Actually, giving credit for sick leave, as provided in this bill, would cost the Government less money, would lead to greater efficiency, and would be an equitable incentive and award for the conscientious employees who are by far in the great majority in the Government service.

HEALTH BENEFITS BILL

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Government's obligation with respect to its sharing of the premium costs to provide Federal employees and annuitants a comprehensive health benefits program has obviously been one of "too little and too late."

In developing a health benefits program for the Federal work force in 1959, its sponsors started with the fundamental premise that, ideally, premium costs should be equally shared by the employer and the employee. Upon evolvement of the program into actual operation in 1960, subsequent to its enactment, the contributions made by the Government equaled not 50 percent of the rate charges, but an average of 38 percent.

As medical and health care costs rose steadily and substantially during the ensuing years, the law placed the entire burden of such increases upon the employee. Not until 6 months ago, when the Government's share of the total premium rates had declined to as little as one-fourth of the costs, did the Congress restore its contributions to the initial 38-percent level.

While that action was the least that a model employer might reasonably be expected to take, its effect has been short lived indeed. Within the short span of these past few months, increased premiums have already depreciated the Government's participation to one-third of the average charges.

With a continuing trend of higher health care costs, early remedial action in this area is essential. To attain the original objectives of the minimal ideal of equal sharing of costs, and to advance the relative position of Federal workers to that enjoyed by most employees in the private sector, I am proposing a bill to require the Government to share half the costs of all plans and options in which employees may enroll. Let us not continue to neglect this ever-present problem—let us face it realistically, and immediately.

BILL BAGGS REPORTS—PARTS IV AND V

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, again I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an exclusive series of articles by Bill Baggs, Miami News editor. The first article in this series appears in the RECORD of January 17, and the second and third appear in the RECORD of January 23. The fourth and fifth articles, dateline Nam Dinh and My Trung, North Vietnam, follow.

The unique feature of these articles is emphasis. Mr. Baggs does not report the military accomplishments, but rather focuses on the human element in limited warfare—the loss that civilians will invariably experience:

[From the Miami News, Jan. 19, 1967]

A NORTH VIET CITY DEVASTATED BY BOMBS—MOST PEOPLE ARE EVACUATED

(By Bill Baggs)

NAM DINH—(Delayed).—Most of the travelers move during the night at North Vietnam. They wish to avoid the attention of the American bombers, and thus the road to this city, about 75 miles south of Hanoi, is a nocturnal traffic jam.

The road is crowded in the darkness.

Bicycles, pedalled with great industry, abound on the road. Men and women, some of them very old, pump their bikes south, and almost every bicycle is loaded with cargo.

The designation of this road is Highway No. 1, and it is, at broadest, barely two lanes, and it degenerates into what is merely a one-lane road. Often you simply stop in the auto, stalled behind a wagon, groaning under a high stack of thatch, drawn by oxen, and, on other occasions, you find yourself in the middle of an army convoy headed south. The headlights of the car reveal a company of infantry marching smartly on the narrow shoulders of the road.

The American bombers have visited this road many times. Detours are frequent hosts. You come upon a bridge which has been bombed out, and the car heaves over the detour of a dirt road, steep and narrow, and

you see what is a symbol of the ingenuity of these people. The temporary bridge, down river, is made of wooden planks and bamboo. It was built overnight. It is not very handsome, but it gets you across the river.

Nam Dinh is the third largest city in North Vietnam. The population was more than 90,000 before the bombing started. Now it is pretty much an evacuated city. At least half of the large wooden doors to the homes, huddled close together on narrow streets, are closed and padlocked.

Nam Dinh is a city which has been bombed often. It is a textile center. Most of the cloth you find in the Hanoi shops comes from here, and a power plant squats on the edge of the city.

We reached Nam Dinh shortly after 7 in the morning. And no other cars were seen on the streets. The common scenery is the bicycle, wheeled along the streets of Nam Dinh, and so too are the wagons, piled with husk, used to fertilize the rice fields, and quite a few walkers and all of them carrying cargo of some nature.

In Hanoi, you hear that down South, in Nam Dinh, the American bombers come with a steady frequency, and that is the reason we traveled here. And what you hear in Hanoi appears to be true.

TWO AIR RAID ALERTS

Indeed, the air alert sounded at 8:03 in the morning, and an American visitor looked down into one of the concrete holes in the ground which serves as a shelter. At least a foot and a half of water, dirty and cold water, stood in the bottom of the hole, and you clutched the sentiment that you would take your chances lying flat on the ground instead of lowering yourself into the wet shelter.

This, and another alert later in the morning, proved false. The American planes passed overhead, headed for another target.

Here in Nam Dinh, the Nursery School is pretty much destroyed. The School is a large building, and bombs have reduced one-half of it to rubble. A nearby building, which has a two-story housing facility, has been riddled by rockets. And 34 pocks in the exterior walls, where the rockets struck, were counted.

You do not report what you hear at North Vietnam. Too much propaganda shrouds reality in any country at war. So you only report what you can see and feel and examine. But the complaint of the people in Nam Dinh, that many civilian neighborhoods, with no military function, have been bombed, appears to be a valid complaint.

A kilometer away from the power plant, presumably a military target, and a block away from Ninh-Binh Street, is a patch of three to four acres of ruins. These were homes and now they are rubble.

On the other side of the city from the power plant, on Hang Thad Street, where, it was said, more than 17,000 persons lived before the bombings, the destruction covers more than six square blocks. The attack on this neighborhood came April 14, 1966.

Four blocks have been utterly destroyed on Phan-Dinh-Phung Street. Only a shattered section of a single wall remains in the rectory of the Catholic Church in this neighborhood. The people who live here, grumbling, take you to the neighborhood pagoda which has been absolutely bombed to the ground. The attack on Phan-Dinh-Phung Street came on May 15, 1966.

On both sides of Dhan Dinh Pheng Street, the greater part of nine square blocks is either demolished or heavily destroyed. This is a community of private homes.

The Department of Defense has announced that only targets of military value are being bombed in Vietnam. But the people here in Nam Dinh do not believe the declaration of policy from Washington. They point to the rubble which once was their homes. And they question the American reporter among them. It is at least a fair statement that they are unmoved when you explain that bombs stray in a war. And all this is understandable from people who have been bombed out of their homes.

[From the Miami News, Jan. 20, 1967]

RICE, RIFLES IN N. VIET BACK COUNTRY

(By Bill Baggs)

MY TRUNG, NORTH VIETNAM—(Delayed)—The way to the village lies over a narrow dirt causeway. Indeed, the road, winding through watery rice fields, is not much broader than the width of an automobile.

A mist in the darkness challenged the vision of the driver. Now and then, a tire kicked pebbles on the edge of the causeway into the water. Once we stalled, everyone got out and examined our predicament, and then we all joined in the democratic pleasure of pushing the car. It was late in the evening when we reached the village.

BAGGS VISITS FARM AREA

My Trung is in the back reaches of North Vietnam, it is almost 80 miles south of Hanoi, and it is farming country. The rice they eat in Hanoi is grown here and elsewhere in the Nam Ha province.

Now the rice harvet is over, and you see stacks of paddy plunked down by the sides of the roads. The morning light reveals a green and wet country. Bananas and tangerines and oranges and papayas decorate the landscape. Pigs are a crop here, and the water buffalo, strong and moving deliberately across a field, is called "the living tractor."

Not much industry hums in the Nam Ha province. There is a factory which cans fruit, a glassware plant and a factory which produces farm implements. Otherwise it is all farming, so you come here to study the agriculture of North Vietnam.

The old worry of the north has been not enough rice. For centuries, North Vietnam got more than half its rice from the south, but the war down there has cut off the supply.

Some foods come in from China, but an intense campaign has begun to grow enough rice here for the population of the country.

When the French governed Indo-China, there was only one rice crop a year. After World War II the government headed by Ho Chi Minh seized the old lands and distributed them into collectives. Each farmer got a small plot for his personal use, such as to grow fruits and vegetables and flowers for his family. An ambitious scheme to control the water was started with the construction of many dikes.

Now there are two rice harvests each year, but Nguyen Viet Ca, who lives in the province and keeps records on agriculture for the government, said larger rice crops are needed. With water control and an extra harvest, and improved techniques, he said, the crops today are three to four times as heavy as when the French ruled.

But more rice is a necessity if the country is going to be independent of foreign sources.

HERE, TOO, THE BOMBS FELL

The government has set a norm of five tons of paddy a year per hectare (almost two and one-half acres). And 31 of the approximate 400 villages in North Vietnam are exceeding the norm he said. Many other villages are meeting it.

Here, too, you hear the familiar stories about the American bombers and we had three air alerts during a 2-day visit in the province. The men and women who do the same work in the fields are trained to fire rifles or machine guns, or both, at the aircraft.

The complaints become bitter when these farmers accuse the Americans of trying to bomb their dikes and destroy the water control system.

Viet Tung, a newspaperman from the Nam Dinh, the only city in the province, said that a 1,000 pound bomb was dropped Dec. 6 last year on the dike at the village of Xuan Tien, along the Ninh Co River. He produced a picture of a dike and said the portion destroyed, clearly visible in the photograph, was 24 meters long (about 26 yards) and 9 meters deep (almost 10 yards).

This reporter explained to Viet Tung that he had talked to persons in the American government who said the policy is not to bomb dikes, but military targets, and that any bombing of dikes is a mistake which is all too common in any war. Viet Tung's reaction is to show you the photograph again.

At lunch in the farmhouse where we stayed, our host, Vu Cong Thuyet, asked if we had ever seen a rice field. A companion, Harry S. Ashmore, chairman of the executive committee of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, said that rice was grown in several neighborhoods of America. Ashmore went on to explain that we farmed rice with machines in the United States. He described the modern technique, and the North Viets around the long wooden table listened with an intense interest.

REPUBLICAN PROGRAMS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in his Republican state of the Union message last Thursday night, the distinguished minority leader stated:

> For the past two years, positive and practical Republican programs have been largely ignored.

This distressed me.

Since then I have spent considerable time worrying about this. I want to be fair. I think most Democrats do.

Now we did ignore many Republican positions.

We ignored their opposition to medicare.

We ignored their opposition to minimum wage increases.

We ignored their opposition to our education bills.

We ignored their opposition to our poverty programs.

We ignored their opposition to civil rights.

We ignored their opposition to our housing and slum programs. These we admit to. We not only ignored them; we overrode them.

But the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] did not say Republican positions. He said positive and practical Republican programs. And for the life of me, I cannot remember what these could have been. I fear there were none.

Woodrow Wilson once said:

> The trouble with the Republican Party is that it has not had a new idea for 30 years.

He made that statement 50 years ago, but it is just as true today as it ever was.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal 1967 supplemental appropriation request has been presented by the President to the Congress.

We are engaged in a historic struggle to combat aggression against the people of South Vietnam. The supplemental appropriation is witness to the fact that our soldiers, our sailors, our marines, and our airmen have all grown in number in our struggle to meet this threat. Almost $1.4 billion of this supplemental request will go to these men and women who are entered in the Armed Forces in defense of freedom.

We find over half a billion dollars will go toward ammunition—the heart and sinew of war. This ammunition for our soldiers and marines on the ground, ammunition for sailors on warships and in the air, ammunition for our airmen over South and North Vietnam. We find almost a like amount for construction activities in southeast Asia. We find over $100 million in research and development for limited war.

This is a time for Congress to be counted—a time when we can show that we shall and will support our men at the frontier of freedom in southeast Asia.

FEDERAL ANTICRIME ACTIVITIES IN 1968 BUDGET

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the toughest problems facing our Nation today is the rising incidence of crime. It strikes at every fiber of our society—its effect on our economy is enormous.

The administration is determined to help reverse the trend of crime in America. The need to make our homes and streets safe for all of our citizens has been repeatedly stressed by the President in his crime messages in 1965 and 1966; in his recent state of the Union message; in his establishment of both the National and District of Columbia Crime Commissions in July 1965; in his legislative proposals to the 89th Congress.

The budget that President Johnson has sent to us today calls for a sharply stepped-up effort in the fight against crime. A major thrust against the cancer of crime was described by the President in his state of the Union message when he said he would recommend to this Congress the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967. The President's budget calls for a 17-percent increase in the Department of Justice law enforcement operations, increasing programs already applied to the problem, and providing initial funds to get this major new effort underway.

Under this new program, our States and cities will receive major assistance in fighting crime. Although the Federal Government has a legitimate interest in law enforcement at all levels, the President has emphasized that the major responsibility for controlling the types of crime most likely to affect you and me must remain with the States, cities, and other local law enforcement officials. The efforts already underway and to be extended and expanded under the proposed safe streets and crime controll bill, will be an appropriate and effective development of creative federalism, tackling a serious problem that is uppermost in the minds of so many Americans.

I am certain that Members on both sides of the aisle will welcome the special emphasis that the President's budget places on striking at crime in our country.

THE BUDGET AND RURAL AMERICA

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the President's forward-looking budget for 1968 includes many recommendations and funds to strengthen programs to help rural America. Not only will the budget provide a wide range of services for rural America, it will also assure a plentiful food supply for people here and abroad.

Many of the programs benefiting rural America are in the Department of Agriculture budget, but important programs of benefit to rural people are included in other parts of the budget.

The President has directed the Secretary of Agriculture to take the lead in helping rural people achieve a higher standard of living. To this end the Department of Agriculture will work with State and Federal agencies and with local groups to help rural communities make the best use of existing programs.

For the Department of Agriculture, the budget provides an increase in expenditures of $296 million, bringing the total to $6 billion in 1968, much of which will be to aid rural people and rural communities.

I would like to call attention to some of the programs in this budget that will help rural people raise their standards of living.

The annual commodity programs for wheat, cotton, feed grains, and other crops will help maintain farm incomes at a high level. These programs, along with land-use adjustment programs, will help retire land not suited for agriculture, while allowing good agricultural land to be brought back into production of wheat and feed grains.

The Farmers Home Administration's direct and insured housing loans to individuals with low to moderate incomes will increase by $100 to $404 million in 1968. Loans for farm labor housing will be raised 50 percent above the 1967 level, as will loans for rental housing. Overall, the Farmers Home Administration will make loan commitments of $1.5 billion in 1968, 42 percent more than in 1966.

This year a new program will provide breakfasts for children in low-income area schools and in rural areas where they must travel long distances to reach school. Program expenditures will go from $2 million in 1967 to $6.5 million in 1968. Research will be emphasized that enhances consumer health and nutrition, and that raises the level of living of rural people. The Extension Service will expand services to low-income families and disadvantaged youths.

Another aspect of improving the quality of rural life is better community services. Here the Farmers Home Administration will increase its direct and insured loans for water, sewer, and recreation facilities by some $44 million over 1967. The Rural Electrification Administration is continuing to provide loans for new and improved telephone and electric services. The budget provides for new loans of $515 million, an increase of $61 million over 1967. There will be planning assistance for 15 new resource conservation and development area pilot projects, with work to start on eight of these projects in fiscal year 1968. Extension Service will provide additional multicounty agents to help accelerate economic growth and adjustment in rural areas.

In addition the Farmers Home Administration will increase rural renewal loans for initial planning in depressed rural areas. Also, river basin and watershed planning efforts which benefit rural areas and small communities will be continued in 1968. Funds recommended in the budget provide for starting construction of 80 small watershed protection projects and beginning planning on 100 other projects.

To help extend to rural people the assistance available under various Federal programs, the Rural Community Development Service staff will review and seek better program execution. A strengthened Farmers Home Administration field staff, working through the existing technical action panels, rural development committees, and by other means, will be used in this effort at the State and local level.

FREEDOM FOR WHOM?

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, another newspaper has ripped holes in that recent statement to an American editor in which Ho Chi Minh said his people "never will surrender our independence and freedom for the sake of peace."

If Ho refers to the North Vietnamese, points out the New York World Journal Tribune, they have already surrendered their freedom. And their independence is in no danger from the United States.

If he refers to the Vietnamese as a whole, the newspaper continues, he should consider the forceful manner in which he has been rejected by those south of the 17th parallel.

We have no intention of infringing on North Vietnam's independence. What we fight for is to insure freedom of choice for the South.

I insert this World Journal Tribune response to Ho in the RECORD:

[From the World Journal Tribune, Jan. 18, 1967]

FREEDOM FOR WHOM?

Another American newspaperman has reached Hanoi. And Bill Baggs, editor of the Miami News, was able to have an interview with Ho Chi Minh, himself.

Unhappily, in the published accounts at least, the discussion was not very enlightening. So far as its applicability to the problem of peace in Viet Nam is concerned, it boiled down to a repeated insistence by Ho that his people "never will surrender our independence and freedom for the sake of peace."

But just who are Ho's people? If he means the North Vietnamese, they have already surrendered their freedom, and their independence is in no danger from the United States. That has been made very clear by every authorized spokesman for American policy.

If, however, Ho means the Vietnamese people as a whole, that is another matter. A majority south of the 17th Parallel have rejected him in the kind of elections Ho never dared call.

And just as the United States will not infringe upon North Vietnamese independence, so it is fighting to insure freedom for the South—freedom of choice.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the budget which President Johnson has sent to us today reflects his resolve, which has clearly never flagged, to take those steps, deliberately and firmly, which will lead us to the enjoyment of equal rights and equal justice for all.

Great strides have been made by this administration in securing equal rights for all citizens. Steps forward include:

Virtual elimination of discrimination in public accommodations in most areas.

A more than threefold increase in the number of Negro children attending desegregated schools.

Significant progress in the elimination of segregation in public facilities.

A doubling of the number of Negroes registered to vote in the Southern States.

Expansion in the number and variety of job opportunities open to Negroes in both the public and private sectors of the economy and the development of greater opportunities for promotion.

Enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act which has already been of inestimable benefit to the poor.

To continue progress toward equal opportunity as well as equal rights, this budget includes increased funds to:

Equalize opportunity in programs carried on by recipients of Federal financial aid and among Federal contractors.

Investigate criminal violations of civil rights.

Enable the Commission on Civil Rights to investigate complaints, hold hearings, and make studies of civil rights problems.

Conciliate and resolve disputes in communities across the country.

Achieve equal opportunity in private employment.

Aside from legislative proposals which the President will later transmit to the Congress, the continually advancing budget levels for enforcement in the civil rights area serve major notice that he and his administration remain unswervingly dedicated to the strengthening of all programs authorized under present law.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 376. An act fixing the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Joint Economic Committee.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MAHON, for 30 minutes, today, immedately following the reading of the budget message of the President, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include tabular material.

Mr. HARDY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ALBERT, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. JONAS, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, January 31; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. ERLENBORN), for 60 minutes, on February 2; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. COLLIER.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. FINO and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERLENBORN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. WYDLER.

All Members (at the request of Mr. KAZEN) for 5 legislative days, to revise and extend their remarks on the President's budget message.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KAZEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. BLATNIK.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 25, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

245. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental request for new obligational authority for the support of military operations in southeast Asia, for fiscal 1967 (H. Doc. No. 42); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

246. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of Farm Credit Administration and certain banks of the farm credit system, fiscal year 1966 (H. Doc. No. 43); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

247. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1966, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

248. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the administration of the District of Columbia Nonresident Tuition Act, Board of Education, District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

249. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of proposed amendments to certain concession contracts, pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

250. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on matters contained in the Helium Act (Public Law 86-777), pursuant to the provisions of 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

251. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

252. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report on aliens conditionally entering the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 203(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 3536. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing an additional tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the immediate deduction of such expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 3537. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3538. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Conservation Act to provide that no land contained in the national wildlife refuge system shall be sold, transferred for any other use, or otherwise disposed of without the approval of the Migratory Bird Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 3539. A bill to provide that U.S. payments to the United Nations shall not be used for programs contrary to the policies of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 3540. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmaster, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 3541. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 3542. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3543. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 3544. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 3545. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to the payment of pensions to widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 3546. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in order to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed in the United States from the first Sunday following Memorial Day to the first Sunday following Labor Day; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3547. A bill to authorize an additional method for Federal savings and loan associations to raise capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3548. A bill to add a new title XII to the National Defense Educational Act of 1958; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3549. A bill to provide that certain functions with respect to housing loans shall be performed by the Federal Housing Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 3550. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3551. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to provide an exemption for certain short-term employment at agricultural or horticultural fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt servicemen from the excise tax on transportation by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 3553. A bill to designate the Oahe Reservoir on the Missouri River in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota as Lake Oahe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 3554. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 3555. A bill to establish a Bureau of Older Workers in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 3556. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 3557. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for an Older Americans Community Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3558. A bill to provide compensation for damages to certain facilities rendered inoperative or otherwise adversely affected as a result of the modernization of the Monongahela River navigation project; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3559. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3560. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3561. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3562. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 3563. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 3564. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 3565. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3566. A bill to provide for the award of the Good Conduct Medal to certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3567. A bill to postpone the application of daylight saving provisions of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in certain States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3568. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3569. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3570. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3571. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 3572. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 3573. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 3574. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 3575. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3576. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3577. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 3578. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3579. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 3580. A bill to amend section 407 of the Social Security Act to make permanent the existing temporary authority to provide aid to families with dependent children in cases where the parent is unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3581. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 3582. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to increase the exemption from duty for returning residents from $100 to $200, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3583. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for more effective prevention, control, and abatement of air pollution through the establishment of air regions and standards applicable thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 3584. A bill to amend section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to permit grants after construction is commenced for basic water and sewer facilities which qualify for such grants but cannot receive them prior to construction because of the unavailability of funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3585. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 3586. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 3587. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 3588. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 3589. A bill to establish a Federal sabbatical program to improve the quality of teaching in the Nation's elementary or secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3590. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 3591. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 3592. A bill to provide uniform, fair, and equitable treatment of persons, businesses, or farms displaced by Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 3593. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to eliminate certain requirements for the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration in Alaska or Hawaii; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3594. A bill to amend section 228 of the Social Security Act to provide benefits at age 72 for certain additional uninsured individuals, and to exclude the first $50 per month of any governmental pension in determining whether an individual's benefits under such section are subject to reduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3595. A bill to prevent reduction of certain widows' benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3596. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understanding the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3597. A bill to amend section 301(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that any person who is a national and citizen of the United States at birth under section 301(a)(7) of that act shall not lose his nationality and citizenship if the alien parent is naturalized while such person is under the age of 16 years and such person begins residing in the United States permanently while under the age of 16 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3598. A bill to provide that the next cruiser commissioned in the U.S. Navy shall be named the *Brooklyn*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3599. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3600. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3601. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to review de novo claims for benefits and payments under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3602. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes," approved April 10, 1918, to provide that no export trade association shall restrict any foreign buyer from dealing, directly or through an agent of his own selection, with any producer, manufacturer, or seller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3603. A bill to amend sections 512 and 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide direct loan funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3604. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the funeral expenses payable with respect to certain veterans from $250 to $500; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3605. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3606. A bill to exempt from income tax, annuities and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3607. A bill to repeal part I of subchapter G of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3608. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3609. A bill to amend paragraph 1798 (c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate the present temporary reductions in the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents in cases where the articles involved were obtained with foreign currencies purchased from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3610. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit the use of social security records to aid in locating runaway parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3611. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military service of a veteran entitled to a civil service retirement annuity may be counted for social security purposes if he irrevocably elects to exclude such service from the computation of such annuity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3612. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that any article of medical equipment or machinery imported by a State or its political subdivision for certain purposes shall be free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3613. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on transportation of persons by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3614. A bill to provide income tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3615. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child shall be deemed dependent on his natural or adopting parent, for purposes of determining his eligibility for child's insurance benefits, if such parent is a fully insured individual at the time required for such eligibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3616. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an alternative method of crediting earnings for purposes of determining an individual's insured status and benefit amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3617. A bill to equalize income tax revenues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3618. A bill to establish reciprocal import quotas upon the importation of confectionery and chocolate into the United States from foreign countries which impose quotas upon imports of confectionery and chocolate from the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3619. A bill to designate judicial precedents which shall be binding in the administration and enforcement of the internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3620. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3621. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3622. A bill to provide that communications relating to income tax which are mailed to a taxpayer shall not bear on the outer covering any markings which disclose information concerning such taxpayer's income or tax liability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3623. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that the interest on certain obligations shall not be tax exempt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that, in the case of stock or stock options issued or granted in whole or in part for services rendered, the gain therefrom shall be treated as ordinary income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3625. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for a tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 3626. A bill to amend section 4001 of title 38, United States Code, to prescribe qualifications for members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3627. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall provide complete medical services for any veteran totally dis-

abled from a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3628. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that certain veterans who were prisoners of war shall be deemed to have a service-connected disability of 50 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3629. A bill to increase from $600 to $750 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3630. A bill to mend the Anti-Dumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 3631. A bill to provide for the dedication of certain streets on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation and to convey title to certain platted streets, alleys, and strips of land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 3632. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 3633. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Kellogg unit, Delta division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 3634. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent, across-the-board benefit increase, and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 3635. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a statutory policy governing the broadcasting of views on controversial issues; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3636. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the basic salaries of postal field service employees on a regional basis in accordance with prevailing wage rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 3637. A bill to promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by modernizing practices of the Federal Government relating to the inspection of persons, merchandise, and conveyances moving into, through, and out of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 3638. A bill to promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by modernizing practices of the Federal Government relating to the inspection of persons, merchandise, and conveyances moving into, through, and out of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 3639. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 3640. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 3641. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 3642. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 3643. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3644. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require Government contributions toward health benefits plans equal to 50 percent of rate charges; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 3645. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to increase from $200 million to $500 million the amount of the annual appropriations authorized thereunder for grants for basic water and sewer facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 3646. A bill to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (by request):

H.R. 3647. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 3648. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3649. A bill to extend the provisions of law providing Federal assistance for elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3650. A bill to increase the authorization of appropriations for work experience and training programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3651. A bill relative to age discrimination in employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 3652. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on manganese ore (including ferruginous ore) and related products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3653. A bill to appropriate funds to carry out section 402 of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 3654. A bill to provide for fair representation of all areas of the United States in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National CARIH Asthma Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission on National Defense Policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.J. Res. 203. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 204. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 205. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Amerigo Vespucci; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to direct the Librarian of Congress to transfer certain documents to the Hall of Records Commission of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution relating to freedom for Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that highway trust funds should not be withheld; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H. Res. 169. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949, and related acts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 170. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the withdrawal of American troops from Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Res. 171. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949, and related acts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. Res. 172. Resolution creating a select

committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949, and related acts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Res. 173. Resolution to amend rules X, XI, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Res. 174. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that no further expenditures for highway beautification should be made until the Vietnam war is terminated; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

3. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3655. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Morsello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3656. A bill for the relief of George Apostolopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3657. A bill for the relief of Leowidas Kotsasiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3658. A bill for the relief of Stavras Soukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3659. A bill for the relief of Cologero Armandini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3660. A bill for the relief of Eleftherios Ekonomou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3661. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Maranzano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3662. A bill for the relief of Serafem J. Loucas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3663. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Dimosthenis Fokas and their minor child, Anastos Fokas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3664. A bill for the relief of Antonino Eterno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3665. A bill for the relief of Francesco Scalice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3666. A bill for the relief of Vassiliki and Athanasios Levantis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3667. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zambianchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3668. A bill for the relief of Calogera Tranchina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3669. A bill for the relief of Salvatore and Domitella Barone and minor child, Josephine Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3670. A bill for the relief of Salvatore and Vincenza Coico and minor children, Francesca and Luigi Coico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3671. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Turriciamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3672. A bill for the relief of Andrea Spitaleri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3673. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Leontaritis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3674. A bill for the relief of Chrisoula Aglamisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3675. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 3676. A bill for the relief of Jerssie T. Ramirez Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 3677. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Traiani Lissitsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 3678. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sophocles Sakellariou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3679. A bill for the relief of Nunsia (Nancy) Francesca Badali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3680. A bill for the relief of Kazimerz Sosnowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3681. A bill for the relief of James M. Yates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3682. A bill for the relief of Theodor Avitahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 3683. A bill for the relief of Saidi Parseghian de Malumian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3684. A bill for the relief of Young Il Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3685. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Wiercinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3686. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmela Mancuso and her daughter, Filippa Mancuso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3687. A bill for the relief of Hanna Lerner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3688. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Sylvana (Maria Mattozi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3689. A bill for the relief of Maria D'Ascola Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3690. A bill for the relief of Demir Alp Barker, Mufide Barker, and Ali Halim Barker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3691. A bill for the relief of Sun On Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 3692. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nahit Esen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3693. A bill for the relief of Carmello Stancanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3694. A bill for the relief of Esther Joseph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3695. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe (Joseph) Gagliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3696. A bill for the relief of Remigio Bernardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3697. A bill for the relief of Rosario Toria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3698. A bill for the relief of Marianna Galati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3699. A bill for the relief of Lucio Maugeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3700. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Zomparelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3701. A bill for the relief of Raffaele and Franceschina Piscitelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3702. A bill for the relief of Domenico Surleti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3703. A bill for the relief of Newton Dowden and Shirley Agnes Dowden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3704. A bill for the relief of Michele Ponte-Affronti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 3705. A bill for the relief of Sun On Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 3706. A bill for the relief of Christina von Renner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3707. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Kaddusi Gazioglu and sons, Orhon and Mehmet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 3708. A bill for the relief of Ladislao Toth and Tsuzsanne Patkos de Toth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 3709. A bill for the relief of Christopher Bugarchich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 3710. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lolita Lerma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 3711. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Giovanni Di Chiro, M.D.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3712. A bill for the relief of Rear Adm. Arthur A. Ageton, U.S. Navy, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3713. A bill for the relief of William H. Morning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3714. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Kreysa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3715. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3716. A bill for the relief of Edward G. Beagle, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3717. A bill for the relief of Mrs. M. M. Richwine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3718. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gonzalez-Mora, and his wife, Natalia Sandoval Gonzalez-Mora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3719. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Ippoliti, and his wife, Marcella Ippoliti, and their children, Miss Stafania Ippoliti and Master Franco Ippoliti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3720. A bill for the relief of Panagiota and Konstantinos Karras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 3721. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tai Koo Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 3722. A bill for the relief of Associated Engineers & Contractors, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kameyo Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Saku Hiratsuka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3725. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Marcelino C. Guiang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 3726. A bill for the relief of Delia Pili; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3727. A bill for the relief of Elpidio and Natividad Damazo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3728. A bill for the relief of Theodora Papadopalis Ivanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3729. A bill for the relief of Modestino Caiazza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3730. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charley Conley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3731. A bill for the relief of James D. Stephens: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3732. A bill for the relief of Luis Donato Rodrigues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 3733. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ho Yong Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 3734. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe De Stefano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3735. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Perrakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 3736. A bill for the relief of Stephen H. Clarkson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3737. A bill to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Riverside; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 3738. A bill for the relief of Carmen Yaciofano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

13. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association, Washington, D.C., relative to crime and anticrime legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

14. Also, petition of Clarence E. Whaley, San Jose, Calif., relative to impeachment of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

15. Also, petition of Roger D. Kaiser, Lompoc, Calif., relative to confinement of Alaskan prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tribute to Judge Minard E. Hulse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, this past December, Judge Minard E. Hulse, one of Illinois' great jurists, retired from the Lake County circuit court.

Judge Hulse occupies a high place in the hearts and minds of all of us who have known him. My association with Judge Hulse has been both personal and professional and spans many years. I knew him first as a family friend and fellow member of the bar; then, as a jurist, before whom I frequently appeared as a practicing attorney. And, again, when I was a member of the Illinois State Senate and he came to me with recommendations for changing the laws affecting his court.

Judge Hulse's primary concern is with people, knowing that only by helping the individual is it possible to benefit society itself. He has always recognized the institution of the American family as the basic ingredient to the successful development of the individual and the community, and the need to rehabilitate wherever possible the young people who are the victims of poor judgment or poor environment, or lack of parental supervision and advice. He backed legislation—now law in Illinois and in some other States—permitting husbands and fathers to be released from custody during daytime hours for full-time employment, returning to custody at night to fulfill their sentences, thus contributing not only to their own welfare but to that of their families and society.

A great lawyer and a great judge, yes—but, above all, Judge Hulse is a great humanitarian, a man of the big heart and of the wise decision. He is a man of the firm resolve that the key to improved human behavior lies in human decisions for the right, and that in all things, divine guidance alone can enable man to attain a higher place in the esteem of his fellow man and his Creator.

This is the place Judge Hulse occupies today. In that high estate, I salute him, his faithful and beloved Evelyn, and their wonderful family.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay this tribute to Judge Hulse in the House of Representatives, and to call to the attention of my colleagues the high regard in which he is held by the citizens of Lake County and of Illinois.

Hon. Gordon Browning; Distinguished Tennessean and a True Servant of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, you and many other Members of the House will recall as your friend the Honorable Gordon Browning, of Tennessee, who served with distinction in the House of Representatives during several terms some years ago and who later served so ably as Governor of Tennessee. Military men and civilians alike will recall the great record of military service of Gordon Browning during both World War I and World War II. He is a man who has devoted himself since childhood to serving the people—service in the most honorable and dedicated form. I share the pride of millions who have been inspired by the selfless devotion to public service of this great American. His heart and his courage are as big as Tennessee itself, from Smoky Mountains to Mississippi plain.

Some who have not seen Governor Browning for some years might bring forth the question, "What is Gordon Browning doing now?" And then, those who know him well would realize that this question has but one answer, "Gordon Browning is serving the people." He is today, despite pain and physical affliction, in contact, town to town in Tennessee, delivering to thousands a valiant message on the responsibilities we all have to God and country, and as Democrats, to our party and to its ideals. As a fellow Tennessean, I salute him.

Tax Relief Offered for Employee Moving Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced legislation to exclude from taxable income certain reimbursed moving expenses of employees who are transferred.

Under existing law, only the bare essentials of moving expenses are excludable from taxable income for these employees. These excludable expenses cover only the actual cost of moving the employee's possessions, and his transportation along with that of his family. All other moving expenses, when reimbursed to him by his company, are counted as personal income and the law requires the employer to withhold Federal income tax on such reimbursements.

Last year, the 89th Congress enacted into law provisions for the Federal Government to reimburse its employees for certain expenses incurred in moving as a result of a Government-requested transfer.

It is manifestly inconsistent for the Government to recognize the legitimacy of these expenses for reimbursement on the one hand, while taxing payments for these same expenses on the other hand. In effect, the tax law works against the very principle of full-expense reimbursement which the Congress adopted for the Federal Government last year.

In addition, this unfairness creates a hardship on employees and severely penalizes them through no fault of their own. It is time this situation is corrected.

My bill would exclude from income many costs in addition to the bare essentials excluded under existing law. Excluded would be such legitimate and necessary expenses as storage expenses; house-hunting trips; meals and lodging while the employee and his family are occupying temporary quarters at the new location; travel between the old and new location; and expenses incurred in connection with disposing of the old residence.

The 49th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, today when many speak of building bridges between the East and the West, establishing further contacts with East European nations to induce their further liberalization and their faltering, hesitant expression of limited independence from Soviet control, it is easy to become discouraged by the minimal effectiveness of such a policy. Far more frustrating however, is the realization that some of the Captive Nations are beyond the reach of the engineers of these bridges. I wish to call attention to one of those nations in particular which lay beyond the bridge span possibilities—the Ukraine. For the Ukraine and other nations like it have fallen prey to the direst Soviet colonialization. The Soviet Union has incorporated the Ukraine within the geographical boundaries of the Soviet Union, as though to obliterate from history the previous existence of the Ukraine as a nation. Thus the Soviet Union has eliminated any possible contact, any possible construction of bridges, between the West and the Ukraine as a national entity. The Soviet Union denies national identity to the Ukrainian people, claiming they form an integral part of Russia.

Yet the Soviet Union will never succeed in erasing the memory of national existence from the hearts of the Ukrainian people. Nor will it ever succeed in extinguishing the fervent passion for independence which smolders in Ukrainian souls. Proof of these two statements lies in the previous failure of the Russians' attempt to incorporate the Ukraine. For this is the second Soviet-executed tragedy to befall the Ukraine. The first Russian incorporation attempt with regard to the Ukraine covered a period of nearly 250 years, ending with the Ukrainian declaration of independence on January 22, 1918. On that glorious date in Ukrainian history, the Ukrainian people seized upon the opportunities afforded them by Russian internal strife to achieve the restoration of their own independence.

However the Ukrainian nation was to have only a brief respite from Soviet domination. Within barely 2 years the Soviet Union had reconquered the Ukraine. Again the Ukrainian people were to be subjected to Russian incorporation efforts.

Today on the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, we as Americans wish to extend moral encouragement to the Ukrainian people in deepest respect for their commitment to the principles of freedom and liberty they have so undeniably demonstrated throughout their history.

The Dedicated Service of Ronald Gall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn that the Navy Department has awarded a Certificate of Appreciation to my distinguished constituent, Ronald Gall, for his outstanding service to the U.S. Navy.

Formal presentation of the commendations to Mr. Gall was made on Tuesday, January 10, by Rear Adm. B. M. Strean, Deputy and Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel at the Navy Department in Washington.

The work for which Mr. Gall was cited was his support, as corporate director of public relations of the Curtiss-Wright Corp., of Navy recruiting advertising and publicity programs. It covers the period of the last 5 years.

In an accompanying letter of commendation, Adm. B. J. Semmes, Chief of Naval Personnel, said:

> You have devoted your time, energy, and ability to create and to place a series of Navy recruiting advertisements of sustained excellence. The response to these advertisements has been outstanding. The Recruiting Aids Division has received over 4,000 replies to the advertisement sponsored by Curtiss-Wright in 1965. In response to this year's advertisement, the Recruiting Aids Division has received over one thousand inquiries during the first week of its exposure.
>
> I want to commend you for the warm hospitality and personal attention which you have given to the young naval officers who worked with you during these years. You have acted as their mentor and have given freely of yourself and your vast knowledge of advertising and the media.
>
> Thank you for your devoted public service to the U.S. Navy and I know that you have achieved genuine satisfaction in accomplishing a job well done.

Mr. Gall has been active for years in the Navy support programs. He is a long-time member of the Navy League of the United States and presently is a vice president and director of its Passaic-Bergen Council. Recently, he served on the Advisory Committee of Adm. John Bergen, chairman of the Committee of the New York Navy League Council which commemorated the 50th anniversary of Naval Researve Aviation at a dinner held on October 26 at the Waldorf-Astoria, attended by approximately 1,500 people.

I am proud that he is my constituent and my friend.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday was the 49th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. It was on January 22, 1918, that Ukraine declared its independence from Russia.

Prior to the declaration of independence, the Ukrainians were under the domination of the czars. The Romanoff dynasty was overthrown in 1917; eventually Russia was taken over by the forces of communism.

The freedom of Ukraine was short-lived. Whether the larger country was run by the czars or by the commissars made no difference to the Ukrainian people, who were once more, in 1920, taken over by the Russians.

Since the end of World War II, no less than 61 nations have gained their independence. Forty-three of the 61 are smaller geographically than Ukraine, which is 232,046 square miles in area.

Only 3 of the 61 countries have populations that exceed Ukraine's 45 million. The Maldive Islands, which achieved independence in 1965, have 115 square miles of territory and 97,000 inhabitants.

Certainly, like all lovers of freedom, liberty, and independence, I have rejoiced when the peoples of new nations severed the ties that had previously bound them to colonial empires such as those held by Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, and Portugal. I was pleased when the Philippines were granted their independence by the United States.

We hear a great deal these days about more treaties, increasing trade, cultural exchanges, increased communication and travel, a lessening of tensions, and coexistence with the Soviet Union. If the past has any meaning, most of these supposedly reciprocal agreements will turn out to be one-sided affairs.

The next time the Soviet Union asks us to sign any sort of treaty, convention, or other agreement, let us insist, as part of the bargain, that she demonstrate her good faith by granting independence to Ukraine. As President Lyndon B. Johnson told the Congress in his state of the Union message in 1966:

The . . . most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence—the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions . . . We follow this principle by encouraging the end of colonial rule.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a table which lists the countries that have secured their freedom since World War II, together with the dates of independence, areas, and populations:

Nation	Date of independence	Area (square miles)	Population
Algeria	1962	919,591	[1] 12,000,000
Botswana	1966	275,000	559,000
Burma	1948	261,789	24,732,000
Burundi	1962	10,739	[1] 2,780,000
Cambodia	1953	69,898	[1] 6,200,000
Cameroon	1960	183,591	5,150,000
Central African Republic	1960	241,313	1,352,000
Ceylon	1948	25,332	11,600,500
Chad	1960	490,733	4,000,000
Congo (ex-Belgian)	1960	905,562	15,625,000
Congo (ex-French)	1960	134,749	[1] 826,000
Cyprus	1960	3,572	591,000
Dahomey	1960	43,483	2,244,000
East Germany	1949	41,816	17,065,600
Gabon	1960	102,317	465,000
Gambia	1965	4,361	330,000
Ghana	1957	92,100	7,740,000
Guinea	1958	94,925	3,500,000
Guhana	1966	83,000	636,000
Indonesia	1949	735,268	160,000,000
Israel	1948	7,993	2,561,400
Ivory Coast	1960	124,502	[1] 3,750,000
Jamaica	1962	4,232	1,800,000
Jordan	1946	37,737	1,935,440
Kenya	1963	224,960	9,365,000
Kuwait	1961	5,800	567,422
Laos	1949	91,428	3,000,000
Lesotho	1966	11,716	858,000
Libya	1951	679,536	1,617,000
Malagasy Republic	1960	230,035	6,262,000
Malawi	1964	45,747	4,000,000
Malaysia	1963	128,338	[1] 9,245,491
Maldive Islands	1965	115	97,000
Mali	1960	463,947	4,576,000
Malta	1964	122	319,476
Mauritania	1960	397,683	1,000,000
Mongolia	1946	604,247	1,087,200
Morocco	1956	174,471	13,323,000
Niger	1960	459,073	3,328,000
Nigeria	1960	356,669	[1] 56,400,000
North Korea	1948	46,540	[1] 10,900,000
North Vietnam	1949	60,156	17,700,000
Pakistan	1947	365,529	102,876,000
Philippines	1946	115,707	32,345,000
Rhodesia (de facto)	1965	150,333	4,216,000
Rwanda	1962	10,169	2,903,071
Senegal	1960	76,124	3,490,000
Sierra Leone	1961	27,925	[1] 2,200,000
Singapore	1965	225	1,844,000
Somalia	1960	246,155	2,500,000
South Korea	1948	38,004	28,754,000
South Vietnam	1955	66,280	16,124,000
Sudan	1956	967,491	13,540,000
Tanzania	1961	362,844	10,578,100
Togo	1960	21,853	1,642,000
Trinidad and Tobago	1962	1,980	975,000
Tunisia	1956	63,378	4,675,000
Uganda	1962	91,134	7,551,000
Upper Volta	1960	105,869	4,858,000
Western Samoa	1962	1,097	130,000
Zambia	1964	290,587	3,710,000

[1] 1964; all others 1965, except Indonesia, Jamaica, Lesotho, and Mauritania which are 1966.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago on January 22, a nation was formed by the union of the Ukrainian National Republic and the Western Ukrainian National Republic. The Ukrainian people breathed freedom for barely 2 years before falling to the imperialism and tyranny of Communist Russia.

It is fitting during this Ukrainian independence week that the American people rededicate ourselves toward working for renewed freedom of all captive nations.

With Americans dying in the jungles and on the plains of Vietnam, defending those embattled people against communism's terrors, we should vow to regain freedom for the Ukrainians who have suffered so much for so long.

During our efforts, let us recall the words of a great American spoken about our own fight for freedom, for they apply equally to the people of the captive nations:

For what avail the plough or sail, or land or life, if freedom fail?

Fino Urges Troop Withdrawal From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my resolution, last year the first in the House of Representatives, to declare the sense of the House that American military commitments in Europe be revised so as to enable the withdrawal of such American troops as might be withdrawn consonant with national security.

I originally introduced this resolution in February 1966, out of concern with the U.S. war effort and the U.S. balance-of-payments position. It is likely that the Senate will pass some resolution regarding our European troop strength during 1967.

Passage of my resolution would lead to freeing more troops for service on the home front and in southeast Asia. I am not urging escalation or de-escalation. I am proposing measures which show Europe that we mean business. I hope that the House will not default to the Senate in such vigilance.

Our European commitment clearly interferes with our troop rotations in Vietnam. I would also hasten to point out that our European military commitment is very costly. The billions we are spending in Europe could be trimmed to bring our budget closer to balance, and help head off the need for the proposed 6-percent tax increase.

Not only is our commitment costly in budget terms, but it is costly in balance-of-payments terms. In 1965, in the middle of the administration's much heralded war on balance-of-payments difficulties, this country lost $1.6 billion in gold. This was the biggest loss of gold since 1960. France, Germany, and Spain, directly or indirectly, have bilked us of $5 billion worth of gold since 1960. Now France is after gold again. We have almost 300,000 troops stationed in Germany and Spain, and the dollars paid to support these troops, many of which wind up in French hands, constitute a high proportion of the dollars traded in for U.S. gold.

The American military commitment keeps our taxes high and holds out the promise of even higher taxes. But what does it do for Europe? It keeps European taxes low. It eases the strain on European budgets through minimizing defense expenditures. The reduced European taxes subsidize European industry, making European exports more competitive with American exports. This hurts our trade situation.

Another reason to reduce U.S. troop commitment in Europe is the fact that some of our NATO allies are trading with North Vietnam. How can we expect diplomats to take our war effort seriously while we tolerate a heavy strain in keeping up the military protection of those who encourage or trade with our enemies?

If we shift some troops from Europe to Vietnam, we can meet our heavy military needs in Vietnam without resort to the draft of college students and other young Americans in unusual number. As long as we are keeping troops in Europe that could better be used on behalf of American interests in Vietnam, we are making our boys face a military draft so that America can protect Europe, while Europe's youth escape the service Europe might otherwise require of them. I do not want American students in rice paddies while American soldiers keep Europe's young people free for wine, women, and song.

What exactly is wrong with Europe protecting Europe? Our strategies which say otherwise are based on postwar military psychologies which have ceased to be realistic now that the great Communist threat is China—at least for the moment. I do not urge the withdrawal of any troops in Europe who are clearly protecting our interests. Let us withdraw those who are protecting European and not American interests.

Dr. Edward G. Locke, Director, Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Edward G. Locke, internationally known research administrator and director of the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory in Madison,

Wis., since 1959 passed away last December 19. He had been ill for the past year.

Dr. Locke was a frequent visitor to Washington, a man I knew as a friend and as an eminently qualified director of the outstanding Forest Products Laboratory in Madison. He was the sixth Director in the 56-year history of the Laboratory which is maintained in Madison by the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Locke was a tireless worker and lifetime friend of the wood and paper products industry. Death cut short his career at the time he neared attainment of one of his most cherished goals—a goal that brought him to Washington and to Congress on many frequent occasions—the first major expansion of the world-famed Laboratory's physical plant in 35 years.

Mr. Speaker, to the many friends and relatives whom Dr. Locke has left behind, I extend my deep condolences.

Time for a New Hoover Commisison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 12 full months I have been telling the people of Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District that the Congress must insist upon getting more mileage out of every single tax dollar before we agree to any new tax that might be proposed by the Johnson administration. I promised the people in Minnesota that if I were elected I would take immediate action to tighten up the expenses of running this Nation.

Today I am introducing a bill which I expect to help achieve that important goal.

I have proposed that we establish a commission of the executive branch to make a comprehensive study of all Federal operations. It is clear that the population explosion coupled with the rapid pace of technological change, especially in the fields of transportation, communication, and production, have expanded the duties and functions of government. But it is imperative that a constant and sincere reevaluation of these functions be pursued. This commission, modeled after the two successful Hoover Commissions, would make such an evaluation and propose recommendations for change wherever appropriate.

The commission would be authorized to determine the amount of duplication and inefficiency in any area of government; to study the problem of communication among the various units; to examine jurisdictional conflicts and inconsistencies; and to recommend ways to coordinate programs and policies among units with similar responsibilities, suggesting redefinitions of those duties wherever they are required.

The growth of bureaucracy in the past 25 years has been astounding; today there are over 2½ million employees under civil service. Today there are about 215 grant-in-aid programs administered by more than 20 different Federal departments and agencies. The cost of these programs alone has tripled in one decade.

It is incumbent upon the Congress to demand the highest degree of efficiency possible in the operation of our Government. This commission, composed of 14 members, would gather the Nation's best experts to make recommendations toward that goal. It would include two Congressmen, two Senators, two Governors, two members from the executive branch, and six from outside the Government.

Passage of this bill would prove to the American citizen that we intend to streamline Government organization, and will reduce duplication and inefficiency. It could put our Government once again on a sound businesslike basis.

Blatnik Salutes Outgoing Cabinet Member Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the chorus of tributes to John T. Connor, the outgoing Secretary of Commerce, that we have heard in public and private in the past several days.

Secretary Connor's outstanding talents as a creative, inspired leader and administrator have been clearly apparent across the broad range of responsibilities entrusted to the Department of Commerce.

Under him, the Department has been a major force in meeting the urgent and diverse problems of our times at home and abroad.

He has played a primary role in keeping the dollar strong as an architect and major participant in President Johnson's balance-of-payments program, under which our bankers and businessmen have made sizable contributions in the past 2 years to supplement the Government's own significant efforts.

He has headed an export expansion program that has helped bring the Nation's overseas trade to historic record levels, with resultant benefits to workingmen throughout the Nation no less than to their employers and to the Nation's balance-of-payments goals.

He has made farsighted and far-seeing contributions to the economic development of the less-developed sections of our own Nation through distinguished and progressive leadership, and the establishment of regional development commissions, within terms of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The related Appalachia program operating through Secretary Connor has, as you know, been highly successful thus far and holds vast promise for the future both in its own 13-State area and as a pioneer effort in the field of cooperative Federal-State regional development.

Another critical problem area for this Nation is automobile and traffic safety, where accidents take far more lives than are lost in Vietnam. Today the Nation's highways and motor vehicles are becoming safer, and will continue to become safer in the years ahead, because of safety programs initiated and inaugurated and now being pursued under Secretary Connor's leadership.

And if safeguarding the lives of Americans must always be our primary concern, the goal of safeguarding the land itself for this generation and for posterity certainly also holds an extremely high priority. Under Secretary Connor, the Department of Commerce undertook an energetic program of landscaping and scenic enhancement of our roads even before passage of the important Highway Beautification Act of 1965, and is now carrying forward this program with distinction.

I believe these few examples of major programs emphasize Secretary Connor's deep involvement and devoted leadership in meeting the problems of our times, ranging from the domestic economy to international affairs to the safety of our people and the quality of our lives.

But the sum of Secretary Connor's contributions in these years is, of course, far greater than simply the sum of these and all the other programs and policies and actions with which he has been concerned.

It lies, in a larger sense, in the qualities he brought to bear through these 2 years in service in an extremely demanding position of public trust: breadth of vision, balanced perspective, seasoned competence, an informed and cultivated intelligence, and most of all, an absolute determination to serve the public good.

One of the most distinguishing attributes of an outstanding leader, it is often said, is his ability to select and train a worthy successor. Clearly, Secretary Connor has done this. Alexander B. Trowbridge, who has served as Assistant Secretary of Commerce and whom President Johnson has now named Acting Secretary of Commerce, is a fine and competent and able successor who will assure continuity in the forward thrust of this important Department. Secretary Trowbridge's appointment underlines once again the extremely high quality of leadership in the executive department in general, and the Commerce Department in particular, under the administration of President Johnson.

As Secretary Connor prepares to leave Washington, I am certain that all of us—and all of the American people—join in wishing him and his family the continued happiness and success they so richly deserve in the years to come.

Secretary Connor has indeed earned a grateful and sincere "Well done" from us all.

The Future of the Federal Power Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall wrote an interesting and informative article in the January 1967 issue of Public Power. Entitled "Future of the Federal Power Program," the article discusses present and projected plans to meet the electricity needs of the Nation. Secretary Udall explained in the article:

The role of the Federal Government in the Nation's electric power industry is changing—but its goal is not. The goal continues to be an abundant supply of low-cost power for all our people.

Citing the importance of joint action among electric utilities and the necessity of reliability, Secretary Udall predicted that in 25 years, the United States would still "have the finest, most efficient and most reliable power system in the world."

In one of his recommendations the Secretary states:

The Commission (FPC) should have the power to assure that the giant new EHV transmission networks which are developing throughout the land are best adapted to the needs of the regions they serve, and that they do not become tools of discrimination against other utilities or service areas.

The provisions of my measure—H.R. 2311—would enhance, substantially, the orderly development to which Secretary Udall refers. The entire article follows:

FUTURE OF THE FEDERAL POWER PROGRAM

(By Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior)

The role of the Federal Government in the Nation's electric power industry is changing—but its goal is not. The goal continues to be an abundant supply of low-cost power for all our people.

In the past the Federal Government has developed multipurpose river projects, sold hydro power at wholesale to preference customers, and thus provided a yardstick for power rates and helped prevent monopoly.

We shall continue to develop new multipurpose river projects and sell power to preference customers. But the fact is that while electric loads are doubling every 10 years we are running out of undeveloped river projects to meet preference customer load growth. In the Columbia River Basin, for example, the Bonneville Power Administration has assured hydro resources to meet preference customer load growth only until about 1980, and possibly not even that long. BPA foresees a regional need for a one million-kw thermal plant as early as 1973, and a thermal plant that big or bigger each year starting in 1975.

SHARING TECHNOLOGY

In the future Federal hydro will be used more and more for peaking, and as the good hydro sites are developed, the Federal role in the West more and more will be to assure access for all to new technology as compared with actual provision of the energy in the past.

Fortunately, mounting pressures of load growth are quickening the pace of new technology and new techniques in the power field. Power pooling, both for planning and operating purposes, is the natural outgrowth of these pressures. To encourage establishment of pools and to participate in them in various ways increasingly is becoming one of the most important aspects of the changing Federal role.

If each public agency or cooperative which traditionally has relied heavily on Federal multipurpose projects could supplement its supply by building its own thermal plant, the problem might easily be solved. But this is not a practical solution. The most efficient thermal plants are big—one million kw and larger. Whether publicly or privately owned, few utilities acting alone can finance, build and utilize the output of a plant this size.

So the challenge comes into focus; how to bring together publicly and privately-owned utilities to plan, finance, build and share the benefits of the most efficient generating plants and EHV transmission lines American engineers can design; how to integrate these large new plants and lines with the valuable hydro peaking plants owned by the Federal Government; and how to accomplish all of this in such a way that the identities of individual systems, large and small, public and private, are not destroyed?

PATTERNS EMERGING

I believe the patterns are beginning to emerge, all over America but particularly in the West.

Just this past summer the Interior Department helped to work out a series of agreements with members of a new planning organization in the Pacific Southwest called Western Energy Supply and Transmission Associates. WEST, as it is commonly known, is now comprised of 11 private companies, eight public and municipally owned systems and three G&T cooperatives.

Under the auspices of WEST, two large 750-megawatt, coal-fired steam plants and over 1,000 miles of associated EHV transmission are being built by utilities in the Southwest. Additional steam plants are in the planning stages. Public agencies will share in the output. Negotiations are seeking to provide a basis for integrating WEST-sponsored plants with Federal hydro capacity.

Our agreements provide for water supply, utilization of Indian-owned coal and transmission rights of way across Indian and Federally-owned lands. For the first time in agreements of this nature, the utilities agree to abate air and water pollution caused by operation of coal-fired steam electric generating plants.

From the conservation standpoint, these are very important stipulations. But equally important, in terms of the Federal Government's changing role in the Nation's power picture, we did not agree to the arrangements until WEST broadened its membership to include additional public agencies and three REA-financed G&T cooperatives. We believe that consumer-owned utilities must have the opportunity to participate in the economies of large-scale generation and transmission projects.

Regardless of their ownership—public, cooperative or private—electric utilities have one basic job: to serve the people in the most economical, efficient and reliable way possible. Each system, each segment of the industry, has a very important job to perform, and the benefits of new planning techniques, new technology, pooling and interconnections must be available to all.

IMPROVED POOLING

Happily, the concept of pooling of both generation and transmission is being accepted in the industry. During the past five years many significant pooling arrangements have been consummated. TVA has reached agreement with some 19 Southwest utilities for construction of 500-kv a.c. lines which will ultimately increase the load-carrying capability of both TVA and the combined systems by 1½ million kw. In the Upper Midwest the Missouri Basin Systems Group is a unique pool of over 100 preference systems and the Bureau of Reclamation. In much the same region we now have the Mid-Continent Area Power Planners (MAPP), which is another pool consisting of private utilities and some preference customers.

The Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie is another example of the changing role of the Federal Government in the Nation's power business. In that, the Nation's largest single transmission undertaking, the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation are joined by the City of Los Angeles and a group of privately-owned utilities in building four giant lines—two 500-kv a.c. and two 750-kv d.c.—that will spread power benefits through 11 western states. Some 250 publicly owned systems will benefit to one degree or another.

In this instance, the Federal Government is pioneering—along with the City of Los Angeles and Southern California Edison Co.—in direct current technology. To pioneer in technology will continue to be part of the Federal Government's role.

INTERCONNECTIONS AND RELIABILITY

Eventually the entire Nation will be interconnected. In early 1967 we will move closer to that goal, when the eastern and western power systems of the U.S. and Canada will be test-interconnected by the closing of three 230-kv interconnections and one 161-kv interconnection in the Missouri River Basin system (PUBLIC POWER, Dec., page 38). If serious problems are encountered, the ties will be reopened while the problems are resolved prior to going on a full operational basis.

A total of 209 major public and private power systems with capacity of nearly 245 million kw and 265,000 miles of main transmission line will be tied together when the interconnection is operational. This capacity will represent about 40% of the world's total and will form the largest interconnected power system grid the world has ever known.

But while these interconnections will represent an important step forward, we must recognize that they are merely the forerunners to the stronger ties needed in the future. It must be a national goal to beef up these small interconnections until they are as strong, for example, as the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie will be.

The Northeastern blackout of November 9, 1965, marked a dramatic and rather sudden change of emphasis on strong interconnections from economy to reliability, although the former is still very important and strong interconnections are essential to both. Where the original National Power Survey of the Federal Power Commission was heavily oriented toward the economies of scale, it is now being updated with the emphasis

on reliability aspects of the Nation's bulk power supply.

REGIONAL PLANNING

The blackout pointed up a lack of regional thinking and planning. While the Pacific Northwest and the Tennessee Valley have been planning their electric systems regionally for many years and several holding companies in the north central and southern states have been doing likewise, power planning until recently has been a rather fractionated, company-by-company thing. For example, the Northeast power failure revealed that the interconnected Northeast companies had no program for load-shedding or intersystem tie line tripping under emergency conditions. Vital decisions affecting proper service to one-sixth of the Nation were left in the hands of company dispatchers who had only moments to consider them and whose control room instruments could not be relied upon during those critical moments. This was hardly a regional approach to power planning.

Regional power planning, admittedly, is not easy. The objective, if each region is to have the most reliable and efficient electric system that engineers can design, must be that the many independent utility systems so coordinate their activities that they build and operate their electric properties as though they were, in fact, only one utility system. By no means am I suggesting the desirability of single ownership. Diversity of ownership improves the conditions for political liberty and this is a goal we place higher than efficiency and reliability. I believe we can have both.

We must plan and pool not only our generating and transmission resources but our financial strength, our know-how and in some cases our purchasing. We must provide mutual assistance—line crews, equipment, power supply—in time of emergency or catastrophe. There will be complicated problems of engineering, economics, finance, law and politics. Each utility, whether publicly or privately owned, may have to forego the exercise of part of its traditional sovereignty. The industry may have to seek advice and assistance from experts in other disciplines, for example, systems analysis experts from the space and aeronautical industry.

While I would be the last to argue that the best power planning for every region of our country can be done in Washington, D.C., there are important and essential types of planning that can be done on a National level. The division of the U.S. into appropriate regions for power planning, the establishment of criteria for reliable and efficient system design and operation, the encouragement of research and development work, the coordination of the work of various regional utility groups and studies of the advantages of interregional power transfers are examples of power planning that perhaps can best be done on a national basis.

ROLE OF FPC

The Federal Power Commission, which took the leadership in preparing the monumental National Power Survey, probably is the most logical Federal agency to provide leadership in organizing the National effort. I suspect that only a Federal agency could hope to bring together on either a voluntary or compulsory basis the many diverse and sometimes antagonistic elements of our Nation's electric utility industry.

The efforts of the FPC are particularly vital to the protection of the interests of small public agencies through wholesale rate jurisdiction which the FPC has, in the past several years, exercised with vigor. The Commission's power to order interconnections can also be a valuable tool in safeguarding the small utility. But this, like other areas of FPC authority, needs strengthening if the agency is to be of maximum effectiveness in protecting the public interest in an era of expanding technology and growing complexity in the electric power industry. The Commission should have the power to assure that the giant new EHV transmission networks which are developing throughout the land are best adapted to the needs of the regions they serve, and that they do not become tools of discrimination against other utilities or service areas.

NEW PATHS OF POWER PROGRESS

In the Pacific Northwest, where the Bonneville transmission system has served as the backbone grid for the Pacific Northwest Power Pool since World War II, some of the most important decisions affecting the future of the Federal power program are in the making. That region is just now beginning to plan for the transition from an all hydro power supply to one of hydro and thermal combined.

The Federal Government—BPA in this case—does not propose to build the necessary thermal plants. But BPA has the transmission and the hydro peaking and the reserves necessary to make thermal plants highly efficient and reliable. It intends to make these services available, under appropriate arrangements, to non-Federal builders of thermal plants. BPA also proposes to share in the output of the thermal plants built by others, either through exchange arrangements or direct purchase. In this manner BPA will be able to continue to serve the load growth of preference customers and industry in the Northwest; depending on the arrangements worked out, it could even continue to supply a portion of private utilities' loads if they so desire.

Precisely how all of this is to be accomplished is still to be determined. For public and private agencies there are important legal as well as technical and operating problems. Administrator David S. Black has appointed a Task Force within BPA to work with representatives of all the utilities in the region in solving these problems (Public Power, Nov, page 42). He also has signed a contract with a consulting firm, Battelle-Northwest, for a study of potential nuclear steam plant sites in the Northwest. So here, again, the Federal Government is exercising leadership and pioneering new paths of power progress.

NEW ERA IN NORTHEAST

While the role of the Federal Government in the development of the West is legend, there has never been a Federal power program in New England. Rates in New England are nearly 30% higher than in any other part of the country. But now the Dickey-Lincoln School Project on the Upper St. John River has been authorized as a Federal project, and we have $1.1 million for advance planning. This project will contribute about 800,000 kw of capacity and over one billion kwh of energy. It will provide between 75,000 kw and 100,000 kw of 8-mill energy to municipalities and cooperatives in Maine who now pay from 15 to 21 mills per kwh for their power supply. And while the first shovel of earth is yet to be turned for this project, the Federal yardstick is already being felt in New England. The utilities there are now busily planning big nuclear plants, pumped storage projects and interconnections, all of which promise lower costs of production. The Dickey-Lincoln School Project could open the way for development of an EHV system in the region, linking the hydro capacity of Canada's Maritime Provinces with New England and New York. With such a system there could be exchanges of energy, great diversity gains, improved reliability and opportunities to tap new resources, such as Churchill Falls in Canada.

DUAL-PURPOSE PIONEERING

The Federal Government is helping pioneer yet another promising field, that of gigantic nuclear-powered plants for the dual purpose of water desalinization and steam electric generation. We have agreed, subject to Congressional authorization and appropriations, to join in the construction of the world's largest such plant at a site just off the southern California coast. With the Atomic Energy Commission and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California we will participate in financing the desalting part of the plant. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, the Southern California Edison Co. and San Diego Gas and Electric Co. will finance and build the electric generating facilities.

The $444-million project is expected to produce 150 million gallons of fresn water daily at a delivered cost of about 27 cents per thousand gallons and 1,800,000 kw of power at costs competitive with alternative sources of power. The Interior Department is to put up $57.2 million toward capital and operating costs for the desalinization features of the plant and the AEC $15 million.

I view Interior's participation as another example of our leadership role by assuming part of the risk in the application of new technology. Never before has a plant of such magnitude been built, or even proposed. Interior is buying technical know-how by participating in a large-scale operation from which we expect to learn much. At the same time we expect this plant to contribute significantly to both the water and power needs of the region.

Joint participation of so many agencies permits a much bigger dual-purpose plant producing vastly more steam at greatly lowered steam costs. A project of this magnitude simply could not have been put together without the broad-based support it enjoys. Being part of a joint venture in this vast undertaking further is in keeping with the cooperative approach we urge on the industry, and which Interior intends to pursue.

There are many areas of the U.S. and the world where both water and power are in short supply. The marriage into a single operation of facilities to produce both water and power offers economic advantages to both, and the efforts of the Federal Government in this field will be intensified.

A MORE BEAUTIFUL AMERICA

There is another and more subtle challenge that our power programs must meet in the years ahead. It is the challenge to make the supplying of electricity to cities and farms compatible with a beautiful America. The people of our country have always been practical, first-things-first, developers. When most of the farms of America had no central station electric service and even the cities had unreliable and expensive service, our efforts were concentrated on getting a reliable supply of low-cost electric power to every consumer. Now that job, as regards today's needs, is pretty well mastered—so much so that the public takes it for granted. But the public can be very demanding and today there is growing insistence that electric generating stations, lines and substations be designed so as not unnecessarily to mar the rural landscape or clutter urban areas. Increasingly there is public insistence that new distribution lines; and even some transmission lines, be placed underground in cities. Planning authorities are requiring better air and water pollution control measures at generating stations, and attractive planning for substations in suburban and business areas. From now on our

programs and policies will reflect this basic concern for the protection and enhancement of our environment.

In this connection, I have recommended to the President a $30-million research and development program over a five-year period to advance the technology of placing power transmission lines underground. This proposed program grew out of the President's instructions to Cabinet members to review recommendations of the 1965 White House Conference on Natural Beauty for possible Federal implementation. I expect significant reductions in the cost of placing lines underground to result from this effort, and look forward to the cooperation of the entire utility industry and the manufacturers.

NEW METHODS

Finally, we must move into new methods of electric generation. Geothermal steam must be put to work and the development of fuel cells expedited. Other exotic forms of energy must be explored: thermoelectric generators, thermionic converters, magnetohydrodynamics (MHD), the fusion reactor. Solar energy research must be pushed.

How well the Federal Government performs its role will help determine where our Nation's power system stands 25 years from now. Will we then still have the finest, most efficient and most reliable power system in the world? The answer must and will be yes, for such a system is vital to our National security and the welfare of our children and generations yet to come.