pointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Conway, Blair P.
Crew, Randolph E.
Mitzel, Michael F.
Haskins, Steven W.
Lovely, Francis B., Jr.
Delones, Robert C.

The following-named (U.S. Military Academy graduate) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ellzey, Michael B.

La Jon R. Hutton for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant and temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the U.S. Marine Corps, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following-named (meritorious noncommissioned officer) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Schillinger, Charles W.
Trout, Benjamin H., II

The following-named (staff noncommissioned officer) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Moe, Robert E.

The following-named (commissioned warrant officers/warrant officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps for limited duty, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Brewer, Patrick R.
Clark, Adrian L.
Conner, Gerald H.
Cook, Loy E.
Costlow, Walter E.
Darrow, Marvin L.
Flournoy, William E.
Groom, Robert W.
Johnson, Stephen J., Jr.
Keil, Richard L.
Knox, Charles, Jr.
Ludwig, Robert M.
McCarthy, William J.
Moody, John E.
Reeder, Edmond W.
Riley, Martin J., Jr.
Rowe, Clark H.
Russell, Robert H.
Smith, Lake Jr.
Woodson, Duane L.

The following-named (staff noncommissioned officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps for limited duty, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Alvarez, Robert L.
Bare, Harry E.
Boudreaux, Ervin J.
Bounds, Jack B.
Carson, Edgar M.
Carver, Richard J.
Cecchetti, Mario E.
De Long, Samuel T. J.
Dominguez, Joe
Dunacusky, Joseph G., Jr.
Durie, Charles W.
Frye, Harold E., Jr.
Gordon, Donald E.
Gravenor, Randall W.
Hawbaker, Lowell D.
Hicks, Grady L.
Johnson, George H., Jr.
Jukoski, Alexander P.
Juneau, John E.
Lambert, Carl E.
Lemieux, Joseph R. E. N.
Lewis, Fred M.
Libby, Frederick A.
Lippe, Ralph
Maxik, Bernard J.
McGuire, Donald E.
McLaughlin, Richard S.
Meads, Walter S., Jr.
Owens, James E.
Raub, Leonard D.
Reffelt, Edwin L.
Ripperger, Robert K.
Rogers, Joe G.
Sanfratello, Johnie A.
Scarangello, Anthony F.
Scott, James P.
Stabile, Anthony D.

The following-named (U.S. Naval Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefore as provided by law:

Anderson, Timothy J.
Artmann, Rufus A., Jr.
Bacon, Paul C.
Baker, David L.
Barber, John C.
Beaty, David C.
Boivin, John A.
Brahmstadt, Clifford A.
Brookes, Richard C.
Buchli, James F.
Campbell, James C.
Carver, Howard C., III
Cathey, Michael R.
Charles, Roger G.
Christian, Leslie A.
Clatworthy, Raymond J., III
Cornetta, Ronald J.
Culver, William L.
Delong, Michael P.
Donnelly, William R., Jr.
Earl, Robert L.
Ehmer, James S.
Eisenbach, Charles R., II
Ellis, Dalton R., Jr.
Etter, William P., II
Foresman, James L.
Foulkes, Richard R.
Glynn, Daniel M.
Goebel, James A.
Goodwin, William G.
Gordon, Adrian J.
Hapke, Norman F., Jr.
Hart, John T.
Heely, Edwin D.
Heinemeyer, Klaus Peter
Hepp, Edward J., Jr.
Holihan, Robert J.
Holtzclaw, Gary E.
Howard, Patrick G.
Hudson, Richard B.
Isbell, Robert P.
Isbell, William P.
Johnson, Russell L.
Kalish, William R.
Kettner, Alan A.
Kieffer, John A., Jr.
Kunkel, Richard H., Jr.
Langston, Michael D.
Lewis, Edward G.
Lister, Dennis L.
Matus, John F.
McConnell, Paul R.
McCormack, Orval W.
McKee, Donald S.
McNeece, James R.
Meltzer, Max C.
Millen, John C.
Mills, Edward H.
Morgan, Michael D. L.
Nelson, William J., Jr.
OBrien, John J., Jr.
ORourke, Robert J.
Pace, Peter
Philip, George, III
Pruiett, Ronald E.
Ptack, Kenneth R.
Robitaille, Joseph A., Jr.
Roll, Raymond A.
Roth, Michael G.
Samaras, George N.
Scivicque, Richard S.
Selden, Jules B.
Shaw, Dennis R.
Sheahan, William J., III
Shields, Michael F.
Slough, John J.
Stoll, Ronald M.
Toppelberg, Alan S.
Trompeter, Thomas R.
Tuttle, Robert E.
Vetter, David A.
Weiss, Thomas J.
Wilkerson, Thomas L.
Williams, Michael J.
Williamson, John T.
Wright, Henry A.
Zahn, George A., Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Acly, Peter A.
Alexander, William S.
Allen, Joe E.
Anderson, Gary K.
Anuszewski, John W.
Ashman, John W.
Bank, John D.
Barnes, Robert C., Jr.
Beeler, Park L., II
Begun, Lawrence C.
Bently, Jon R.
Black, William R.
Boillot, David A.
Bradstreet, Bernard F.
Brodrick, Steven P.
Brown, David T.
Broz, Charles F.
Budd, Paul D.
Burton, Ronald L.
Buechler, Robert J.
Calderas:, John, Jr.
Champe, Charles R.
Colt, Peter L.
Connor, Michael C.
Cooper, C. Richard, Jr.
Cress, John R.
Daigle, Paul R.
Dakin, William E., Jr.
Dalia, George C., Jr.
Davis, Crane
Davis, William P., II
Decker, Andrew P.
Deggendorf, Terrence T.
Devylder, Edgar P., Jr.
Doyle, Kevin M.
Dunn, Charles C.
Eckenrode, David J.
Engelman, Robert A.
Ertwine, Carl H.
Ewing, James J., Jr.
Faro, David R.
Feltner, Jonathan P.
Ferguson, Michael J.
Finneran, Patrick J., Jr.
Fitzgerald, Kenneth W
Freiherr, Stephen P.
Friese, William P.
Fuller, James R.
Gazdayka, John R.
Gernert, Royce G.
Gettman, James A.
Gibson, Carl R.
Gingrich, David M.
Goslin, Gary J.
Graves, Terrence C.
Greenfield, Charles A.
Grischkowsky, Roger S
Gustafson, Grant P.
Hadar, Steven P.
Hagan, John R.
Hager, Hampton C., Jr.
Hansen, Robert W.
Harrington, Patrick J.
Haughey, David W.
Hayes, John E.
Henry, Floyd P.
Higgins, William R.
Holmes, Michael
Howe, Dennis K.
Hudock, John M., Jr.
Huntington, Frederick L.
Hutchinson, Robert H.
Ingram, Thomas M.
Jackson, Charles B.
James, Albert E., Jr.
Jones, Stuart C.
Kadolph, Harold D.
Karch, John F.
Kehrli, Bruce A.
Kirkpatrick, William J
Knestrick, Martin E.
Kuhrtz, Steven G.
Kurth, Richard C.
Kuzniewski, Gregory S.
Kyle, Albert S.
Lancaster, John A.
Lawson, John F.
Lewis, James T.
Linkous, Harry A., III
Lipson, Merek E.
List, Robert W.
Lloyd, Robert M.
Lovett, Connie B.
Lyman, Donald R.
Macknis, John F.
March, Donald F.
Masters, John H., Jr.
McAtee, Keith C.
McCarver, Dennis M.
McGaughey, George L., Jr.
Metli, Richard
Morrow, Michael K.
Moyher, Cyril V.
Munyon, William H.
Murphy, Edward J.
Narney, John K.
Neal, Richard O.
Nelson, Jan H.
Nelson, Robert R.
Newlin, Robert B.
Nickerson, Douglas W.
Norton, Raymond J.
Nyderek, Joseph M.
O'Shaughnessy, Edward M., Jr.
Oswald, Edwin L.
Packard, Robert A., Jr.
Parker, Paul D., II.
Peake, David B.
Pearson, Thomas R., Jr.
Peterson, Paul W.
Polnaszek, David A.
Pribbenow, Merle L.
Radcliffe, Harry Q.
Randall, David S., Jr.
Reed, Nathaniel H.
Reilly, Thomas L.
Renaghan, Joseph F.
Roberson, Larry E.
Roepke, Craig S.
Rowen, Charles G.
Sammons, Jack L., Jr.
Sanborn, James C.
Sandberg, Michael B.
Scheer, Donald A.
Schmid, John A.
Schroeder, Karl R.
Seagraves, James F.
Shaw, Stephen C.
Smaldone, Joseph P.
Smith, Clinton A.
Smith, Michael D.
Snocker, Frederick G.
Steel, Charles
Stephien, Edward R.
Steury, Jack E.
Stocker, Norman R.
Sullivan, John J., Jr.
Sute, John R.
Tait, Robert, Jr.
Tarbet, Dale M.
Taylor, Joseph Z.
Tehan, William J.
Terry, Joseph B.
Titcomb, Warren S.
Toeniskoetter, Charles J.
Toyama, Thompson R. T.
Tritsch, John B.
Tucker, Courtney L.
Ulrich, Carl W.
Waller, Robert W.
Warford, Charles F., Jr.
Warren, Clifford B., III.
Weir, David E.
Welsh, Joseph R., Jr.
Williams, James G.
Wilson, Bruce B.
Wojtasek, James D.
Wolfe, Charles E., Jr.
Wroblewski, Ronald J. P.
Wzorek, James F.
Zimmerman, Jeffrey M.

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Rogers, Robert D.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 21, 1967:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Jonathan Davis, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1973.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate, April 21, 1967:

POSTMASTER

Anne C. Freeman to be postmaster at Lebanon, in the State of Connecticut.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.—Psalm 23: 3.

Eternal God, our Father, whose love never lets us go, whose patience never lets us down, and whose justice never lets

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

us off, hear us again as we offer unto Thee our morning prayer. We come out of a sense of need, out of a conviction that Thou art with us, and we would find our confidence and our courage in the support of Thy sustaining strength.

We pray for light upon our way, love along our path, and life amid the daily duties of our demanding day. Center our lives and the lives of our people around faith rather than fear, around justice rather than injustice, and around high principles rather than low prejudices. Strengthen us where we are weak, hold us firm when we would fall, steady us when we start to slip, and lift us up when down we go.

Remind us of the integrity which has undergirded our Nation, the freedom which is our rich heritage, and of our faith in Thee which has made and still makes our Nation great and strong. Lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 20, 1967, 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. Jones, one of his secretaries.

AUTHORITY FOR THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON APRIL 28, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Friday, April 28, 1967, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting Gen. William C. Westmoreland, U.S. Army, commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ACT OF JUNE 30, 1954, AS AMENDED, PROVIDING FOR THE CONTINUANCE OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 303) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

CONGRESS SHOULD STEP UP PROGRAMS FOR WATER AND SEWAGE FACILITIES

Mr. PATMAN. 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. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to increase the authorization for basic water and sewage facilities from $200 million to $1 billion. This new authorization would become effective in the next fiscal year, beginning July 1.

Mr. Speaker, this new authorization would provide funds for programs under section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. This section authorized the Department of Housing and Urban Development to make grants up to 50 percent of the cost of water and sewage facilities in cities of more than 10,000 population. This section also authorized HUD to make grants up to 90 percent for such facilities in towns of less than 10,000 population.

The development needs of our cities, small towns, and rural areas are critical. Certainly the existence of good basic water and sewage plants and related facilities are essential if these development programs are to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest backlogs of public need is in this area. This has been a growing development gap and one which our cities and small towns have been unable to close. The situation was heightened in 1966 when high interest rates and tight money prevented many municipalities from voting and selling bonds for the construction of water and sewage plants.

As a result, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has a backlog of about $4 billion in requests for grants for this type of facility. At present, authorizations would allow appropriations of only $200 million for fiscal year 1968, beginning on July 1. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this authorization is much too small to make any meaningful dent in this backlog.

Outlays for water and sewage facilities require tremendous blocks of capital which local governments are simply unable to find. As a result, other development programs, such as housing, industrial expansion, urban and rural development, and other similar programs are deferred or canceled. The enactment of a meaningful program of Federal grants for water and sewage facilities will unlock local initiative in these other development areas and move the country forward.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the $1 billion authorization which I propose will be paid back to the country many times over as a result of new activity which these facilities will create.

EXPRESSION OF SORROW OVER LOSS OF RUSSIAN COSMONAUT

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I, as I am sure is true of all Americans, share the sorrow of the Russian people caused by the loss of one of their cosmonauts this morning.

The Russians have a good space program, and we have a good space program, but so long as we deal so much in the unknown we will have more accidents. I am very thankful that we have brave men who will risk their lives to improve the lot of mankind, be they Russians, Americans, or whoever they are.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] in his expression of sorrow over the death of one of Russia's brave pioneers of space. The gentleman from Texas is a very active and important member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics and chairman of both the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight and Space Oversight. When he speaks, he speaks the sentiments of all those in Congress interested in the exploration of outer space. He also expresses the sentiments, I am sure, of all Americans when he says we join the people of Russia in their bereavement over the death of one of their bravest sons. Like our own astronauts, the Russian cosmonauts are blazing new trails. They are the heroes of the skies and when one of them falls, the whole world mourns. I am sure I speak the sentiments of all Members of the House when I say we extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to the widow and children of Cosmonaut Komarov in their time of sadness.

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3399) to amend section 2 of Public Law 88-240 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—the bill provides $20,500 for continuation of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission; is that correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct, for 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. May I have the assurance of the gentleman from Wisconsin that this will be the end of the Commission, by the end of November of 1968?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman has that assurance.

Mr. GROSS. And the end of expenditures for this purpose?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3399

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of Public Law 88–240 (77 Stat. 477) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission shall cease to exist upon completion of the construction authorized by this Act, or on November 6, 1968, whichever shall first occur."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3399 simply extends the life of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission from May 6, 1967 to November 6, 1968.

This bill was passed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 20, 1967, and has been placed on the Consent Calendar for May 1, 1967. This is uncomfortably close to the May 6, 1967 expiration date. Therefore, the reason I am asking unanimous consent to bring H.R. 3399 up at this time is to allow sufficient time for legislative action in the Senate. This additional week should prevent the life of the Commission from expiring while legislative action is being completed in the House and in the Senate.

As explained in the report accompanying this bill, the construction of the memorial authorized by Public Law 88–240 has been delayed because the United States was unable to obtain reasonable bids in March 1966. It was necessary to rebid the construction and a contract has now been awarded.

The Department of State has strongly urged that this Commission not be allowed to die before it fulfills its task. To do so might be a matter of embarrassment to the United States and the Philippines, as well as grounds for a possible misunderstanding. The Commission's Philippine counterpart is continuing to function and should have a single point of contact with the United States to resolve the numerous problems that will arise during the construction now underway.

The total additional cost for operating this Commission during the remainder of the extended period covered by this bill is estimated at $20,500.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 3399.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3399, which will extend the life of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission for an additional period of about 20 months, to November 6, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, the continuation of this Commission, in my view, is extremely important because the memorial which was authorized by Public Law 88–240 is now under construction, and it is essential that there be a focal point, which this Commission represents, for clearing the various problems that always arise during construction periods.

This Commission was created by an act of Congress in 1953 with the assigned function of cooperating with the Philippine Government in planning a memorial on Corregidor that would be a fitting tribute to the sacrifices of the Americans and Filipinos who fought there and on Bataan. A companion Commission, known as the Philippines National Shrines Commission, was created by the Philippine Government.

The plans for the memorial that finally evolved from the work of these two Commissions was a modest proposal that it is estimated will cost the United States approximately $1,500,000. Under these plans, Corregidor will be transformed from the state of ruin into which it had fallen to a simple but dignified memorial area comparable to Saratoga or Gettysburg. The site will be consecrated ground. Other improvements will include the erection of historical markers, the restoration of sites such as the famous Malinta Tunnel, the repair of roads, the installation of facilities for electricity and water, and a small pavilion that will serve as a tourist center, house an auditorium and serve as a repository for historical documents. Twin flagpoles will be erected at the highest point on the island from which flags of both countries would fly and be illuminated at night. The Philippine Government is prepared to accept its share of responsibility including arrangements for guards, for adequate transportation to the island, and for collaboration with the United States in the production of a documentary film that will put in perspective the story of Corregidor.

In the initial request for bids in March 1966, the Commission was unable to obtain a response within the available funds. The process of rebidding the construction of the proposed memorial has delayed it for about 1 year, which is the primary reason for the request for the extension of the Commission's life. I have been a member of the Commission almost since its inception. Therefore, I am aware of the unavoidable delays and the efforts on the part of the Commission to move this memorial construction along as rapidly as possible.

I do not believe that the Commission should be allowed to expire before the functions assigned it by the Congress have been completed and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the approval of H.R. 3399.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks, that the gentleman from Alabama may extend his remarks, and that any other Member who so desires may extend his remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE OIL POLLUTION ACT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, recently it was revealed that the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 is partially unenforceable.

This law—which went into effect last November—was meant to strengthen the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, by imposing more stringent penalties on violators.

The Oil Pollution Act was confounded by this amendment, however, as it limited its enforcement to cases where the offender was "willfully or grossly negligent" in discharging oil.

As a result, it has now been discovered, attorneys of the Justice Department have not filed even one case against owners of ships that were oil pollution violators since the Clean Water Act became effective 5 months ago.

The situation is both unintended and regrettable.

The 1924 law actually was more effective before the 1966 Clean Water Act was passed. In its original state, the Justice Department had only to prove that a discharge of oil came from a certain ship and then the shipowner could only avoid prosecution by proving in turn that the escaped oil resulted from an accident or was an emergency.

When the Oil Pollution Act was amended last year, it was not the intent of Congress to weaken the enforcement provisions of the act, and I am today introducing legislation to remedy this unintended result.

My amendment is intended to repair enforcement difficulties of the Clean Water Act, and would forbid any careless or accidental discharge of oil into navigable waters. The Clean Water Act was intended to do this in the first place.

I propose this amendment at a time when the whole country is aware of the damage oil discharged into navigable waters can cause—when the recent *Torrey Canyon* disaster and the Cape Cod oil slick are foremost in our minds.

In my home area of Buffalo, N.Y., an oil slick has jeopardized both Buffalo Harbor and the Niagara River.

I hope the 90th Congress will recognize the urgency involved in passing this bill, or one like it.

Certainly I know it was not the intention of this House or the other body to weaken the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act. To remedy this defect I have today introduced legislation, and I hope we can consider it at this session.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will be glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GARMATZ. I might say as far as oil pollution is concerned, there is a meeting in London on May 4 and 5 of the IMCO, which is the International Maritime Consultants Organization. Our committee will have a representative over there to see what is going on and follow the meetings right on through.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EMERGENCY STRIKE LEGISLATION NEEDED

Mr. PICKLE. 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. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I want again to address the House on the problem of emergency strike legislation. The possibilities of a national railway strike now, or a trucking or airline strike at other times, are almost too frightening to consider, but nevertheless we have got a railroad dispute staring us in the face.

The news media this past weekend carried reports that negotiators mediating the railroad dispute have reached an impasse.

It seems to me that Congress will again be faced with the problem that came before it less than 2 weeks ago, and frankly, not to squarely face this problem would be less than responsible.

What concerns me now is the fact that, in light of recent labor disputes in both the trucking and railroad industries, there has been some harsh legislation introduced. I do not wish to indict the persons supporting any of the approaches I am going to mention because I believe everyone here has dealt with this problem in good faith. But at the same time, I am convinced that many of the approaches recommended destroy collective bargaining and the entire framework of our national labor policy.

The railroad dispute will quite possibly rear its head again early next month. I am hopeful that it can be settled by the parties involved. However, I am fearful that if it is not settled, some of the solutions recommended in pending legislation will be grabbed in desperation and enacted as permanent laws. The railway dispute is too much upon us to be dealt with on anything other than an ad hoc basis.

Many of you are familiar with my bill, H.R. 5638. I have spoken of it to you from this floor, and I have been in correspondence with all of you on the subject. I know that the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee are fully aware of the bill.

Even so, I am shocked that we, the Congress, have quietly wallowed in our lackluster vacuum and let the problem grow to crisis proportion.

I would be less than honest to try to tell you that we are solely responsible for a labor policy that brings nearly every transportation dispute to the Halls for settlement. The executive department, by its inaction to propose any guidelines for new laws that could deal with strikes that threaten to cripple the country, has become our "partner in sin" in this matter.

This foot dragging should not be allowed to continue, and I call upon the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to schedule immediate hearings on legislation designed to correct these abuses.

It is surprising and shocking to realize that nothing has been done and, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I believe the time is running out.

I do know that the able chairman of the Commerce Committee has told me that hearings would be set if no settlement is made in the railway strike and the issue is returned to Congress.

But, no matter whether this particular dispute is resolved or not, the basic problem will still be with us. This is reason enough to give our attention to considering a well-thought-out and reasonable course of action.

I realize full well the complexities and technicalities of this matter. This is no legitimate reason to simply agonize and hope the problem will go away.

The problem will not vanish like so much grease on a shirt when bleach is added to the wash water. It is going to take the kind of action that only this legislative body can give it.

Everyone in this Congress knows that our Commerce Committee chairman is a fair and courageous American, and that he will give all sides a good and fair chance to present their case. But we have got to get with it. The hour is late and the public interest demands it.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to review the provisions of my bill in order to show how it is the only type of approach which will preserve the cornerstone of collective bargaining and present a workable solution to crippling strikes.

The bill amends section 10 of the Railway Labor Act. It preserves the present process up to and including the Federal Mediation Board.

As is the case now, the Mediation Board is empowered to give notification to the President if a dispute between a carrier and its employees is not adjusted under earlier provisions of the act, and, if in the judgment of the Board, such a dispute "threatens substantially to interrupt interstate or foreign commerce to a degree as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation."

At this point, my proposal would add new procedures to deal with whatever problem arises.

After receiving notification from the Mediation Board, the President would have the discretion to take either of two approaches:

He could appoint a nonbinding Emergency Board with powers virtually identical to those given the Emergency Board under present law or he could announce his intention to establish a binding arbitration board, termed a Special Board.

If, at this stage, the President elects to appoint an Emergency Board, he may appoint as many disinterested individuals to the Emergency Board as he deems desirable and necessary. The President may, also, in his discretion, charge the Emergency Board with the responsibility to make a statement of the facts of the dispute and/or recommendations for the settlement of any or all of the matters in dispute.

Within 60 days after the appointment of the Emergency Board, or such date as he may specify—but not to exceed 60 additional days—if the dispute has not been settled, the Board shall report to the President, and for 30 days after this report is made, there will be a 30-day cooling-off period during which there will be no change, except by mutual agreement, in the working conditions out of which the dispute arose.

After this cooling-off period, the President may exercise any or all, or none of three alternatives:

First. He may transmit the report of the Emergency Board to Congress for such action as he may recommend.

Second. If the report includes recommendations for settlement, the President may provide by executive order that these recommendations shall serve as the working conditions for a period not to exceed 120 days.

Third. He may notify the parties of his intention to establish a Special Board.

I may note at this point that the Special Board I just mentioned can be initiated by the President immediately after the notification by the Mediation Board and its procedures have been utilized.

At whichever point the President announces his intent to establish a Special Board—if he ever does decide to do so—the parties have 10 days from the announcement to select members of a Special Board which will have authority to make a final and binding determination of matters in dispute. The parties may also establish procedures for the Board, and ascertain the matters in dispute which shall be determined by the Board.

If the parties fail to establish the Special Board, the President shall appoint three members of the Board, one member shall be appointed by the representatives of the employees and one shall be appointed by the carriers involved. In reaching its determination, the Special Board may, in its discretion, adopt the recommendations of the Emergency Board, and shall take into consideration all relevant information surrounding the dispute.

The Special Board would make and publish its determination within 60 days after its appointment except that the President may extend the period for not more than an additional 60 days. With certain exceptions, the determination of a Special Board would be final and binding upon the parties for the period described by the Special Board, as long as the period does not exceed 2 years. The decision of the Special Board shall be enforceable by proceedings in the U.S. district courts.

The determination of a Special Board may be set aside only by application of a party to the Board proceedings, and only on the grounds that the determination was based on fraud or corruption, or was not in accordance with section 10 of the act or with the Constitution. In no event would the reviewing court have jurisdiction to review or set aside a determination of a Special Board on the ground that rates of pay, rules, or working conditions prescribed were not just and reasonable.

Now let us look at the alternatives available. The easiest answer here is to do nothing. If we allowed the present law to stand, Congress would continue to be brought into every serious dispute, and in light of the growing complexity of our society, I know they will be successively more difficult.

That is not the problem, though. The problem is that collective bargaining would be the innocent and invariable

victim of such action. If the parties feel that congressional intervention is the final step in every serious nationwide labor dispute, then all efforts at bargaining will lapse, and the parties will concentrate their efforts in lobbying pressure.

Another suggested approach is that of "finality." Under this scheme, compulsory arbitration would be keyed in at the end of every process of negotiation and mediation. In other words, it would be a procedure unquestionably at the end of the line whenever there is a bargaining standoff in a serious dispute.

Under this plan, I feel the parties would lose their incentive to bargain. Possibly at least one of the parties would feel that they would get a more favorable result under arbitration and accordingly, they would not be truly interested in bargaining prior to arbitration.

As Secretary Wirtz has said on this point, compulsory arbitration not only eliminates strikes, it also eliminates bargaining. Furthermore, I feel that the choice of only one abrupt remedy to cover the tremendous scope of disputes is inadequate.

Many of these same objections apply to the plan to create a permanent labor-management court. Once the jurisdiction of the court is invoked, I feel that the parties would be removed from the bargaining arena and that a voluntary settlement would be most unlikely.

In light of these proposed alternatives, I restate my firm conviction that the need is for further procedures which enable continued bargaining in an atmosphere conductive to good-faith negotiation, which give the President a choice of procedures and allows him to tailor the remedy to fit the situation, and finally which secludes the nature and even the existence of that ultimate step of governmental intervention which would conclusively settle the dispute.

President Johnson has said to negotiators that the public occupies a third seat at the bargaining table. I think it is time the law took cognizance of that fact.

The power to act in serious disputes must lie somewhere. I think that responsibility should rest in the Chief Executive. I am aware of the argument that a Presidential choice of procedures might cause the parties to neglect bargaining with each other, directing pressures on the White House on which route to select. In light of all the circumstances, I think this argument is without merit. I realize that there are weaknesses to this approach, but I submit that the alternatives are much worse.

It should be remembered, however, that the President does not shoulder this responsibility alone. He may make the choice to take direct action by Executive order or he may refer it to the Mediation Board or the Special Board. He can also refer disputes to Congress for whatever action this body thinks best.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoin upon this body the need for our active consideration and participation in arriving at a workable solution to this vexing problem.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman from Texas is bringing up a very important matter and something which is of great concern to all of us. I remember and remind the gentleman that a year ago the President in his state of the Union message told us he would send up legislation on this. We have been sitting here and waiting for it ever since. I am not sure that it is a matter for the committee, because we have been waiting here for the President to send this legislation up.

Mr. PICKLE. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois the fact that they have not submitted a report is simply an indication that this is a highly technical and involved matter. I understand they will have a report out in the next week or two. I hope it is true. There has been foot dragging but the fact that there has been foot dragging down the street does not mean there has to be any more here. You and I must shoulder the responsibility, too, I will say to the gentleman.

BLEAK TIME IN THE HISTORY OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what the gentleman from Texas just said, this is a bleak time in the history of collective bargaining.

President Johnson has reported that his Special Mediation Panel—made up of three distinguished citizens—has developed a reasonable formula which would avert a nationwide railway strike.

But the unions and the carriers have rejected the Panel's proposal. And a crippling shutdown of a major segment of our transportation system is only 8 days away.

The situation that now faces us is not only tragic, but unnecessary as well.

I have observed many wage disputes between labor and management during my years in the House of Representatives. Yet seldom, if ever, have I seen a situation such as this, where both parties are so close to agreement, yet so unwilling to take the last, short step together.

In his message to Congress on April 10, President Johnson stated that:

> The differences which remain in this dispute are important. But they are slight when compared with the price to the country and to these parties from a suspension of rail service.

If that statement was true then, it is doubly true today. The economic and social consequences of such a strike have not lessened. But the differences between the disputing parties have. The President's Special Panel has worked long and diligently, favoring no party but the public interest. The Panel has reported that the parties are not far apart; that:

> The matter is one of dollars and cents alone and the real differences between the parties in our judgment are not great.

In view of this, and in view of the seriousness of the situation, I call upon both labor and management to put aside their differences and consider the national interest as a whole. I call upon them to accept the Panel's reasonable recommendations.

All that is now needed is the will to settle.

That will must be the order of the day.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Johnson carried to Europe with him the added burden of a threatened nationwide railway strike.

The President is to be commended for the tireless efforts that he and his Special Mediation Panel have made to avert such a strike. The Panel reports that it has brought labor and management so close together that their differences are now a matter of "dollars and cents." In my opinion, only a thread now separates them.

Yet, as close as they are, both parties have reached an unyielding deadlock, and neither appears willing to give an inch. A strike is only 8 days away.

I sincerely hope that the unions and management can be made to understand that their unreasonable positions are posing a grave threat to the well-being of this Nation.

It is obvious that we cannot afford a strike. It is also obvious, at least to me, that neither of the disputing parties can afford the consequences of bringing such a strike about.

Collective bargaining remains the best way to settle these disputes. And it remains one of the strongest pillars of our free enterprise system.

If both parties will understand this, they will serve not only their Nation's interest, but their own interests as well.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

Mrs. KELLY. 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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, by request of the executive branch, legislation proposing to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended.

The proposed amendments are necessary in order to enable the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to effect

an orderly disposition of payments arising out of recent claims settlement agreements with Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

In addition the proposed legislation contains provisions which bear on the disposition of the funds remaining in the Italian claims program, and propose various technical changes in the existing statutes.

I should like to mention at this point that during the last Congress, the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs considered similar legislation and reported it with amendments to the full committee.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe I felt that it was incumbent upon me to introduce this new legislation requested by the executive branch. I am doing it today.

The text of the bill being introduced is as follows:

H.R. 9063

A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (f) of section 4, title I, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) No remuneration on account of services rendered on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission under this title shall exceed 10 per centum of the total amount paid pursuant to any award certified under the provisions of this title, on account of such claim. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, demands or receives, on account of services so rendered, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both."

(2) Subsection (b) of section 7, title I, is amended by inserting "(1)" after the subsection letter, and adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(2) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deduct from any amounts covered, subsequent to the date of enactment of this paragraph, into any special fund, created pursuant to section 8, 5 per centum thereof as reimbursement to the Government of the United States for expenses incurred by the Commission and by the Treasury Department in the administration of this title. The amounts so deducted shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

(3) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c), section 7, title I, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) If any person to whom any payment is to be made pursuant to this title is deceased or is under a legal disability, payment shall be made to his legal representative, except that if any payment to be made is not over $1,000 and there is no qualified executor or administrator, payment may be made to the person or persons found by the Comptroller General to be entitled thereto, without the necessity of compliance with the requirements of law with respect to the administration of estates."

(4) Subsection (c) of section 8, title I, is amended by inserting the phrase ", prior to the date of enactment of the amendment of this paragraph," immediately after the word "covered" and before the word "into", and by inserting "(1)" after the words "section 7(b)" and before the words "of this title."

(5) Section 8, title I, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(e) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed out of sums covered, subsequent to the date of enactment of this subsection, into any special fund created pursuant to this section to make payment on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to this title with respect to claims included within the terms of a claims settlement agreement concluded between the Government of the United States and a foreign government as described in subsection (a) of section 4 of this title, as follows and in the following order of priority:

"(1) Payment in the amount of $1,000 or the principal amount of the award, whichever is less;

"(2) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid principal balance of each remaining award which shall bear to such unpaid principal balance the same proportion as the total amount available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid principal balance of all such awards; and

"(3) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid balance of each award of interest which shall bear to such unpaid balance of interest, the same proportion as the total amount available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid balance of interest of all such awards."

(6) Section 302, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cover into each of the Bulgarian and Rumanian Claims Funds, such sums as may be paid by the Government of the respective country pursuant to the terms of any claims settlement agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of such country."

(7) Section 303, title III, is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (2), and by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and immediately thereafter, the word, "and".

(8) Section 303, title III, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Pay effective compensation for the nationalization, compulsory liquidation, or other taking of property of nationals of the United States in Bulgaria and Rumania, between August 9, 1955, and the effective date of the claims agreement between the respective country and the United States."

(9) Section 304 of title III is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(b) The Commission shall receive and determine, or redetermine as the case may be, in accordance with applicable substantive law, including international law, the validity and amounts of claims owned by persons who were nationals of the United States on August 9, 1955, which arose out of the war in which Italy was engaged from June 10, 1940 to September 15, 1947, and with respect to which provision was not made in the treaty of peace with Italy: *Provided,* That no awards shall be made to persons who have received compensation in any amount pursuant to subsection (a) of this section or under section 202 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, or to persons whose claims have been denied by the Commission for reasons other than that they were not filed within the time prescribed by section 306.

"(c) The Commission shall receive and determine, or redetermine as the case may be, in accordance with applicable substantive law, including international law, the validity and amounts of claims owned by persons who were nationals of the United States on September 3, 1943, and the date of enactment of this subsection, against the Government of Italy which arose out of the war in which Italy was engaged from June 10, 1940, to September 15, 1947, in territory ceded by Italy pursuant to the treaty of peace with Italy: *Provided,* That no awards shall be made to persons who have received compensation in any amount pursuant to the treaty of peace with Italy or subsection (a) of this section.

"(d) Within thirty days after enactment of this subsection, or within thirty days after the date of enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under subsections (b) and (c) of this section, whichever date is later, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register the time when and the limit of time within which claims may be filed with the Commission, which limit shall not be more than six months after such publication.

"(e) The Commission shall certify awards on claims determined pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of this section to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of remaining balances in the Italian Claims Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 310 of this title, after payment in full of all awards certified pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

"(f) After payment in full of all awards certified to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to subsections (a) and (e) of this section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer the unobligated balance in the Italian Claims Fund into the War Claims Fund created by section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended."

(10) Section 306, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) Within thirty days after enactment of this subsection or the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, whichever is later, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register the time when and the limit of time within which claims may be filed under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, which limit shall not be more than six months after such publication."

(11) Section 310, title III, is amended by adding at the end of Subsection (a) thereof the following paragraph:

"(6) Whenever the Commission is authorized to settle claims by the enactment of paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title with respect to Rumania and Bulgaria, no further payments shall be authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of section 303 of the Bulgarian or Rumanian Claims Funds, as the case may be, until payments on account of awards certified pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 303 with respect to such Fund have been authorized in equal proportion to payments previously authorized on existing awards certified pursuant to paragraph (1), (2), and (3) of section 303."

(12) Section 316, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 303 and subsection (b) and (c) of section

304 of this title not later than two years following the date of enactment of such paragraph, or following the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under paragraph (4) of section 303 and subsections (b) and (c) of section 304 of this title, whichever is later."

TO DESIGNATE APRIL 28–29, 1967, AS "RUSH-BAGOT AGREEMENT DAYS"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (S.J. Res. 49) to designate April 28–29, 1967, as "Rush-Bagot Agreement Days," and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] if now, or in the future, it is anticipated that the adoption of this resolution will result in any expenditure on the part of the Federal Government?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I can assure the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that the adoption of this joint resolution does not contemplate the expenditure of any Federal moneys as a result of this celebration.

Mr. GROSS. It does not involve any funds whatsoever?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield further——

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It does not involve any Federal funds whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 49

Whereas the Rush-Bagot Agreement was signed on April 28–29, 1817, providing for naval disarmament between Canada and the United States along the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain; and

Whereas this agreement is still in existence one hundred and fifty years later, making it the oldest arms limitation treaty in effect in the world today; and

Whereas Canada and the United States share the longest unfortified boundary in the world as a result of such agreement; and

Whereas the commemoration of the signing of such agreement would serve as a reminder of the lasting friendship between Canada and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating April 28–29, 1967, as "Rush-Bagot Agreement Days" and inviting the Governors of the several States and the chief officials of local governments and the people of the United States to observe such days with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX-INCENTIVE DEVELOPMENT ACT TO STRENGTHEN SMALLTOWN AMERICA

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for increased job opportunities and employment—the Tax-Incentive Development Act of 1967—a bill that can mean much to our cities, large and small, by creating employment opportunities in our smaller cities.

Several of my colleagues are also introducing similar bills.

This bill provides tax incentives to induce business to locate in smaller communities—a proposal that has the endorsement of many officials in our Government.

This bill will offer:

An added 7 percent credit, in addition to the investment credit now under suspension—for machinery and equipment investment, and

Accelerated tax amortization of investment in industrial and commercial facilities, including land, over a 60-month period, to industry locating new or branch plants in small town and rural America.

It is my hope that this bill will assist small town and rural areas to develop their resources and their people and provide jobs and employment opportunities to our young people and others who want to live at home.

A recent poll shows that 50 percent of our people want to live in rural America.

Our major cities are caught in a population strangulation—our small towns are caught in a population decimation.

Their problems are interrelated and intertwined.

By providing jobs and opportunities in our small towns, our young people will be encouraged to channel their talent and their creativity into their own communities, rather than into major cities to compete with residents of those cities for jobs.

The Washington Post said in a recent editorial:

The country cannot accept as inevitable the further concentration of rural refugees in its large cities . . . The neglect of this problem is rapidly producing two nations—one a rural wasteland and the other an urban slum.

President Johnson, in a major policy address in Dallastown, Pa., on September 3 last, said:

The cities will never solve their problems unless we solve the problems of the towns and smaller areas.

And he concluded:

Modern industry and modern technology and modern transportation can bring jobs to the countryside rather than people to the cities.

That is the objective of this bill—that is what we hope to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the purpose of this bill is to bring the benefits of an expanding economy to rural and smalltown America—there is a specific clause which prohibits the pirating of industry from another section.

My bill simply provides an added tax incentive to industry that locates a new plant or branch plant in smalltown and rural America—and it deserves strong support.

JEWISH OPPRESSION

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today marks the commencement of the Passover season, sacred to Jews the world over, commemorating the flight of the Jews from their persecutors in Egypt.

It is a sad fact that in this day and age Jews are still suffering oppression in certain countries of this world.

One of the worst offenders is the Government of the Soviet Union. For many years now it has denied to Jews fundamental civil and religious rights accorded other groups. Alone among Soviet nationalities, Jews are denied schools and other institutions necessary for the perpetuation of their heritage. They are forbidden formal and official contacts with coreligionists in other countries. Jews are not even allowed any form of nationwide federation of congregations or clergy. And this is only a partial listing of the Soviet practices toward Jews which violate fundamental human rights.

For this first day of Passover, a joint statement has been released signed by 300 Members of the House of Representatives, condemning Soviet suppression of Jewish religious, cultural, and spiritual life. I am proud to be a signer of that statement and to have played a role in its preparation and in obtaining such widespread support for it. It is particularly significant that the signers—185 Democrats and 115 Republicans, from every State in the Union—represent all shades of opinon, and that the list includes our honored Speaker, Mr. MCCORMACK, the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, and the minority leader, Mr. FORD, as well as the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MORGAN, and the ranking minority member of that distinguished committee, Mrs. BOLTON.

I have no doubt that such diversity reflects the widespread bipartisan American sentiment against the repressive Soviet policies. It is our devout hope that such an expression of strong disap-

proval of the Soviet Union's discrimination against the Jewish people will help to awaken the sensibilities of the Soviet Government to the worldwide condemnation of its policies in this respect and exert a positive influence for improvement.

The list is not closed, and those Members who have not yet indicated their support for the statement are cordially invited to do so.

The joint statement and list of signers, as of noon today, follow:

STATEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON SOVIET JEWRY

The undersigned Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States associate themselves with their fellow citizens and people of good will throughout the world in condemning the suppression of Jewish spiritual and cultural life in the U.S.S.R. The evidence presented by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry leaves no room for reasonable men to doubt that the government of the U.S.S.R. continues to pursue a program calculated to destroy the means of Jewish cultural and spiritual survival, and to break the will of Soviet Jewry to live as Jews. Such a practice not only violates fundamental human rights, it is contrary to the guarantees of Soviet law and asserted policy.

Alone among Soviet nationality groups, Jews are forbidden the schools and other institutions of Jewish learning, teaching and publishing, that are required if the heritage of Jews is to be perpetuated. Alone among major religious groups in the Soviet Union, Jews are forbidden the right to have any form of nationwide federation of congregations or of clergy. Alone among major religious groups in the Soviet Union, Jews have no formal and official contacts between Soviet Jews and their co-religionists abroad. A systematic campaign of intimidation inhibits them from openly protesting these inequities.

Premier Alexei Kosygin declared recently that all citizens, including Jews, are free to leave the Soviet Union to join their relatives abroad. We await translation of those words into deeds.

These inequities imposed on Soviet Jews must be protested by everyone who values human rights of all individuals and all groups everywhere.

E. Ross Adair (Ind.)
Brock Adams (Wash.)
Joseph P. Addabbo (N.Y.)
John B. Anderson (Ill.)
William R. Anderson (Tenn.)
Mark Andrews (N. Dak.)
Frank Annuzio (Ill.)
Thomas L. Ashley (Ohio)
Wayne N. Aspinall (Colo.)
William H. Ayres (Ohio)
Walter S. Baring (Nev.)
William A. Barrett (Pa.)
William H. Bates (Mass.)
James F. Battin (Mont.)
Page Belcher (Okla.)
Alphonzo Bell (Calif.)
Charles E. Bennett (Fla.)
Tom Bevill (Ala.)
Edward G. Biester, Jr. (Pa)
Jonathan B. Bingham (N.Y.)
John A. Blatnik (Minn.)
Ray Blanton (Tenn.)
Hale Boggs (La.)
Edward P. Boland (Mass.)
Richard Bolling (Mo.)
Frances P. Boland (Mass.)
Francis P. Bolton (Ohio)
John Brademas (Ind.)
Frank J. Brasco (N.Y.)
Jack Brooks (Tex.)
Donald G. Brotzman (Colo.)
Clarence J. Brown, Jr. (Ohio)
Gary Brown (Mich.)
George E. Brown, Jr. (Calif.)
James T. Broyhill (N.C.)
Joel T. Broyhill (Va.)
John Buchanan (Ala.)
J. Herbert Burke (Fla.)
James A. Burke (Mass.)
Lawrence J. Burton (Utah)
Phillip Burton (Calif.)
George Bush (Tex.)
Daniel E. Button (N.Y.)
James A. Byrne (Pa.)
John W. Byrnes (Wis.)
Earle Cabell (Tex.)
William T. Cahill (N.J.)
Hugh L. Carey (N.Y.)
Bob Casey (Tex.)
Elford A. Cederberg (Mich.)
Emanuel Celler (N.Y.)
Frank M. Clark (Pa.)
Donald D. Clancy (Ohio)
Don H. Clausen (Calif.)
James C. Cleveland (N.H.)
Jeffery Cohelan (Calif.)
Harold R. Collier (Ill.)
Barber B. Conable, Jr. (N.Y.)
Silvio O. Conte (Mass.)
John Conyers, Jr. (Mich.)
Robert J. Corbett (Pa.)
James C. Corman (Calif.)
William C. Cramer (Fla.)
John C. Culver (Iowa)
Glenn Cunningham (Nebr.)
Emilio Q. Daddario (Conn.)
Dominick V. Daniels (N.J.)
John W. Davis (Ga.)
William L. Dawson (Ill.)
Eligio de la Garza (Tex.)
James J. Delaney (N.Y.)
John R. Dellenback (Oreg.)
John H. Dent (Pa.)
Edward J. Derwinski (Ill.)
Charles C. Diggs, Jr. (Mich.)
John D. Dingell (Mich.)
Harold D. Donohue (Mass.)
John G. Dow (N.Y.)
John Dowdy (Tex.)
Thaddeus J. Dulski (N.Y.)
Florence P. Dwyer (N.J.)
Bob Eckhardt (Tex.)
Ed Edmondson (Okla.)
Don Edwards (Calif.)
Jack Edwards (Ala.)
Joshua Eilberg (Pa.)
Marvin L. Esch (Mich.)
Edwin D. Eshleman (Pa.)
Frank E. Evans (Colo.)
George H. Fallon (Md.)
Leonard Farbstein (N.Y.)
Dante B. Fascell (Fla.)
Michael A. Feighan (Ohio)
Paul Findley (Ill.)
Paul A. Fino (N.Y.)
Daniel P. Flood (Pa.)
Thomas S. Foley (Wash.)
Gerald R. Ford (Mich.)
William D. Ford (Mich.)
L. H. Fountain (N.C.)
Donald M. Fraser (Minn.)
Samuel N. Friedel (Md.)
Richard Fulton (Tenn.)
Don Fuqua (Fla.)
Nick Galifianakis (N.C.)
Cornelius E. Gallagher (N.J.)
Edward A. Garmatz (Md.)
Tom S. Gettys (S.C.)
Robert N. Giaimo (Conn.)
Sam Gibbons (Fla.)
Jacob H. Gilbert (N.Y.)
Charles E. Goodell (N.Y.)
George A. Goodling (Pa.)
Henry B. Gonzalez (Tex.)
Kenneth J. Gray (Ill.)
Edith Green (Ore.)
William J. Green (Pa.)
Martha W. Griffiths (Mich.)
James R. Grover, Jr. (N.Y.)
Gilbert Gude (Md.)
G. Elliott Hagan (Ga.)
James A. Haley (Fla.)
Seymour Halpern (N.Y.)
Lee H. Hamilton (Ind.)
John Paul Hammerschmidt (Ark.)
James M. Hanley (N.Y.)
Richard T. Hanna (Calif.)
George V. Hansen (Idaho)
Julia Butler Hansen (Wash.)
William Henry Harrison (Wyo.)
James Harvey (Mich.)
William D. Hathaway (Maine)
Augustus F. Hawkins (Calif.)
Ken Hechler (W. Va.)
Margaret M. Heckler (Mass.)
Henry Helstoski (N.J.)
Floyd V. Hicks (Wash.)
Chet Holifield (Calif.)
Elmer J. Holland (Pa.)
Frank J. Horton (N.Y.)
Craig Hosmer (Calif.)
James J. Howard (N.J.)
William L. Hungate (Mo.)
John E. Hunt (N.J.)
Edward Hutchinson (Mich.)
Donald J. Irwin (Conn.)
Andrew Jacobs, Jr. (Ind.)
John Jarman (Okla.)
Charles S. Joelson (N.J.)
Harold T. Johnson (Calif.)
Robert E. Jones, Jr. (Ala.)
Joseph E. Karth (Minn.)
Abraham Kazen Jr. (Tex.)
James Kee (W. Va.)
Hastings Keith (Mass.)
Edna F. Kelly (N.Y.)
Carleton J. King (N.Y.)
Cecil R. King (Calif.)
Horace R. Kornegay (N.C.)
Theodore R. Kupferman (N.Y.)
Dan Kuykendall (Tenn.)
Peter N. Kyros (Maine)
Melvin R. Laird (Wis.)
Odin Langen (Minn.)
Sherman P. Lloyd (Utah)
Clarence D. Long (Md.)
Speedy O. Long (La.)
Donald E. Lukens (Ohio)
Richard D. McCarthy (N.Y.)
John W. McCormack (Mass.)
Joseph M. McDade (Pa.)
Jack H. McDonald (Mich.)
Robert C. McEwen (N.Y.)
John J. McFall (Calif.)
Torbert M. Macdonald (Mass.)
Clark MacGregor (Minn.)
Hervey G. Machen (Md.)
Ray J. Madden (Ind.)
Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. (Md.)
Robert B. Mathias (Calif.)
Spark M. Matsunaga (Hawaii)
Lloyd Meeds (Wash.)
Thomas J. Meskill (Conn.)
George P. Miller (Calif.)
Wilbur D. Mills (Ark.)
Joseph G. Minish (N.J.)
Patsy T. Mink (Hawaii)
Chester L. Mize (Kans.)
G. V. Montgomery (Miss.)
William S. Moorhead (Pa.)
Thomas E. Morgan (Pa.)
Thomas G. Morris (N. Nex.)
F. Bradford Morse (Mass.)
Rogers C. B. Morton (Md.)
Charles A. Mosher (Ohio)
John E. Moss (Calif.)
Abraham J. Multer (N.Y.)
John M. Murphy (N.Y.)
William T. Murphy (Ill.)
Lucien H. Nedzi (Mich.)
Robert N. C. Nix (Pa.)
Barratt O'Hara (Ill.)
James G. O'Hara (Mich.)
Alvin E. O'Konski (Wis.)
Arnold Olsen (Mont.)
Thomas P. O'Neill (Mass.)
Richard L. Ottinger (N.Y.)
Edward J. Patten (N.J.)
Thomas M. Pelly (Wash.)
Claude Pepper (Fla.)
Carl D. Perkins (Ky.)
Jerry L. Pettis (Calif.)
Philip J. Philbin (Mass.)
J. J. Pickle (Tex.)
Otis G. Pike (N.Y.)
Richard H. Poff (Va.)
Howard W. Pollock (Alaska)
Joe R. Pool (Tex.)
Melvin Price (Ill.)

Robert Price (Tex.)
David Pryor (Ark.)
Roman C. Pucinski (Ill.)
Graham Purcell (Tex.)
Albert H. Quie (Minn.)
Tom Railsback (Ill.)
William J. Randall (Mo.)
Thomas M. Rees (Calif.)
Ogden R. Reid (N.Y.)
Ben Reifel (S. Dak.)
Ed Reinecke (Calif.)
Joseph Y. Resnick (N.Y.)
Henry S. Reuss (Wis.)
George M. Rhodes (Ariz.)
John J. Rhodes (Ariz.)
Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (Mich.)
Ray Roberts (Tex.)
Howard W. Robison (N.Y.)
Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (N.J.)
Byron G. Rogers (Colo.)
Paul G. Rogers (Fla.)
Fred B. Rooney (Pa.)
Benjamin S. Rosenthal (N.Y.)
William V. Roth (Del.)
Richard L. Roudebush (Ind.)
J. Edward Roush (Ind.)
Edward R. Roybal (Calif.)
Philip Ruppe (Mich.)
William F. Ryan (N.Y.)
Fernand J. St Germain (R.I.)
William L. St. Onge (Conn.)
John P. Saylor (Pa.)
Henry C. Schadeberg (Wis.)
James H. Scheuer (N.Y.)
Richard S. Schweiker (Pa.)
Fred Schwengel (Iowa)
George E. Shipley (Ill.)
Garner E. Shriver (Kans.)
B. F. Sisk (Calif.)
Henry Smith III (N.Y.)
James V. Smith (Okla.)
William Springer (Ill.)
Robert T. Stafford (Vt.)
Harley O. Staggers (W. Va.)
J. William Stanton (Ohio)
Tom Steed (Okla.)
Sam Steiger (Ariz.)
Robert G. Stephens, Jr. (Ga.)
Samuel S. Stratton (N.Y.)
W. S. Stuckey (Ga.)
Leonor K. Sullivan (Mo.)
Robert Taft, Jr. (Ohio)
Roy A. Taylor (N.C.)
Charles M. Teague (Calif.)
Herbert Tenzer (N.Y.)
Fletcher Thompson (Ga.)
Frank Thompson, Jr. (N.J.)
Robert O. Tiernan (R.I.)
John V. Tunney (Calif.)
Morris K. Udall (Ariz.)
Lionel Van Deerlin (Calif.)
Guy Vander Jagt (Mich.)
Joseph P. Vigorito (Pa.)
Joe D. Waggonner, Jr. (La.)
Jerome R. Waldie (Calif.)
E. S. Johnny Walker (N. Mex.)
G. Robert Watkins (Pa.)
Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio)
J. Irving Whalley (Pa.)
Richard White (Tex.)
William B. Widnall (N.J.)
Lawrence G. Williams (Pa.)
Larry Winn, Jr. (Kans.)
Lester L. Wolff (N.Y.)
Jim Wright (Tex.)
Wendell Wyatt (Oreg.)
John W. Wydler (N.Y.)
Sidney R. Yates (Ill.)
John Young (Tex.)
Clement J. Zablocki (Wis.)
Roger H. Zion (Ind.)

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE ACTION TO AVERT PARALYZING TRANSPORTATION STRIKES

Mr. FINDLEY. 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. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the discussion that has ensued today about the dangers of paralyzing transportation strikes. It is very true, as the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, that more than a year ago our President took note of this problem and said he was going to send down proposals. What strikes me as very curious is that this Congress has not taken any initiative in this period of more than a year to study the problem and come forth with recommendations on its own.

Insofar as I know the only hearing held on the problem of strikes consisted of about 5 minutes of discussion by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recently at the time of the impending railway strike.

I will be glad to yield to any Member of this body who can point to any discussions, any hearings, or any consideration that the Congress has given in the last year to this problem of strikes.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. Is the gentleman familiar with the bill that I have introduced, H.R. 5638?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am not. But I will ask my friend if he has had any hearings on it?

Mr. PICKLE. I have sent copies to your office and all Members' offices in the last 60 days trying to engender some support and discussion on this. But I do not believe I have heard from the gentleman as to his support or opposition to it.

Mr. FINDLEY. I will say to the gentleman, I do not happen to be on his committee and if I was, I certainly would support him. I just wonder if he has some channel through which he can get the leadership to give consideration to his bill.

Mr. PICKLE. In my opinion, hearings should be held on this subject and they should have been held.

Mr. FINDLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. I have called on the chairman of the committee today to call for hearings on this. I said in my remarks which I have extended, that the chairman said if this strike is not settled now, he would immediately start hearings. My point is that regardless of whether the strike is settled, and it would have to be on an ad hoc basis, we ought to hold hearings on this general subject now.

Mr. FINDLEY. I certainly agree with the gentleman, and I hope he succeeds.

Mr. PICKLE. To that extent I will say the gentleman is correct.

Mr. FINDLEY. I compliment the gentleman and I hope he will secure enough support from both sides of the aisle and get action on this.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

NATIONAL RAISIN WEEK SPEECH

Mr. MATHIAS of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity to invite the attention of the Members to an observance with which I have long been familiar as a resident of the San Joaquin Valley of California.

I refer to National Raisin Week. April 23 to 29 marks not only the 58th anniversary of National Raisin Week, but the continuance of the oldest—and perhaps most famous—national food week in the country.

Through the years, the distinguished Congressman from Fresno, Calif., Representative BERNIE SISK, has told the Members during National Raisin Week of the history and growth and importance of America's raisin industry. He has documented the contribution of the raisin industry to the economy of California and the Nation. And he has suggested that raisins have also contributed to the ever improving standard of health of our fellow Americans and of people in other lands.

On Wednesday, April 26, through the courtesy of the California Raisin Advisory Board, Congressman SISK and I will be privileged to offer the Members raisin pie dessert at lunch in the House dining room. We do so not only to remind you that this is National Raisin Week but to give you a chance to learn firsthand that raisins are a taste surprising treat.

We are confident that the hard working members of your staffs will enjoy the raisins in the sample packs distributed today to each Representative's office. Raisins, of course, are famed as an energy producing food, but I will leave it to you to judge whether they have noticeably increased the output of work in your offices.

Despite the promise implicit in the title of a smash stage and film musical comedy, the Nation's raisin industry has not succeeded since its birth 94 years ago without really trying.

On the contrary, long before the advent of cars and Avis, it tried harder. It is still doing so. Because it must.

For the raisin industry, success is a matter of holding even on per capita consumption—something a great many farm products have not been able to do. Holding a constant per capita rate of use means, of course, that sales grow as fast as the population does.

How have raisins managed to hold their own in the per capita consumption race? With the boom in convenience foods, the accompanying decline in home baking, and the mushrooming number of food products on the supermarket shelves, many once-popular food items have fallen by the wayside. Others have held their markets only by drastic price cuts.

Not so raisins. Why?

Many food industry leaders are con-

vinced the broad marketing advances set by raisins can be attributed almost entirely to the aggressive, industrywide promotional program of the California Raisin Advisory Board.

In recent years the board has conceived and promoted a highly effective marketing concept; namely, that raisins should join forces with as many related foods as possible, including the new processed and baked convenience items. This approach has paid handsome dividends for raisins.

In the late 1950's, for example, per capita consumption of raisins dropped to 1.4 pounds, partly as a result of several short-crop years. However, recent figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture indicate that raisins are now being consumed at the rate of 1.6 pounds per person per year. This has been accomplished without any reduction in the price received by the raisin industry. Just the opposite. Price records of the Raisin Administrative Committee show bulk raisins brought 11 to 11½ cents a pound 10 years ago, compared to 16½ to 18 cents in the past two seasons.

Essentially, the California Raisin Advisory Board's program is one of constant research and development, supported by merchandizing assistance to bakeries, supermarkets, and manufacturers of raisin products to make it convenient and more profitable for them to use more raisins.

Happily for the raisin industry, raisins themselves are well suited for use in a great many food items. One survey conducted by the Advisory Board noted at least 190 items in a grocery store that had raisins in them.

Another plus factor enjoyed by the raisin industry is profitability of the product. A grocery trade organization conducted an independent survey which indicated that raisins return $15.50 per annual dollar invested, compared to the average of $4.84 for dry groceries.

Dollar sales per shelf foot are critically important to any grocer, independent, or chain.

A recent study made in six representative stores, covering 8 weeks of sales, sharply confirmed the sales potential of what the industry calls the "amazin' raisin."

In dollar sales per shelf foot, dried fruit ranked sixth; ninth in unit sales per foot. Raisins rated first among dried fruit for dollar margin per foot and accounted for 40 percent of dried fruit sales. Moreover, in this study, raisins again proved that instead of hurting other sales, they suggest other foods and promote the sale of additional items.

Conceding these most helpful factors, however, I think that the raisin industry of California's San Joaquin Valley and the California Raisin Advisory Board can take major credit for the industry's growth and success.

It is an industry that thinks imaginatively, acts boldly, and plans for tomorrow.

Recognizing that today's busy homemaker likes her convenience foods and has become accustomed to less time at a hot stove, the California Raisin Advisory Board has created literally hundreds of ways for her to add the taste surprising treat of raisins to simple but exciting dishes.

A good deal of that effort is directed to teenagers and the young married, to assure that tomorrow's mothers know how to use raisins—lots of raisins—for their family's enjoyment—and good health.

Maybe the next 94 years will prove that California's raisin industry is going after the wrong market. But I would not bet on it. Any industry that can suggest 25 ways to eat a raisin has got to continue growing and prospering.

I am proud to salute the 100,000 raisin growers, packers, and employees—who are California's and America's raisin industry—during this 58th annual National Raisin Week.

GRANTS FOR ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include pertinent extraneous material and tabular matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the consideration by my colleagues when the appropriation bill for the National Foundation for Arts and Humanities is taken up.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week the House of Representatives will consider the appropriations bill for the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities. A great hue and cry has been raised by some people to the effect that the Appropriations Committee's action in recommending $3.5 million instead of the $6 million budget requested will somehow cause us to lose ground in the cultural struggle to win the hearts and minds of men. I fail to see how grants to study the history of the comic strips plays any part in this struggle, but I do know that there are substantial sources or non-Government funds available to the academic communities. It seems somewhat ludicrous for liberals to criticize the reduction in the Government's own program when so many private foundations are continually contributing to the arts and humanities.

This week end every Member of Congress received a copy of the Ford Foundation Annual Report of 1966. This is only one of numerous foundations that make grants to benefit the arts and humanities. The Ford Foundation report shows that the Ford Foundation approved grants totaling $87,901,937 in 1966 for the arts and humanities. I include these grants at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Ford Foundation Annual Report of 1966

Humanities and the arts	Changes during the fiscal year	
	Grants (reductions)	Payments (refunds)
Symphony orchestras:		
Bank of New York, as trustee for the following [1]	$58,750,000	$58,750,000
American Symphony, New York City ($1,000,000)	500,000	50,000
Atlanta Symphony ($1,000,000)	750,000	100,000
Baltimore Symphony ($1,000,000)	750,000	100,000
Birmingham Symphony ($600,000)	200,000	30,000
Boston Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	
Brooklyn Philharmonia ($250,000)	75,000	15,000
Buffalo Philharmonic ($1,000,000)	750,000	100,000
Chicago Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	
Cincinnati Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Cleveland Orchestra ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Columbus Symphony ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
Dallas Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Denver Symphony ($1,000,000)	750,000	100,000
Detroit Symphony ($1,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Festival Orchestra, New York City ($350,000)	75,000	15,000
Florida Symphony, Orlando ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
Fort Wayne Philharmonic ($250,000)	75,000	15,000
Hartford Symphony ($1,000,000)	350,000	50,000
Honolulu Symphony ($750,000)	350,000	50,000
Houston Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Hudson Valley Philharmonic, Poughkeepsie ($250,000)	75,000	15,000
Indianapolis Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Jacksonville Symphony ($250,000)	75,000	15,000
Kalamazoo Symphony ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
Kansas City (Mo.) Philharmonic ($1,000,000)	750,000	150,000
Little Orchestra, New York City ($350,000)	75,000	15,000
Symphony orchestras—Continued		
Bank of New York, etc.—Continued		
Los Angeles Philharmonic ($2,000,000)	$500,000	$100,000
Louisville Orchestra ($500,000)	200,000	20,000
Memphis Symphony ($400,000)	100,000	20,000
Milwaukee Symphony ($1,000,000)	250,000	50,000
Minneapolis Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Nashville Symphony ($500,000)	200,000	20,000
National (Washington, D.C.) Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
New Haven Symphony ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
New Jersey Symphony, Newark ($500,000)	150,000	20,000
New Orleans Philharmonic ($1,000,000)	750,000	134,400
New York Philharmonic ($1,000,000)	500,000	100,000
North Carolina Symphony, Chapel Hill ($750,000)	250,000	50,000
Oakland Symphony ($1,000,000)	350,000	50,000
Oklahoma City Symphony ($600,000)	150,000	30,000
Omaha Symphony ($400,000)	100,000	20,000
Philadelphia Orchestra ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Phoenix Symphony ($600,000)	250,000	44,480
Pittsburgh Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Portland (Ore.) Symphony ($1,000,000)	250,000	50,000
Puerto Rico Symphony, San Juan (no trust participation)	375,000	
Rhode Island Philharmonic, Providence ($350,000)	150,000	15,000
Richmond Symphony ($500,000)	150,000	20,000
Rochester Philharmonic ($1,000,000)	750,000	150,000
Sacramento Symphony ($500,000)	200,000	20,000

See footnotes at end of table.

The Ford Foundation Annual Report of 1966—Continued

Humanities and the arts	Changes during the fiscal year	
	Grants (reductions)	Payments (refunds)
Symphony orchestras—Continued		
Bank of New York, etc.—Continued		
St. Louis Symphony ($2,000,000)	$500,000	$100,000
San Antonio Symphony ($1,000,000)	750,000	150,000
San Diego Symphony ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
San Francisco Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Seattle Symphony ($1,000,000)	750,000	100,000
Shreveport Symphony ($350,000)	75,000	15,000
Syracuse Symphony ($750,000)	250,000	50,000
Toledo Orchestra ($500,000)	150,000	20,000
Tulsa Philharmonic ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
Utah Symphony, Salt Lake City ($1,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Wichita Symphony ($500,000)	150,000	20,000
Other artistic resources:		
Ballet training and resources:		
Boston Ballet, Inc	300,000	148,000
City Center of Music and Drama (New York)		200,000
City Center Joffrey Ballet	500,000	330,000
Houston Foundation for Ballet		
San Francisco Ballet Company		64,400
School of American Ballet		400,000
School of the Pennsylvania Ballet Company	450,000	325,000
Utah Ballet Society		35,000
Civic opera development:		
Baltimore Civic Opera Company		
Central City Opera House Association (Colorado)		35,000
Chautauqua Opera Association (New York)		20,000
Cincinnati Summer Opera Association		20,000
Connecticut Opera Association		20,600
Fort Worth Civic Opera Association		20,000
Houston Grand Opera Association		30,000
Kansas City Lyric Theatre (Missouri)		15,000
New Orleans Opera House Association		30,000
Opera Association of New Mexico		34,000
Opera Company of Boston	195,000	
Opera Guild of Miami		20,000
Opera Society of Washington (District of Columbia)		71,300
Seattle Opera Association	100,000	
Spring Opera of San Francisco		
Symphony Society of San Antonio		30,000
New York Pro Musica Antiqua: Production of early music and musical dramas		11,000
Professional training in music:		
Manhattan School of Music		
Peabody Institute of Baltimore		156,000
Resident theater program:		
Alley Theatre, Houston	1,400,000	137,500
American Shakespeare Festival Theatre and Academy, Stratford (Conn.)		98,400
California, University of (theatre group)		
Minnesota Theatre Company Foundation, Minneapolis (Tyrone Guthrie Theatre)		
Mummers Theatre, Oklahoma City	535,000	
Washington Drama Society (Arena Stage, Washington, D.C.)	896,450	
Tamarind Lithography Workshop: Development of lithographic art		
Theatre Communications Group: Cooperative program among nonprofit theaters		147,000
Development of individual talent:		
Advancement of creative aspects of music in the public schools:		
Music Educators National Conference	250,000	475,000
Virginia State College	85,000	21,250
Young Audiences, Inc		144,000
Grants-in-aid and fellowships:		
Administrative interns	(1,071)	63,716
Arts reporters, editors, and critics	(4,660)	25,730
Concert soloists		3,500
Marlboro School of Music		35,000
Poets and writers associated with theaters and opera companies	(18,750)	8,300
Programs for other talented individuals		16,338
North Carolina School of the Arts Foundation: Professional and academic training	1,500,000	250,000
Performances of works commissioned for concert artists receiving grants-in-aid:		
Denver Symphony Society		
Indiana State Symphony Society		
Pittsburgh Symphony Society		
Scholarships in independent art and music schools:		
Art Academy of Cincinnati		5,000
Art Association of Indianapolis		4,000
Development of individual talent—Continued		
Scholarships in independent art, etc.—Continued		
Art Institute of Chicago		$32,000
Art Students' League of New York		28,000
Atlanta Art Association		
California College of Arts and Craft		9,000
California Institute of the Arts:		
Chouinard Art School		4,000
School of Music		4,000
Cleveland Institute of Art		1,000
Cleveland Institute of Music		8,000
Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts		4,000
Cooper Union		7,000
Corcoran Gallery of Art		5,000
Cranbrook Gallery of Art		6,000
Dayton Art Institute		4,000
Juilliard School of Music		34,000
Kansas City Art Institute		
Layton School of Art		4,000
Manhattan School of Music		30,000
Mannes College of Music		8,000
Maryland Institute		
Memphis Academy of Arts		4,000
Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts		
Museum of Fine Arts (Boston)		19,000
New England Conservatory of Music		
Otis Art Institute		4,000
Peabody Institute of Baltimore		13,000
Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts		11,000
Philadelphia College of Art		15,000
Portland Art Association		
Pratt Institute		19,000
Rhode Island School of Design		30,000
San Francisco Art Institute		15,000
San Francisco Conservatory of Music		4,000
Society of Arts and Crafts (Detroit)		4,000
Worcester Art Museum		4,000
Whitney Museum of American Art: Staff travel to select works by contemporary American artists for exhibition in New York	$155,000	
Experiments, demonstrations, and studies:		
American Federation of Arts: Films for school art curriculum	511,500	
American Place Theatre: Readings and productions of new plays		80,000
City Center of Music and Drama (New York): Production of contemporary operas	100,000	125,000
International Council of Museums: Study of European artists and institutions		18,000
Juilliard School of Music: Book by Micheal St. Denis on theatrical training	22,500	22,500
Nelson Gallery Foundation (Kansas City, Mo.): Catalog of Chinese paintings	13,237	12,237
Yale University: Research in acoustical design	80,000	
The humanities:		
American Council of Learned Societies: Programs to advance scholarship in the humanities		567,000
American Historical Association: Bibliographies of British civilization		6,000
Conferences on humanistic study groups:		
Bowdoin College	36,500	36,500
Fordham University	(9,719)	(9,719)
Johns Hopkins University	36,000	36,000
Cooperative program with regional liberal-arts colleges to strengthen the humanities:		
Duke University	200,000	170,000
North Carolina, University of	200,000	170,000
Council on Library Resources: Research on library problems		1,000,000
Folger Shakespeare Memorial Library: National Shakespeare Anniversary Committee	(29,050)	
Rutgers University: Scholarly publication by the university press		13,000
Texas, University of: National literary translation center		
Special institutional grants:		
Carnegie Hall Corporation (New York): Stage renovation and improvement	200,000	200,000
Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts:		
City Center of Music and Drama		243,782
Juilliard School of Music		197,069
Metropolitan Opera Association		
Philharmonic Symphony Society of New York		316,052
Total, humanities and the arts	87,901,937	69,252,335

[1] Figures in parentheses in this column represent endowment funds held in trust by the Bank of New York, to be matched by the orchestras; principal of the endowments will be distributed in 1976. Figures in the other columns are direct grants, made in addition to the endowments, and are payable over a 5-year period on a nonmatching basis.

RUSSIAN SPACE DISASTER

Mr. MILLER of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my sympathy and the sympathy of our Committee on Science and Aeronautics to the widow and orphaned children of the Russian astronaut, Col. Vladimir Komarov, who just suffered a disaster comparable to our own tragic one.

Space is still a hostile environment in which to operate. But when men give their lives to those things they believe are right and in the interest of their country, whether they are friends or foe,

I think it fitting that we recognize it. So I do want the RECORD to show our sympathy for the widow and her children.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that while we had a disaster, our present Surveyor, operating on the moon, is an outstanding success in the space program.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, ANNUAL REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 110)

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 Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the First Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education.

As this report points out, extension and continuing education—once the neglected stepchild in the American educational system—has now become a vital part of that system. Benefiting 25 million citizens each year, continuing education is helping to meet the needs of America's adult population. It recognizes that education is a continuing process that does not end when the student leaves the classroom.

The Federal role in supporting continuing education began more than a century ago. As our society evolved and became more complex, the Federal effort intensified. Today, through Federally supported programs, we can cite these examples of progress:

American adults, denied the opportunity to learn when they were young, are being taught to read and write.

The poor and the unemployed, through special education and training, are being given a chance to stand on their own two feet.

Scientists, engineers, doctors, dentists and teachers are improving their skills and keeping up with the latest technological advances.

Employees at all levels of government are being trained to serve the public better.

These extensive efforts are complimented by our recent efforts under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to bring colleges and universities into local communities to conduct seminars and other programs on issues of great concern. Under this program we are focusing the intellectual resources and research facilities of higher education on problems affecting the daily lives of every citizen—from health and housing to transportation and recreation.

In its first year alone, the program reached every State in the Nation, with 300 colleges and universities participating. In fiscal 1968, this number will almost double.

The attached report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education details much of this progress and recommends a number of steps to strengthen continuing education in America.

After consultation with the Council, the administration developed and submitted to the Congress legislation to improve our continuing education programs under title I by—

Extending the program for another 5 years.

Enabling smaller colleges and universities to continue to participate.

Providing additional funds for experimental projects.

I commend this report to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 21, 1967.*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

EXPANSION OF CANINE CORPS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 824) to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 824

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting through the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, are authorized to acquire, train, and maintain as many dogs as may be necessary to be used in connection with law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise only to ask the gentleman, in support of this bill, which is a necessary bill, whether or not it is open-ended or there is any restriction on either the numbers or the amount of expense that could be used in this man-dog team, which is presently estimated at $2,390.

Mr. DOWDY. The Police Department estimates that no more than 25 new dogs will be acquired for training and added to the corps each year. The amount to be appropriated is left to the discretion of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's answer, which is quite satisfactory. As I understand it, this same legislation did pass in the 89th Congress.

Mr. DOWDY. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the expansion of the Canine Corps of the Metropolitan Police force as the need for such expansion may develop.

The use of dogs in urban police work originated in Belgium more than 50 years ago, and has since spread to many other countries. Today, more than 40 police departments in the United States are utilizing dogs in patrol work, and the number is increasing very rapidly.

The Canine Corps was first established in the District of Columbia in December 1959, and on April 19, 1960, six dogs went on the streets of the city with their handlers. By the end of that year, the number had increased to 20 such teams, and today the corps consists of some 80 teams on the streets and 11 more in training, for a total strength of 91.

PERFORMANCE OF THE CANINE CORPS

The types of work performed by these man-dog teams, and the effectiveness of the Canine Corps as an arm of the Metropolitan Police Department, are presented by the following statistics for the calendar year 1966. During this period, an average of 80 man-dog teams patrolled the streets of the Nation's Capital each month, and they responded on a total of 7,365 calls:

Type of work performed by dogs	Assignment	Resulted in arrest
Tracking	115	3
Open seeks	143	34
Building seeks	801	84
Chasing	19	16
Deterrent	87	52
Articles searched for and found	80	----------
Stolen cars recovered	110	----------

During the year 1966, a total of 944 felony cases and 2,395 misdemeanor cases were cleared by the use of the Canine Corps. A breakdown of actual arrests made in six major categories of crime, with dogs and without the use of dogs, is the following.

Offense	Arrests		
	Dogs used	Dogs not used	Total
Housebreaking	153	127	280
Robbery	43	141	184
Assault	37	98	135
Larceny	15	95	110
Carrying deadly weapon	26	88	114
Rape	3	2	5

From these figures it is seen that more than one-third of the arrests made in connection with these crimes were accomplished with the aid of dogs during that year.

In addition to their actual participation in these arrests, the dogs of the Canine Corps have proved invaluable on many other occasions by the deterrent effect of their mere presence at the scene of actual or potential trouble. The dogs' keen sense of smell enables them to locate fugitives hiding in buildings, junkyards, and other places where the policemen would otherwise have a most difficult and dangerous task in apprehending them.

Your committee is informed that for

several reasons any program of expansion of the corps cannot be made to proceed too rapidly. First, the recruitment and selection of the dogs must be accomplished carefully and deliberately. Then the training itself takes 14 weeks, and the nature of the training work forbids too large groups. In this connection also, each dog is assigned to one particular man, and this patrolman and his dog must be trained together. Thus, any rapid acceleration in the training program would take too many patrolmen off their regular beats at one time, to the detriment of law enforcement in the city. In addition, each man-dog team in service must be brought back for 1 day of refresher training every 2 weeks. For these reasons, the Police Department estimates that no more than 25 new dogs can be acquired, trained, and added to the corps each year.

Thus far, all the dogs in the Canine Corps have been donated, and thus have cost the Police Department nothing. However, if the contemplated program of expansion necessitates the purchase of any of the new dogs, it is estimated that they may cost as much as $250 each. An item of expense is involved in the fact that the policemen who handle these dogs must transport them daily in their own cars, and also must keep the dogs at their homes. This calls for fenced yards and extra cleaning. Also, most of the work of these policemen must be performed at night. For these reasons, these men are paid additional compensation in the amount of $580 per year. With the exception of a few sergeants who perform this duty, all the officers who serve as dog handlers are grade 2 technicians.

The cost of training and adding a man-dog team to the Canine Corps is presently estimated at $2,390. This includes the handler's extra compensation, and the food and veterinary care for the dogs, but not any cost of purchase.

Enactment of this proposed legislation would provide legislative authorization for such expansion of this corps, which has proved such an invaluable asset to law enforcement in the District of Columbia, as future needs may dictate.

This bill is identical to H.R. 1935 of the 88th Congress—House Report No. 76—and to H.R. 1064 of the 89th Congress—House Report No. 19—both of which passed the House.

The following letter, written by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia during the 88th Congress, expresses their endorsement of this proposed legislation.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, February 25, 1963.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report H.R. 1935, 88th Congress, a bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia. The bill authorizes the acquisition of as many dogs as may be necessary for police use. The police force now has approximately 70 dogs, most of which are on active duty. Some are still in training.

The Commissioners recognize that the man-dog teams of the Canine Corps of the Police Department have compiled an excellent record of crime detection and prevention since they first appeared on the streets of the District of Columbia in 1960. The corps was originally established on an experimental basis with five man-dog teams. With the concurrence of the congressional appropriation subcommittees the corps was continued on this basis through the fiscal year 1961. Fifty man-dog teams were authorized for fiscal year 1962 and 75 for fiscal year 1963.

The Commissioners have recommended an increase of 25 dogs in the budget for fiscal year 1964.

Therefore, the Commissioners recommend the enactment of this legislation.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Yours very sincerely,
F. J. CLARKE,
Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the bill just passed and any other District of Columbia bills which are considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

OBSCENE TELEPHONE CALLS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill—H.R. 828—to provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 828

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it shall be unlawful for any person to make use of telephone facilities or equipment in the District of Columbia (1) for an anonymous call or calls if in a manner reasonably to be expected to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; (2) for repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or (3) for any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

(b) A violation of this section shall be deemed to have occurred at either the place at which the telephone call was made or the place at which the telephone call was received.

(c) Whoever violates this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 or to imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.

(d) Any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating this section shall be requested by the court to take a pretrial mental examination, at a mental hospital designated by the courts, and all costs of such examination shall be paid by the Government.

(e) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to affect the application of section 927 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 24–301), to any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with the violation of this section.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, strike out lines 7 through 11, and substitute thereof the following:

"(d) The court may in its discretion order any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating this section to undergo a pretrial mental examination, at a mental hospital designated by the court. All costs of such examination shall be paid by the Government."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 18, strike the period and add the following after the word "Government": "of the District of Columbia."

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would have no objection to that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman to say he would have no objection to the amendment?

Mr. DOWDY. No objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 17, after the word "court." insert "The court will order such an examination on demand of the person arrested, his attorney, or responsible next of kin."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment. It simply makes pre-judicial determination of unsoundness of mind, a two-way street. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it simply allows the same thing for the accused and the apprehended that the court may determine. This is in line, Mr. Speaker, with an overall bill for consideration of those of unsound mind and for admission to Federal hospitals which I have had in the last two Congresses and resubmitted in the well of the House recently. It simply gives the accused and the apprehended, or his attorney under the due process of law guaranteed by the Constitution, or his next of kin, the right to request that the courts have an examination by those qualified in mental examination, submit the evidence, and determine before the fact that he is of sound or unsound mind.

This is a two-way street, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the gentleman will accept this additional sentence in this particular paragraph.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. I will say that I really doubt that this language is required for the purpose, but I would have no objection to it being written into the bill.

Mr. HALL. I certainly appreciate this, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the gentleman has accepted the intent of the amendment, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield for about 30 seconds?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last words and yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this legislation, but I think there is one minor thing we have overlooked. We mention it in the report, but make no mention of it in the bill, and that is decoy telephone laws. Would the gentleman think that that was covered as well as obscene calls and harassment calls?

Mr. DOWDY. I did not understand the gentleman on the kind of calls.

Mr. GROSS. Decoy calls, that is a burglar calling as a matter of decoying.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how we would reach that, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. We would provide punishment for the call for the obvious purpose of burglary, a person obviously calling to decoy the police or to decoy an individual.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman think this would be covered under these words: "For repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any of those provisions, in answer to my friend from Texas, goes precisely to the question of decoy calls.

I will not belabor this, but I will hope the gentleman will give it further consideration and perhaps do something in conference, if it is meritorious.

Mr. DOWDY. If it is necessary, I will be happy to do it. I would think the kind of calls the gentleman is talking about would rather go into the scheme of actually being part of the burglary itself, and the person who was taking part in that would be an accomplice at least in the commission of the burglary. We will check on that, however.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 828 is to provide criminal penalties to persons found guilty of making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia.

The bill makes it unlawful for any person to make use of telephone facilities or equipment in the District of Columbia for the following purposes:

First. For an anonymous call or calls if in a manner reasonably to be expected to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons;

Second. For repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or

Third. For any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

The bill further provides that a violation shall be deemed to have occurred either at the place where the telephone call was made, or at the place where the call was received.

The bill subjects violators to a fine of not more than $500 or to imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both. The laws of Maryland and Virginia impose similar penalties.

Present District of Columbia law—District of Columbia Code, section 22–1121—a disorderly conduct statute, provides a maximum penalty of $250 fine, or 90 days' imprisonment, or both, but it is not specifically directed to the offenses referred to in the bill. It does not furnish a good base for prosecutions of offenders contemplated in the reported bill, as it has proven difficult for the prosecution to prove that telephone calls of the kind referred to herein are a violation of that law.

The bill as introduced further provides that a pretrial mental examination shall be requested by the court of any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating the above provisions, such examination to be at a mental hospital designated by the court, and the cost thereof to be paid by the Government. This has been amended as hereinafter stated.

Finally, provision is included in the bill to assure that nothing in the enforcement of the bill will affect the application of the provisions of the District of Columbia Code with respect to insane criminals and to the commitments thereof.

BACKGROUND

There is hardly a Member of Congress who has not heard complaints from his secretary or staff members who have been the victims of obscene, annoying, or harassing telephone calls at some time or other.

According to information filed with your committee, an increasing number of perverts, burglars, and just plain cranks are using the telephone to plague Washington area residents—particularly women.

Police and prosecutors throughout the area report hardly a day goes by without at least one complaint of an obscene call, some of them involving obscene messages to women, others decoy calls by burglars.

Between 34 and 40 cases a month are under active investigation by the telephone company's security force. Counted as one case is the caller who has given the same shockingly indecent spiel to a hundred or more women.

Washington residents, unprotected by any kind of law against telephone harassment, face this pattern of cases:

A pervert posing as a doctor was believed to have made more than 50,000 calls throughout the area over a period of several years before his recent capture, in nearby Maryland. His spiel: Telling women that their husbands had visited him for delicate medical help and asking them numerous intimate questions.

A university's telephone switchboard was tied up so completely that all school business came to a halt because of one family's domestic crisis. The man got 20 of his friends to keep calling the university where his wife worked. They said nothing, simply breathed into the telephone, but no other calls could come through.

Two District firms—a moving company and a barbershop—nearly went out of business through telephone harassment directed not at the firms but at some employee. In both cases, calls swamped telephone facilities.

A current trap for the unwary is the telephone survey. It is used by both burglars and perverts in the District.

The perverts use the survey to entice the housewife into carrying on an innocent conversation before the caller moves into obscenity.

Police believe burglars are employing the survey technique to "case" a house without running any risk of being spotted. Cited as a typical example is the housewife's response to the seemingly innocuous questions of a caller posing as a TV market analyst.

The bill has the support of the U.S. Department of Justice, the Metropolitan Police Department, the local telephone company, and other groups.

PRECEDENT

This bill is identical to H.R. 10497 of the 89th Congress—House Report No. 1132—which passed the House on October 11, 1965, except for the amendment as reported above.

AMENDMENT

The committee's amendment to this bill was requested by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and provides that the court may order a person arrested for violation of this act to undergo a pretrial mental examination, rather than merely requesting that he do so as provided in the bill as introduced.

Following is the letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia under date of March 20, 1967, expressing their approval of this proposed legislation, as amended:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, March 20, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia desire to report on H.R. 828, 90th Congress, a bill "To provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia."

Subsection (a) of the bill makes it unlawful for any person to use telephone facilities or equipment in the District of Columbia (1) for an anonymous call or calls if in a manner reasonably expected to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; (2) for repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or (3) for any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

Subsection (b) provides that a violation of the bill shall be deemed to have occurred at either the place where the telephone call was made or at the place where the telephone call was received.

Subsection (c) makes a violator subject to a fine of not more than $500, or to imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.

Subsection (d) provides that any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating the bill "shall be *requested* by the court to take a pretrial mental examination, at a mental hospital designated by the court, and all costs of such examination shall be paid by the Government." (Emphasis supplied.)

Subsection (e) provides that nothing in the bill shall be deemed to affect the application to any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating the bill, of section 927 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (D.C. Code, sec. 24–301), providing for commitment to D.C. General Hospital of persons charged with offenses and suspected of being of unsound mind.

The existing District of Columbia disorderly conduct statue (D.C. Code, sec. 22–1121) provides in part that whoever, with intent to provoke a breach of the peace, or under circumstances such that a breach of the peace may be occasioned thereby, acts in such a manner as to annoy, disturb, interfere with, obstruct, or be offensive to others, shall be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both. This provision of the disorderly conduct statute on occasion has been used to prosecute persons who by using a telephone annoy or harass other persons with anonymous, repeated, or obscene and lewd calls. The Commissioners are informed, however, that as a practical matter it has been very difficult for the prosecution to prove that such calls, by such means, constitute a violation of the disorderly conduct statute.

Maryland and Virginia have statutes which prohibit the type of conduct made unlawful by the bill. Both statutes provide for a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment up to twelve months, or both. See Article 27, § 555A, Annotated Code of Maryland (1964); § 18.1–9 and 238 Code of Virginia (1950); and § 18.1–238.2, Code of Virginia (1964 Supp.).

Accordingly, the Commissioners believe the bill is needed for the purpose of providing an effective means of dealing with the kind of activity prohibited by it. However, they suggest that subsection (d) of the bill might be made more effective were it amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Court may in its discretion order any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating this section to undergo a pretrial mental examination, at a mental hospital designated by the court. All costs of such examination shall be paid by the Government."

The Commissioners urge enactment of the bill.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, D.C.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, for almost 2 years now I have been trying to get some effective legislation on the law books to protect the citizens of the District of Columbia from obscene and harassing telephone calls. During the 89th Congress, the District of Columbia Committee, behind the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, favorably reported, and the House later unanimously passed, my bill to raise the penalties for obscene phone calls made within the District. The bill is before us again today.

Last year, when my bill reached the Senate, the District Committee began hearings, but for some reason suspended the inquiry after only 1 day of testimony. Subsequently there was introduced a Senate bill to place Federal penalties on obscene telephone calls made in interstate commerce. The bill, however, neglected the District of Columbia, the main area of my original concern.

Since it appeared that the Senate District Committee had deferred to the Senate Commerce Committee on this legislation, I introduced an amended version of the Senate bill which included the District under its provisions. In the end, the Senate passed a bill similar to my second bill making it a Federal crime to make an obscene phone call in interstate commerce or within the District of Columbia.

At the end of the 89th Congress, the House had passed my bill to raise penalties on calls made within Washington, and the Senate had passed a bill including interstate calls as well as District of Columbia calls. In effect, therefore, no law resulted.

Mr. Speaker, this exact same situation is going to result this year unless the Congress can reach an understanding. The Senate Commerce Committee has reported out a bill similar to the one it passed last year. Today, we in the House are considering legislation affecting the District alone.

My sincere concern is for the residents of the District of Columbia who have been denied adequate protection from the pranksters and perverts who continuously abuse the telephone lines. Although it appears that protection is also needed in regards interstate telephone calls, the real problem, and the problem which seems to me most pressing today, is the calls made in the District.

Mr. Speaker, the communications industry has made commendable and effective efforts during the past 2 years to develop methods of apprehending obscene phone callers. But without effective penalties, the deterrent effect of such methods shrinks proportionately. Today, the usual penalty in the District is a $10 disorderly conduct fine. The bill before us today raises that penalty to a $500 fine and/or 12 months in jail. This punishment is more in line with the penalties exacted by our neighboring States of Virginia and Maryland.

In addition, the apprehended obscene phone caller will be offered psychiatric help, which in many cases is desperately needed and desired. This bill is a strict, yet enlightened, approach to combat the growing menace.

I am sincerely hopeful that the Senate will act on this legislation before us today. We need protection in the District now. The question of interstate calls is a separate question and can be dealt with apart from this bill. It would be most unfortunate for some imagined rivalry to prevent the Senate from acting to help protect the citizens of our Nation's Capital. I have no doubt that with speedy action by the Senate we can have this law enacted before the summer. In any event, I remain hopeful, and the menacing calls continue.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS OF RETIRED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill—H.R. 2824—to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, who married such officer or member after his retirement, may qualify for survivor benefits, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2824

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (a)(3) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–521(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'widow' means the surviving wife of a member or former member if—

"(A) she was married to such member or former member (i) while he was a member, or (ii) for at least two years immediately preceding his death, or

"(B) she is the mother of issue by such marriage."

(b) The amendment made by this Act shall apply with respect to any surviving wife of a "member" (as that term is defined in subsection (a)(1) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act) or former member irrespective of whether such wife became a "widow" (as that term is defined in such amendment) prior to, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that no annuity shall be paid by reason of the amendment made by this Act for any period prior to the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1967.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

I should like to ask the gentleman who supports the bill a question. I must say that I am in support of it also, provided we can find out how many widows are estimated to be affected.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say there is no way to estimate that.

Mr. HALL. Is part of the problem because the widow could have become a spouse after the fireman or policeman had retired?

Mr. DOWDY. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Second, I ask the gentleman, what is the estimate of cost?

Mr. DOWDY. There has been no estimate of cost.

Mr. HALL. Is that for the same reason, that it would be impractical to figure? Will there be a diminishing cost per year?

Mr. DOWDY. I do not know that that would be true. Under the present law a surviving widow cannot draw benefits unless she were married to the policeman or fireman at the time of his retirement. This will provide that if she were married to him for at least 2 years immediately preceding his death, or if she is the mother of issue of such marriage, she could draw benefits.

This would continue into the future. It would not apply just to those presently retired, but would apply to future retirees.

This is the same as was passed by the House last year. We passed this as a part of another bill.

Mr. HALL. I will say to the gentleman that I certainly am in favor of the bill being applicable if the widow is indeed the mother of issue of the retiree. I believe there can be no question about that.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. This measure passed the House of Representatives last year and was deleted in conference due to the fact that widows of veterans who were married after their retirement were not entitled to survivors benefits unless they had been married 5 years prior to the death of the veteran.

The measure should no longer be objectionable because, as I understand it, the same provision is pending right now in the Congress, as a result of action of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a veteran who has been married for 1 year after retirement, so that the widow would be entitled to benefits.

Mr. HALL. I believe that is the provision which passed the House under the veterans legislation the other day, now pending in the other body.

In the opinions both of the gentleman from Texas and of the gentleman from Virginia, I discern that this is entirely in the interest of equity and justice, compared to other benefits we give to our veterans' widows. I strongly support it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to a situation of which he is undoubtedly aware.

In the general area of benefits for police and firemen, the area of salaries, I believe the gentleman is fully aware of the fact that the morale of the police force of the District of Columbia is at a very low ebb, for reasons we need not enumerate at this time.

In the general pay legislation which is pending, it seems to me there is a possible source of further discontent, because under that proposal we would increase rather dramatically the wage of the starting policemen and of the ones who are at the top of the heap in the Police Department, and leave out to a large extent those officers who have been members of the force for a number of years—those who are between those two levels.

Mr. DOWDY. That is the pending legislation, and there was such legislation in the last Congress.

Mr. KYL. Has there not been a proposal by the administration for further adjustments in the salary?

Mr. DOWDY. I say, I think there is such a bill pending in the present Congress, though it is not before my subcommittee. I do not know whether hearings have been held on it up to the present date.

Mr. KYL. There is another matter concerned in that proposal which has come to the Hill, which I hope that the committee may take cognizance of, and that is this: Under that proposal there would be a large number of detectives who have achieved that rank through seniority and by passing examinations for qualification who would be faced with probably going back to the rank of uniformed policemen even though they had achieved their present rank through their own diligent efforts and service. I would hope that the committee may take a look at that legislation so that we do not destroy this standard.

Mr. DOWDY. I am sure it will be looked at. I believe that this bill is before the subcommittee of which the chairman is the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER]. He is here and might have some comments to make on it.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I will say to the gentleman that we have been making a very thorough study of morale, retention, and recruitment, and also of proposed crime legislation. I can assure the gentleman that based upon past experience in our subcommittee and in the full committee, whatever pay legislation may be brought out will be equitable to all ranks. We are concerned about recruitment and morale and all of the other problems which have been so dramatically unfolded in hearings before the subcommittee. It would be rather improvident to undertake at this time to state to the gentleman what will be forthcoming because our studies have not been completed.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read in the paper this morning a statement attributed to Commissioner Tobriner, who is credited with having issued an order to the Chief of Police, Mr. Layton, that he, the Chief of Police, cannot recruit policemen from two or three States, one of them being North Carolina and another, I believe, Tennessee. At least, one of the States was North Carolina. I think this is a slander on the people of the States which he mentioned. I hope that the Committee on the District of Columbia in their legislation dealing with the recruitment of police—and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] just mentioned the consideration of recruitment legislation—will call Mr. Tobriner before the Committee on the District of Columbia and find out why the citizens of any State of the United States are unqualified out of hand to serve in the Police Department of the District of Columbia.

I wonder if this rule will apply to the recruitment of police dogs for the District of Columbia; whether Mr. Tobriner would say that dogs cannot be recruited from certain States in the South for service in the Washington Police Department.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I have not read the story to which the gentleman refers, but I would not be surprised at such statements being made, because it seems a great deal of what goes on in public around here is for the benefit of those who professionally seem to hate the South. I can only say as a North Carolinian that perhaps one of the reasons North Carolina was included would be that it would be very difficult, I think, to talk any intelligent North Carolinian into leaving North Carolina to come here where the head of the government makes such statements about our State.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that the gentleman to whom this statement is attributed does not want great policemen and so, probably, for that reason, he has excluded those who might be recruited from the great State of North Carolina.

The statement attributed to Commissioner Tobriner is unjustifiable. I cannot imagine why one in high position would express such prejudice against the citizens of the great State of North Carolina. Perhaps he will realize the error of his position without delay. If not, there will be a change in policy by the Congress, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] raised a question a moment ago regarding a statement made by the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia with reference to recruitment, and the exclusion of residents of certain States from the recruitment practices by the Metropolitan Police Department. I believe something further should be said about this problem.

One of the difficulties that we have faced as we have conducted hearings and had investigations made on the morale, recruitment, and law enforcement problems was the attitude of those in leadership in the District government. A great deal of the morale problem, according to our expert who looked into the matter, as well as from comments that we had in testimony from the Police Association of the District of Columbia, resulted from the attitude of the President of the Board of Commissioners toward the entire police organization.

I am not one to engage in attacks upon anyone. I am sure the gentleman to whom I refer is sincere in his attitude. But, I must say that I believe he was sincerely wrong in most of his expressed attitudes toward the police in the District of Columbia. We will not have in my judgment a high morale situation in the District of Columbia in the law enforcement field until there is a changed attitude at the top in the District of Columbia government.

When a kind word is said by the President of the Board of Commissioners about the police he always seems to accompany it with a threat that if they make one misstep the full weight of the District government is to fall upon that individual policeman's head.

This has been a very disturbing thing to members of the Police Department. It has been a disturbing thing to those of us who have tried so diligently to improve law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

The statement to which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] referred, in my judgment, would constitute another hammering of a nail into the head of those who are trying to do something about the morale problem and building up of the Police Department.

I was delighted that here today we have passed legislation again expressing the attitude of the Congress on the canine corps. We have had testimony before our subcommittee which indicates that the President of the Board of Commissioners or someone in authority has set upon a pattern of destroying the effective operation of the canine corps. Passage of the legislation relating to the canine corps clearly expresses the will of Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know just who is applying the pressure which brings about these unfortunate statements from the District building. I do know that such statements are doing so much to destroy the existing police department and its morale, and are preventing effective recruitment.

This is a very serious matter. Crime in the District of Columbia is all out of proportion and it is continuing to grow. The situation will not be helped in any way by unwise and foolish statements either by Members of Congress or by appointed officials in the District of Columbia government.

I would hope that the zeal for publicity would subside down at the District building and that dislike for certain regions of the country on the part of some misguided individuals will not further affect in a harmful and deleterious manner the performance of their very important duties in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina and would just say I do not think that Mr. Tobriner has enough practical sense to come in out of the rain.

Mr. WHITENER. Well, sir, I do not know about that, but he is president of the District Commission and his statements do seem to attract headlines. I would hope he would think them through in the future before he makes them. Otherwise, we may have a continuing shower of crime in the District of Columbia that will envelop all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2824 is to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who married such an officer or member after his retirement may qualify for survivor benefits under the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act.

REASONS FOR LEGISLATION

Under existing law, if a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia marries subsequent to his retirement, upon his death his widow is not entitled to any pension whatever. Your committee is of the opinion that this is an injustice and should be corrected.

Accordingly, H.R. 2824 provides that in the event that a retired such officer or member marries after his reitrement, his widow will be entitled to the same full benefits as provided in subsection (a)(3) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act to which she would be entitled had she married the officer or member during his active service. It is specified, however, that in order to qualify for such pension the widow must have been married to such officer or member for at least 2 years prior to his death, or that she be the mother of issue by the marriage. This bill is patterned in general after similar provisions of civil service law as applied to classified Government workers.

This bill is identical to a provision in title II of H.R. 15897 of the 89th Congress, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Policemen and Firemen's Salary Act. This bill passed the House on June 27, 1966, but that provision was subsequently deleted by House and Senate conferees.

The reason for this action was that it came to the attention of the conferees that a similar provision in present law pertaining to widows of retired veterans contains a 5-year minimum for the length of such marriage before the widow can qualify for a pension. This created some doubt as to the propriety of the 2-year minimum which this provision in H.R. 15897 would have imposed in the case of widows of retired District of Columbia policemen and firemen. However, your committee is informed that on March 20, 1967, the House of Representatives amended S. 16 so as to decrease the minimum period of marriage for widows of retired veterans from 5 years to 1 year, and that Senate action on this amendment is now pending. Hence, it would appear that the 2-year minimum period for widows of deceased District of Columbia policemen and firemen, as proposed in H.R. 2824, is well within comparable limits of similar legislation.

Your committee feels that this proposed legislation will correct an inequity of long standing, and commends it to this body for favorable action.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to urge the support of my colleagues in the House for the bill H.R. 2834, which is identical to H.R. 7356 which I introduced last March 16.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide that the widow of a retired member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, who married the member after his retirement, be entitled to an annuity if she had been married to the retiree for at least 2 years prior to his death or is the mother of issue by the marriage.

Under present District of Columbia law, such a widow is entitled to no benefits whatever. I regard this restriction as archaic and fundamentally unfair, and submit that it should be corrected within the limitations imposed by this bill, at once.

In veterans' retirement and survivor benefits legislation, there is presently a 5-year minimum period for the marriage, when contracted subsequent to the veteran's retirement, and this fact persuaded House and Senate conferees to drop this provision last year from H.R. 15897, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Policemen and Firemen's Salary Act. However, this impediment now appears to have been removed, since the House has recently approved a bill which will decrease this minimum period to 1 year for veteran retirees' marriages.

For these reasons, it is my opinion that this legislation is in the public interest and should be approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EQUALIZED BENEFITS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 2897) to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2897

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) each officer or member of the Metropolitan

Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the United States Secret Service who has been retired under the provisions of the fourth paragraph of section 12 of the Act of September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as in effect prior to October 1, 1956, during the period beginning before October 1, 1956, and continuing through July 1, 1967, and who is receiving maximum disability benefits under such paragraph for injury received or disease contracted in the line of duty, shall, on and after the first pay period which begins July 1, 1967, have his retirement benefits computed and paid in accordance with the provisions of subsection (g)(1) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–527(1).

(b) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to reduce the relief or retirement compensation any person receives, or is entitled to receive, from the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out lines 3 through 9, and on page 2 strike out lines 1 through 9, and insert the following:

"That (a) each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the U.S. Secret Service who has been retired during the period beginning before October 1, 1956, and continuing through July 1, 1967—

"(1) under the provisions of the fourth paragraph of section 12 of the act of September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as in effect prior to October 1, 1956, and

"(2) on the basis of a disability which was rated at 100 per centum at the time of his retirement,

shall, on and after the first pay period which begins after July 1, 1967, have his retirement benefits computed and paid in accordance with the provisions of subsection (g)(1) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–527(1)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2897, as amended and reported, is to provide that former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, the U.S. Secret Service, and the District of Columbia Fire Department who were retired prior to October 1, 1956, for disability which was rated at 100 percent at the time of their retirement, shall have their annuities computed on the same basis as are those for members who retired for disability subsequent to that date.

BACKGROUND

From 1916, when the Policemen and Firemen's Relief Fund was first established by act of Congress, until 1957, there was never any disparity in the pensions paid to retired members of the Fire Department and the several police forces in the District of Columbia, or to their widows and dependent orphaned children. All who retired at the same rank and with the same length of service received equal amounts, regardless of changes in contribution rates.

In 1957, however, this long-established policy was abandoned by the enactment of Public Law 85–157, which amended the Policemen and Firemen's Disability Act to provide substantial increases in the annuities for those members retiring after October 1, 1956, and for their widows and orphaned children, but provided no increases whatever for annuitants who had retired prior to that date, nor for their surviving dependents.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

Because of the hazards and vicissitudes incident to service in their police and fire forces, members of this committee and many of their colleagues in the House have long felt that this discrimination in the annuities for retirees from these services, and for their surviving dependents, is unfair and should be eliminated. In fact, at the time of the enactment of the amendments to the Policemen and Firemen's Disability Act in 1957, it was recognized by some Members of Congress that some adjustment to the pensions of older retirees should be the subject of future legislation.

Accordingly, in the 86th Congress a bill, H.R. 3735, to restore the traditional uniformity to all such annuities, regardless of the date of retirement, was passed by the House. The Senate passed this bill with an amendment providing that the annuities of the former members who retired prior to October 1, 1956, would be increased by 10 percent, rather than being made equal to those of the later retirees. The House agreed to this amendment, but despite this modification the bill was vetoed on September 24, 1959.

This effort was resumed in the 87th Congress. S. 1528, identical to the bill as vetoed in the previous Congress except for the deletion of a provision for retroactivity of increases in pensions for surviving dependents of deceased former members, was approved by the Congress but also was vetoed, on September 22, 1961.

By that time, the plight of many of the widows and dependent children of deceased members who had retired or died prior to October 1, 1956, had grown particularly difficult by reason of the very meager annuities to which they were then entitled, and which were inadequate to cope with the steadily rising cost of living. In recognition of this problem, this committee reported S. 1918 on August 8, 1962, extending the benefits of the 1957 amendments to the Policemen and Firemen's Disability Act to all widows and orphaned dependent children of deceased members on a nonretroactive basis. The bill was approved on August 24, 1962, and became Public Law 87–601.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Prior to October 1, 1956, a member of the Police or Fire Departments who retired by reason of disability incurred in line of duty was entitled to an annuity not to exceed 50 percent of his last annual salary. Such a member retiring after that date for disability incurred in line of duty, however, receives an annual pension computed at 2 percent of his last annual salary per year of service, with a minimum of 66⅔ percent and a maximum of 70 percent.

Your committee feels strongly that this situation is a gross injustice, and that at least those older retirees who were rated at 100 percent disability by the Retirement Board, and who thus sacrificed their health and their earning ability in the performance of their hazardous service, are richly entitled to the same annuity benefits as all other retirees in similar circumstances, regardless of their date of retirement. Furthermore, your committee is convinced that the Equalization Act of 1923, which bases all District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments retirees' pensions upon increased salaries whenever there is a salary increase for these forces, does not provide truly equitable treatment by any means for these older totally disabled members, as long as there remains a disparity of from 16⅔ percent to 20 percent in their annuity rates as compared with those of their brothers in service who retired after October 1956. These men faced the same hazards of service, suffered the same loss of physical ability to earn their living as did those who retired under the same circumstances at a later date, and are now facing the same high costs of living. Under these circumstances, it is the view of your committee that the existing difference in the amounts of their annuities should be eliminated, as a matter of simple justice.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

For these reasons, your committee urges favorable action on H.R. 2897, which provides simply that members of the various Police forces and the District of Columbia Fire Department who retired prior to October 1, 1956, for disability incurred in line of duty and which was rated at 100 percent under the Veterans Manual at the time or their retirement, shall have their annuities computed on the basis of the formula provided by the 1957 amendments to the Policemen and Firemen's Disability Act which have been in effect since October 1, 1956. This provision is to be effective on and after the first pay period, which begins after July 1, 1967.

This would increase the pension of such a retiree from the present figure of 50 percent of his last annual salary, as adjusted under the Equalization Act of 1923, to a minimum of 66⅔ percent and a maximum of 70 percent of such salary, depending upon his length of service.

As introduced, H.R. 2897 was identical to a provision in title II of the bill H.R. 15857 of the 89th Congress, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act, which passed the House on June 27, 1966. That provision, however, was subsequently deleted from the bill by House and Senate conferees.

This action by the conferees resulted from a misunderstanding that existed when the language of the provision was drafted. At that time, it was the impression of your committee that a policeman or fireman who was retired for disability prior to October 1, 1956, and who was receiving the maximum allowable annuity of 50 percent of his last annual salary, had been granted this maximum annuity by reason of having been rated by the Retirement Board as 100 percent disabled under the standards of the Veterans Manual. For this reason, the provision in question was so worded as to grant the more liberal benefits to all

members of these forces retired for disability prior to October 1, 1956, and receiving the maximum annuity—50 percent—for such disability. This language would have affected the annuities of some 748 older retired members, which some of the conferees felt would pose a problem.

Recently, however, your committee has learned that members of the Police and Fire Departments who retired for service-incurred disability before October 1, 1956, were awarded the maximum annuity rate of 50 percent if they were rated under the Veterans Manual to be at least 50 percent disabled. Thus, the same rate of pension was granted for disability rated anywhere from 50 percent to 100 percent. In view of this information, your committee amended H.R. 2897 to specify that the more liberal retirement benefits will be authorized only for those older retirees whose disability at the time of retirement was rated at 100 percent, which had been their original intent.

An examination of the personnel files of the members of these police forces and the District of Columbia Fire Department who are presently receiving annuities by reason of retirement for disability of various degrees incurred in line of duty prior to October 1, 1956, reveals that there are some 726 annuitants today, but that only 192 of these were rated under the Veterans Manual at 100 percent disability at the time of their retirement. Thus, not more than 192 retirees will be affected by this proposed legislation, and it is estimated that the cost involved for the first full fiscal year will be approximately $280,000. This cost will of course diminish in the years thereafter.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my wholehearted support of the bill H.R. 2897, the purpose of which is to correct in part an injustice of long standing with respect to former members of the Metropolitan Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who retired prior to October 1, 1956. This proposed legislation provides for such members who retired for service-incurred disability rated at 100 percent the same rates of annuity as are provided for those who retired for disability after the date of October 1, 1956.

Until 1957, when the Congress enacted major amendments to the Policemen and Firemen's Disability Act, effective as of October 1, 1956, there had never been any disparity in the annuities paid to retired members of these forces or to their surviving dependents. These amendments, however, established for the first time a very considerable difference between the amounts granted to those who retired prior to October 1, 1956, as compared to the annuities of those who retired thereafter.

I and some of my colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee have felt strongly that this action was basically unfair, and we have made persistent efforts to remove this differential and to restore the traditional equality of treatment to all such retirees and their dependents. Bills were passed by the Congress in the 86th and 87th Congresses, which sought to restore this equality to some degree, but both were vetoed. In the late stages of the 87th Congress, however, we did succeed in enacting Public Law 87-601, which equalized the pensions of widows and dependent children of the earlier retirees who had died. To this day, however, nothing has been accomplished to equalize the annuities of the retired members themselves.

The bill H.R. 2897, which is identical to H.R. 7355 which I introduced on March 16 of this year, seeks to provide what I consider a very meager minimum of justice, by equalizing the pensions of only those members of the Police and Fire Departments who retired prior to October 1, 1956, for disability incurred in line of duty and which was rated by the Retirement Board under the provisions of the Veterans Manual at 100 percent.

At present, these older disabled retirees are entitled to an annuity of 50 percent of their last annual salary. However, the policeman or fireman who retired after October 1, 1956, for any degree of disability draws an annuity computed at 2 percent of his last annual salary per year of service, with a minimum of 66⅔ percent and a maximum of 70 percent. Considering that these men faced the same dangers and hazards in their daily work, and are now beset by the same rising costs of living, this situation in my opinion is totally inequitable. In this bill we are not asking the full equalization of pensions which we believe to be justified, nor even equal treatment of all who retired by reason of disability. We merely want to obtain for the earlier retirees who were totally disabled in service and thus have sacrificed at least to a large degree their ability to earn a living, the same financial reward as is presently granted to their brothers in service who retired after the magical date of October 1, 1956, for any degree of disability whatever. Obviously, many of these latter are capable of earning a living in some other line of work.

I am informed that at present, there are approximately 820 former members of the Police and Fire Departments who retired prior to October 1, 1956, living and drawing annuities. Of this number, some 726 were retired for disability of various degrees, which is eloquent testimony to the extreme physical dangers which these men faced in the performance of their daily duties. Further, 192 of these men were rated at the time of their retirement as being 100 percent disabled. These are the men whose annuities would be increased by this proposed legislation by from 16⅔ percent to 20 percent.

As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, I do not consider this legislation to be adequate, by any means, to eliminate the injustice which I feel was done to these retired policemen and firemen in the amendments of 1957. From the standpoint of practicality, however, in the light of our experience in the 86th and 87th Congresses, I wholeheartedly commend this legislation for favorable consideration by my colleagues in the House as at least a minimum of just treatment for these gallant public servants who gave so much of their lives and their health for the benefit of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND CHARTER ACT OF CONFERENCE ON STATE SOCIETIES

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 3931) to amend the act of April 3, 1952, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3931

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia", approved April 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 37), is amended as follows:

(1) The first section of such Act is amended by striking out "by the name of 'Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia' " and inserting in lieu thereof "by the name of 'National Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia' ".

(2) Section 18 of such Act is amended by striking out " 'Conference of State Societies, Washington, D.C.,' " and inserting in lieu thereof " 'National Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia,' ".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out lines 7 through 11, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The first section of such Act is amended by striking out "by the name of the 'Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia' " and inserting in lieu thereof "by the name of the 'National Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia' "."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of H.R. 3931 is to amend the charter act of the Conference of State Societies, H.R. 4467, approved April 3, 1952, Public Law 82-293—66 Stat. 37—in order to change its name to "National Conference of State Societies."

The Conference of State Societies was incorporated by the 1952 act referred to, for the purposes of promoting friendly and cooperative relations between the various States and territorial societies in the District of Columbia, to foster, participate in and encourage educational, cultural, charitable, civic and patriotic programs and activities in the District of Columbia and surrounding communities, and to act as contact agent with the States for carrying out State and national programs.

Today its membership includes 52 active State societies, including Guam and Puerto Rico, with approximately 60,000 persons belonging.

Because or the broadening of the scope of the activities of the Conference of State societies, it has requested this legislation to change its name to National Conference of State Societies.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in a letter to the chairman dated March 23, 1967, stated that they

have no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

No opposition to it has been expressed to your committee.

Letter from the Conference of State Societies requesting this legislation, are made a part of this report, as follows:

CONFERENCE OF STATE SOCIETIES,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following background material is offered for your information in respect to H.R. 3820 and H.R. 3931 amending P.L. 293, Eighty-Second Congress, Chapter 131, Second Session (H.R. 4467), April 3, 1952.

"Section Two, Purpose of Corporation, The purpose of this corporation shall be to promote friendly and cooperative relations between the various state and territorial societies in the District of Columbia and to foster, participate in and encourage educational, cultural, charitable, civic and patriotic programs and activities in the District of Columbia and surrounding communities, *to act as contact agent with states for carrying out state and national programs.*"

"Section Four, Headquarters and principal offices of the corporation shall be located in Washington, District of Columbia, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place *but may be conducted throughout the various states and territories of the United States.*"

Current membership consists of fifty-two active societies, including Guam and Puerto Rico, whose aggregate totals approximately sixty thousand persons. Direction is provided by a governing board comprised of one delegate from each society. Management is provided by an Executive Committee comprised of delegate officers who are elected annually for terms of one year. An annual audit of "nonprofit" funds is made by an independent Certified Public Accountant in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and a report is submitted to the House Judiciary Committee as required by the act.

In the past three years, the Conference has engaged in charitable, educational and cultural activities of international scope. Most recently, the Grand Ball of the National Cherry Blossom Festival, held at the Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., joined together all of the Americans in a program of considerable importance. It is the belief of the Executive Committee, therefore, that sufficient justification exists to warrant an official change in name which will truly reflect organizational status and activity.

Your kind consideration in this matter will be gratefully appreciated.

Sincerely,
ROBERT J. SCHISSELL, *President.*

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested—and have acceded to that request—not to call up today for consideration H.R. 3973, the next bill scheduled for consideration.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H.R. 7417) to prescribe administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7417

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act".

OTHER AUTHORITY

SEC. 2. This Act shall supplement all other provisions of law establishing procedures to be observed by the Commissioners and agencies of the District government in the application of laws administered by them, except that this Act shall supersede any such law and procedure to the extent of any conflict therewith.

DEFINITION

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent;

(2) the term "District" means the District of Columbia;

(3) the term "agency" includes both subordinate agency and independent agency;

(4) the term "subordinate agency" means any officer, employee, office, department, division, board, commission, or other agency of the government of the District, other than an independent agency or the Commissioners, required by law or by the Commissioners to administer any law or any rule adopted under the authority of a law;

(5) the term "independent agency" means any agency of the government of the District with respect to which the Commissioners are not authorized by law, other than this Act, to establish administrative procedures, but does not include the several courts of the District and the District of Columbia Tax Court;

(6) the term "rule" means the whole or any part of any Commissioners or agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or to describe the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of the Commissioners or of any agency;

(7) the term "rulemaking" means Commissioners or agency process for the formulation, amendment, or repeal of a rule;

(8) the term "contested case" means a proceeding before the Commissioners or an agency in which the legal rights, duties, or privileges of specific parties are required by any law (other than this Act), or by constitutional right, to be determined after a hearing before the Commissioners or before an agency, but shall not include (A) any matter subject to a subsequent trial of the law and the facts de novo in any court; (B) the selection or tenure of an officer or employee of the District; (C) proceedings in which decisions rest solely on inspections, tests, or elections; and (D) cases in which the Commissioners or an agency act as an agent for a court of the District;

(9) the term "person" includes individuals, partnerships, corporations, associations, and public or private organizations of any character other than the Commissioners or any agency;

(10) the term "party" includes the Commissioners and any person or agency named or admitted as a party, or properly seeking and entitled as of right to be admitted as a party, in any proceeding before the Commissioners or an agency, but nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the Commissioners or an agency from admitting the Commissioners or any person or agency as a party for limited purposes;

(11) the term "order" means the whole or any part of the final disposition (whether affirmative, negative, injunctive, or declaratory in form) of the Commissioners or of any agency in any matter other than rulemaking, but including licensing;

(12) the term "license" includes the whole or part of any Commissioners or agency permit, certificate, approval, registration, charter, membership, statutory exemption, or other form of permission;

(13) the term "licensing" includes process respecting the grant, renewal, denial, revocation, suspension, annulment, withdrawal, limitation, amendment, modification, or conditioning of a license by the Commissioners or an agency;

(14) the term "relief" includes the whole or part of any Commissioners or agency (A) grant of money, assistance, license, authority, exemption, exception, privilege, or remedy; (B) recognition of any claim, right, immunity, privilege, exemption, or exception; and (C) taking of any other action upon the application or petition of, and beneficial to, any person;

(15) the term "proceeding" means any process of the Commissioners or an agency as defined in paragraphs (6), (11), and (12) of this section; and

(16) the term "sanction" includes the whole or part of any Commissioners or agency (A) prohibition, requirement, limitation, or other condition affecting the freedom of any person; (B) withholding of relief; (C) imposition of any form of penalty or fine; (D) destruction, taking, seizure, or withholding of property; (E) assessment of damages, reimbursement, restitution, compensation, costs, charges, or fees; (F) requirement, revocation, or suspension of a license; and (G) taking of other compulsory or restrictive action.

ESTABLISHMENT OF GENERAL PROCEDURES

SEC. 4. (a) The Commissioners shall, for themselves and for each subordinate agency, establish or require each subordinate agency to establish procedures in accordance with this Act.

(b) Each independent agency shall establish procedures in accordance with this Act.

(c) The procedures required to be established by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall include requirements of practice before the Commissioners and each agency.

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner shall publish at regular intervals not less frequently than once every two weeks a bulletin to be known as the "District of Columbia Register," in which shall be set forth the full text of all rules filed in the office of the Commissioners during the period covered by each issue of such bulletin, except that the Commissioners may in their discretion omit from the District of Columbia Register rules the publication of which would be unduly cumbersome, expensive, or otherwise inexpedient, if, in lieu of such publication, there is included in the Register a notice stating the general subject matter of any rule so omitted and stating the manner in which a copy of such rule may be obtained.

(b) All courts within the District shall take judicial notice of rules published or of which notice is given in the District of Columbia Register pursuant to this section.

(c) Publication in the District of Columbia Register of rules adopted, amended, or repealed by the Commissioners or by any agency shall not be considered as a substitute for publication in one or more newspapers of general circulation when such publication is required by statute.

(d) The Commissioners are authorized to publish in the District of Columbia Register,

in addition to rules published under authority contained in subsection (a) of this section, (1) cumulative indexes to regulations which have been adopted, amended, or repealed; (2) information on changes in the organization of the District government; (3) notices of public hearings; (4) codifications of rules; and (5) such other matters as the Commissioners may from time to time determine to be of general public interest.

(e) This section shall become effective thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

PUBLIC NOTICE AND PARTICIPATION IN RULEMAKING

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioners and each independent agency shall, prior to the adoption of any rule or the amendment or repeal thereof, publish in the District of Columbia Register (unless all persons subject thereto are named and either personally served or otherwise have actual notice thereof in accordance with law) notice of the intended action so as to afford interested persons opportunity to submit data and views either orally or in writing, as may be specified in such notice. The publication or service required by this subsection of any notice shall be made not less than thirty days prior to the effective date of the proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal, as the case may be, except as otherwise provided by the Commissioners or the agency upon good cause found and published with the notice.

(b) Any interested person may petition the Commissioners or an independent agency, requesting the promulgation, amendment, or repeal of any rule. The Commissioners and each independent agency shall prescribe by rule the form for such petitions, and the procedure for their submission, consideration, and disposition. Nothing in this Act shall make it mandatory that the Commissioners or any agency promulgate, amend, or repeal any rule pursuant to a petition therefor submitted in accordance with this section.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if, in an emergency, as determined by the Commissioners or an independent agency, the adoption of a rule is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, safety, welfare, or morals, the Commissioners or such independent agency may adopt such rules as may be necessary in the circumstances, and such rule may become effective immediately. Any such emergency rule shall forthwith be published and filed in the manner prescribed in section 7 of this Act. No such rule shall remain in effect longer than one hundred and twenty days after the date of its adoption.

FILING AND PUBLISHING OF RULES

SEC. 7. (a) Each agency, within thirty days after the effective date of this Act, shall file with the Commissioners a certified copy of all of its rules in force on such effective date.

COMPILATION OF LAW

(b) The Commissioners shall keep a permanent register open to public inspection of all rules.

(c) Except in the case of emergency rules, each rule adopted after the effective date of this Act by the Commissioners, or by any agency, shall be filed in the office of the Commissioners. No such rule shall become effective until after its publication in the District of Columbia Register, nor shall such rule become effective if it is required by law, other than this Act, to be otherwise published, until such rule is also published as required in such law.

COMPILATION OF RULES

SEC. 8. (a) As soon as practicable after the effective date of this Act, the Commissioners shall have compiled, indexed, and published in the District of Columbia Register all rules adopted by the Commissioners and each agency and in effect at the time of such compilation. Such compilations shall be promptly supplemented or revised as may be necessary to reflect new rules and changes in rules.

(b) Compilations shall be made available to the public at a price fixed by the Commissioners.

(c) The Commissioners must publish the first compilation required by subsection (a) of this section within one year after the effective date of this Act and no rule adopted by the Commissioners or by any agency before the date of such first publication which has not been filed and published in accordance with this Act and which is not set forth in such compilation shall be in effect after one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

DECLARATORY ORDERS

SEC. 9. On petition of any interested person, the Commissioners or an agency, within their discretion, may issue a declaratory order with respect to the applicability of any rule or statute enforceable by them or by it, to terminate a controversy (other than a contested case) or to remove uncertainty. A declaratory order, as provided in this section, shall be binding between the Commissioners and the agency, as the case may be, and the petitioner on the state of facts alleged and established, unless such order is altered or set aside by a court. A declaratory order is subject to review in the manner provided in this Act for the review of orders and decisions in contested cases, except that the refusal of the Commissioners or of an agency to issue a declaratory order shall not be subject to review. The Commissioners and each agency shall prescribe by rule the form for such petitions and the procedure for their submission, consideration, and disposition.

CONTESTED CASES

SEC. 10. (a) In any contested case, all parties thereto shall be given reasonable notice of the afforded hearing by the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be. The notice shall state the time, place, and issues involved, but if, by reason of the nature of the proceeding, the Commissioners or the agency determine that the issues cannot be fully stated in advance of the hearing, or if subsequent amendment of the issues is necessary, they shall be fully stated as soon as practicable, and opportunity shall be afforded all parties to present evidence and argument with respect thereto. Unless otherwise required by law, other than this Act, any contested case may be disposed of by stipulation, agreed settlement, consent order, or default.

(b) In contested cases, except as may otherwise be provided by law, other than this Act, the proponent of a rule or order shall have the burden of proof. Any oral and any documentary evidence may be received, but the Commissioners and every agency shall exclude irrelevant, immaterial, and unduly repetitious evidence. Every party shall have the right to present in person or by counsel his case or defense by oral and documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. Where any decision of the Commissioners or any agency in a contested case rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, any party to such case shall on timely request be afforded an opportunity to show the contrary.

(c) The Commissioners or the agency shall maintain an official record in each contested case, to include testimony and exhibits, but it shall not be necessary to make any transcription unless a copy of such record is timely requested by any party to such case, or transcription is required by law, other than this Act. The testimony and exhibits, together with all papers and requests filed in the proceeding, and all material facts not appearing in the evidence but with respect to which official notice is taken, shall constitute the exclusive record for order or decision. No sanction shall be imposed or rule or order or decision be issued except upon consideration of such exclusive record, or such lesser portions thereof as may be agreed upon by all the parties to such case. The cost incidental to the preparation of a copy or copies of a record or portion thereof shall be borne equally by all parties requesting the copy or copies.

(d) Whenever in a contested case a majority of those who are to render the final order or decision did not personally hear the evidence, no order or decision adverse to a party to the case (other than the Commissioners or an agency) shall be made until a proposed order or decision, including findings of fact and conclusions of law, has been served upon the parties and an opportunity has been afforded to each party adversely affected to file exceptions and present argument to a majority of those who are to render the order or decision, who, in such case, shall personally consider such portions of the exclusive record, as provided in subsection (c) of this section, as may be designated by any party.

(e) Every decision and order adverse to a party to the case, rendered by the Commissioners or an agency in a contested case, shall be in writing and shall be accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions of law. The findings of fact shall consist of a concise statement of the conclusions upon each contested issue of fact. Findings of fact and conclusions of law shall be supported by and in accordance with the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence. A copy of the decision and order and accompanying findings and conclusions shall be given by the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be, to each party or to his attorney of record.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 11. Any persons suffering a legal wrong, or adversely affected or aggrieved, by an order or decision of the Commissioners or an agency in a contested case, is entitled to a judicial review thereof in accordance with this Act upon filing in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals a written petition for review, except that orders and decisions of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, Commission of Mental Health, Public Service Commission, Redevelopment Land Agency, and the Zoning Commission shall be subject to judicial review in those courts which review the orders and decisions of those agencies on the day before the date of enactment of this Act but such judicial review shall be in accordance with this Act. If the jurisdiction of the Commissioners or an agency is challenged at any time in any proceeding and the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be, take jurisdiction, the person challenging jurisdiction shall be entitled to an immediate judicial review of that action, unless the court shall otherwise hold. The reviewing court may by rule prescribe the forms and contents of the petition and, subject to this Act, regulate generally all matters relating to proceedings on such appeals. A petition for review shall be filed in such court within such time as such court may by rule prescribe and a copy of such petition shall forthwith be served by mail by the clerk of the court upon the Commissioners or upon the agency, as the case may be. Within such time as may be fixed by rule of the court the Commissioners or such agency shall certify and file in the court the exclusive record for decision and any supplementary proceedings, and the clerk of the court shall immediately notify the petitioner of the filing thereof. Upon the filing of a petition for review, the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding, and shall have power to affirm, modify, or set aside the order or decision complained of, in whole or in part, and, if need by, to remand the case for further proceedings, as justice may require. Filing of a petition for review shall not in itself stay

enforcement of the order or decision of the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be. The Commissioners or the agency may grant, or the reviewing court may order, a stay upon appropriate terms. The court shall hear and determine all appeals upon the exclusive record for decision before the Commissioners or the agency. The review of all administrative orders and decisions by the court shall be limited to such issues of law or fact as are subject to review on appeal under applicable statutory law, other than this Act. In all other cases the review by the court of administrative orders and decisions shall be in accordance with the rules of law which define the scope and limitations of review of administrative proceedings. Such rules shall include, but not be limited to, the power of the court—

(1) so far as necessary to decision and where presented, to decide all relevant questions of law, to interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and to determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of any action;

(2) to compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and

(3) to hold unlawful and set aside any action or findings and conclusions found to be (A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; (B) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; (C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations or short of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations or short of statutory rights; (D) without observance of procedure required by law, including any applicable procedure provided by this Act; or (E) unsupported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceeding before the court.

In reviewing administrative orders and decisions, the court shall review such portions of the exclusive record as may be designated by any party. The court may invoke the rule of prejudicial error. Any party aggrieved by any judgment of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals under this Act may seek a review thereof by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in accordance with sections 11–321, 17–101, 17–102, 17–103, and 17–104 of the District of Columbia Code.

PURPOSE OF BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide an Administrative Procedure Act for the District of Columbia, covering the more than 93 administrative governmental agencies operating in the District, and the laws which those agencies administer.

The bill makes mandatory the establishment by the District of Columbia Commissioners for themselves and for all of their subordinate agencies, rules governing the formal and informal procedures prescribed or authorized by the bill, and likewise requires that each independent agency of the District establish such rules for itself.

It is designed to meet the long-admitted need in the District of Columbia for the reform of administrative process and the achieving of uniformity of administrative rules and rulemaking procedures—paralleling the adoption by the Congress of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act covering the Federal administrative agencies.

Nineteen States have enacted similar legislation.

This bill is identical to H.R. 7067 of the 89th Congress, as approved by the House on July 26, 1965—House Report 646.

This legislation is the result of many years of careful work by a number of lawyers in your committee and in the District of Columbia. It has the endorsement of the District of Columbia Bar Association, as well as of the State division of the Administrative Law Section of the American Bar Association.

Full hearing was accorded interested parties by Subcommittee No. 4 on July 6, 1965.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

In essence, the bill has three primary features:

I

First, it provides for the compilation and publication in the District of Columbia Register of all rules and regulations of the administrative agencies of the District of Columbia which are currently in effect. In addition, it would require that prior to the adoption of any rule, or the amendment or repeal of any rule, a notice of such intended action must be published in the District of Columbia Register. The bill thus would afford interested persons the opportunity to submit data or facts on proposed rules or changes in administrative rules before final action is taken by the agency.

Your committee was advised that 14 of the 22 boards and commissions under the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Department of Occupations and Professions alone had no procedural rules at all. Among rules that are published, it is claimed that many contain "little or no exposition of one's rights, few procedural details, inadequate references to the availability and types of hearings, no hint as to appellate review, vague or incomplete statements as to applicable standards, and no references to statutory citations."

II

The second major purpose of the bill is to provide the opportunity of a hearing for all parties in "contested cases," as specifically defined in the proposed bill, and to require that a transcript of the record be kept in all such cases. In addition, the bill would minimize the possibilities of an agency relying on information dehors the record in reaching a decision in a contested case. While the bill is not as explicit as the Federal Administrative Procedure Act in curtailing opportunities of ex parte consultations, it should suffice until trial and error shows that it does not go far enough.

Under the present procedure within the Department of Inspections and Licenses, for example, when a hearing is requested by a licensee or an applicant for a license, the Department transmits the record to the Board of Appeals and Review, but does not forward to the Board, "confidential intradepartmental or interdepartmental correspondence or documents or information of a confidential nature." These it transmits, instead, separately to the Assistant Corporation Counsel who represents the Department of Inspections and Licenses in the particular case and on whose advice the Board most surely will heavily rely.

In recent years, the press has reported that there have been a number of complaints made by applicants who were denied, or had revoked, licenses as pawnbrokers, cabdrivers, automobile salesmen, and practical nurses, to mention just a few, on the grounds that the particular licensing board or commission concerned based their denial or revocation on evidence not found in the record before the agency. Under H.R. 7417, this could not be done.

Similarly, recent complaints have been voiced that the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the Zoning Commission have, on occasion, based their decisions on some hidden reservoirs of alleged facts or knowledge not set out or referred to in the record of the proceedings before the agency.

III

The third important general purpose of the bill is to provide for a uniform means, whereby the final determination of any agency, other than certain rules or decisions expressly excepted by other provisions of the act, may be reviewed in court in accordance with traditional standards, as enunciated in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the other Federal courts of appeal, controlling judicial review of administrative action.

Although the judicial review of the decisions of many agencies of the District of Columbia government now is provided for, or at least, permitted, it is not systematized, and in other instances no clearly defined avenue or channel of judicial review of administrative action is established. Certainly, the Congress will agree that unless parties and litigants have judicial recourse they are, in practical effect, at the mercy of the administrative agencies to whom they must come in seeking vindication or important personal and property rights.

For example, in a zoning decision of some interest, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ruled that the denial of a petition to rezone must be accompanied by findings of fact justifying the reversal, *Donovan* v. *Clark*—222 F. Supp. 634 (D.C., 1963). The Donovan decision thus reaffirmed and applied an elemental principle of fair administrative procedure so far as appeals from decisions of the Zoning Commission to the district court are concerned. However, because of the variety of review channels that exist for appeals from actions of the many various boards and agencies of the District of Columbia, there is no insurance, in the absence of an overall statutory requirement, that the principle that requires administrative findings to accompany administrative decisions will be protected in all future cases.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia concede the need for the reform of the administrative process in the District. However, they do not consider that the representations of the bar association and other groups, complaining existing administrative practices and procedures, establish a public demand or need for an Administrative Procedure Act for the District. Through the Corporation Counsel's Office, they urge that such reforms as are needed can be achieved by rules or orders of the Commissioners, or by the agencies themselves, thus obviating the need for legislation.

Admittedly, some of the conditions complained of have been remedied, in part of the issuance of rules of procedure in some instances where none existed before.

But while there has been improvement in rulemaking and the promulgation thereof, during the past 10 years of advocacy of reforms in District of Columbia administrative procedures, there has been no improvement in, and the Commissioners are powerless to provide, uniform judicial review, or judicial review of and appeals from quasi-judicial agencies. For example, decisions of the District of Columbia Board of Appeals and Review—to which administrative appeals lie from the various constituent agencies within the District of Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections—must be brought to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. On the other hand, within the District Department of Occupations and Professions there are a significant number of constituent boards, commissions, and committees from whose rulings appeals lie to several different courts and, in at least one case, must be brought to the Board of Commissioners themselves, whose action purports to be final—2 District of Columbia Code, 1305 (1961). We have listed the specifics of this statutory maze in the footnote.[1]

Only Congress, through a bill such as H.R. 7417, can unravel such complexity and simplify the review procedures in question.

BACKGROUND

Since 1965 legislation similar to the reported bill has been introduced, considered, and modified in an effort to prescribe definite administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government.

The adoption by the Congress in 1946 of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act—60 Stat. 237—covering the Federal administrative agencies, set the pattern for many of the States to follow. Thus far, the following 19 States have adopted a State Administrative Procedure Act, or portions thereof; guaranteeing minimum standards of fair administrative procedure: Arkansas, California, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Virginia.

The reported bill is based upon the model act for administrative procedures in the States, approved by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. However, it has been modified and adjusted by the Administrative Law Committee of the District of Columbia Bar Association, and by subcommittees of your committee, to embrace the functions of the District, which operates sometimes as a State, sometimes as a city, sometimes as both. Obviously, all the provisions of the usual model State Administrative Procedure Act may not successfully be applied literally to the varied operations of the many different administrative agencies in the District of Columbia. Hence, the model act has been revised in many respects to meet local conditions, so the reported bill is well developed and provides a comprehensive District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act.

CONCLUSION

The need for an Administrative Procedure Act for the District of Columbia to reform administrative process has been established to the satisfaction of your committee.

The District must achieve uniformity of administrative rules and rulemaking procedures and insist on a common, published repository of such rules, so that the person affected by them, as well as his attorney, may learn at least of their existence.

The time for enactment of such a law as H.R. 7417 is now.

The arguments advanced in opposition to the bill are the same arguments which were advanced by the Federal administrative agencies in opposition to the enactment of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act.

Only the Congress can resolve the issue and by a bill such as H.R. 7417 guarantee in the day-to-day operations of an administrative agency those procedures due any litigant.

Your committee believes the reported bill will improve orderly communications between the public at large and the agencies of the District of Columbia government. It would formalize needed procedures and end the informal, across-the-counter type of actions which have characterized too many decisions of some agencies of the District and resulted in too many complaints to and hearings by your committee in years past.

The passage of this bill, your committee believes, should increase the confidence of the public in the operations of administrative agencies of the District of Columbia and thereby add to administrative efficiency, to the benefit of all concerned. The confidence of the public and the bar can only be captured and retained if there are provided definite, objective, statutory standards of fair administrative procedure to guide, and if necessary to control the administrative powers of rulemaking and adjudication, and to assure a full right to judicial review when such powers have been abused or exercised in an unlawful manner.

The approval by the Congress of H.R. 7417 is therefore urged.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider, was laid on the table.

REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF PODIATRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill—H.R. 3370—to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3370

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia", approved May 23, 1918 (40 Stat. 560), as amended (sec. 2–705, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended by designating the first paragraph as subsection (a), by redesignating the second and third paragraphs as subsections (b) and (c), respectively, and by adding at the end of the second paragraph, redesignated herein as subsection (b), the following: "The Board of Podiatry Examiners may, in its discretion, waive both the written and oral tests or either such test and accept in lieu thereof the satisfactory completion by an applicant of an examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners: *Provided,* That such applicant shall pass a practical examination given by the Board of Podiatry Examiners: *Provided further,* That in exercising its discretion to waive the written and oral tests or either such test the Board of Podiatry Examiners shall satisfy itself that the examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners was as comprehensive as that required in the District of Columbia. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Board of Podiatry Examiners may, in its discretion, require an applicant to satisfactorily complete an examination which supplements the examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners, or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners, may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I simply rise to compliment the gentleman from Texas, and the committee as a whole, and the minority Members in bringing this legislation to the floor, and their patience in so doing, and their being so forebearing over the past several District days in not calling this until certain determinations could be made.

Mr. Speaker, I have here from the president of the District of Columbia Po-

---

[1] Review by Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, final review by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit: Board of Barber Examiners for the District of Columbia, sec. 2–1110: Commission on Licensure to Practice the Healing Art in the District of Columbia, sec. 2–129; Physical Therapists' Examining Board, sec. 2–463; Practical Nurses' Examining Board, sec. 2–434.

Revocation by District Court for the District of Columbia upon motion of the Board: Board of Dental Examiners, secs. 2–311, 2–312; Board of Podiatry Examiners, secs. 2–701, 2–708; Commission on Licensure to Practice the Healing Art in the District of Columbia, sec. 2–213; Nurses' Examining Board, sec. 2–407.

Review by Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit: Board of Examiners and Registrars of Architects, sec. 2–1028.

Appeal from revocation by Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia: Board of Examiners of Veterinary Medicine, sec. 2–810.

Review by Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia: Board of Pharmacy, sec. 2–606.

Appeal to the Board of Commissioners only and purporting to be final: District of Columbia, Board of Cosmetology, sec. 2–1305.

Review by District Court for the District of Columbia: District of Columbia Board of Registration of Professional Engineers, sec. 2–1809; Real Estate Commission, sec. 45–1409.

diatry Society, Dr. Edward Ganny, under date of April 21, 1967, a statement which I would ask unanimous consent to be inserted in the RECORD following the remarks that I will conclude at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become apparent with the cooperation of the committee that this National Board of Podiatry Examiners examines on a basis of discretionary reciprocity with the District of Columbia podiatrists. Second, that they are well organized and led in that this requires not only 4 years of education, but a basic science examination at the end of the second year, ordinarily in the podiatry school, and then a final or fourth-year examination involved in the clinical purposes.

This is indeed according to the Podiatry Society of the District of Columbia, recognized in many of our States, in fact, the majority of them, as being generally a more severe and a more self-controlling and proving examination than the various States or the District of Columbia has.

Therefore being interested only in the maintenance of quality care to individuals I have absolutely no further reservation about this bill, but commendation for the committee on the manner in which they have handled it.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I rise simply for the purpose of commending them.

Mr. Speaker, the statement to which I referred earlier is as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PODIATRY SOCIETY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
April 21, 1967.

HON. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: We earnestly request your support for House Resolution No. 3370, introduced by Mr. McMillan, which "amends the the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia" to recognize the National Board of Podiatry Examinations" in lieu of the "local board's own theoretical examinations for licensing of podiatrists in the District." The National Board examination consists of two parts—Part I:

Part I, which includes comprehensive examinations in the basic sciences, such as anatomy, histology, embryology, bacteriology, bio-chemistry, chemistry, pathology, pharmacology, materia medica, physiology, hygiene and public health, generally is taken near the end of the student's second year.

Part II, which covers the fields of dermatology, syphology, jurisprudence, ethics, economics, orthopedics, foot gear podistric medicine, physical medicine, therapeutics, podiatry-chiropody, hospital protocal, radiology, foot pathology, diagnosis, surgery and anesthesia, is usually taken near the end of the student's fourth year of study.

National Board Examinations in Podiatry are now recognized in 27 states and British Columbia.

The Podiatry Society of the District of Columbia, annually submits a list of five well qualified members who are considered by the D.C. Board of Commissioners for appointment to any existing vacancies on the D.C. Board of Podiatry Examiners.

Our sincere thanks.

Respectfully,
EDWARD GANNY, DSC,
President of D.C. Podiatry Society.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill (H.R. 3370) is to provide the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners with the discretionary authority to accept the written theoretical examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners to virtually all graduates of the recognized podiatry colleges, in lieu of the local Board's own theoretical examinations for licensing of podiatrists in the District. However, a satisfactory performance on a practical demonstration test administered by the District of Columbia Board will continue to be required of all applicants for such license.

The National Board of Podiatry Examiners consists of 12 members, representing such nationally recognized professional organizations as the Federation of Podiatry Boards, the American Podiatry Association, and the American Association of Colleges of Podiatry. In addition, 13 groups of prominent educational testing specialists assist the national board in the development of its testing program, which is presently recognized and accepted in 19 States and by the Army and the Navy.

Your committee is advised that the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners favors the adoption of the national board theoretical examinations as the standard for licensing of podiatrists in the District because this examination, by reason of its national scope and character, offers a uniform and consistent measure of academic professional qualification. Also, the resources available to the national board make possible a rapid processing of these tests, and the early reporting of the results to the applicants. Further, all expenses incident to the preparation and administration of these tests are sustained by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners.

We are advised that the examination given by the national board is at least as comprehensive and as difficult as that conducted by the District of Columbia Board. However, this bill charges the District of Columbia Board with the responsibility of satisfying itself that this continues to be the case; and the Board is empowered in its discretion, to require any applicant to supplement his national board examination with whatever further theoretical test or tests the Board may deem advisable.

PRECEDENT

H.R. 6350, which was passed by the House on July 23, 1963, and which was approved on August 19, 1964—Public Law 88-460—extended an identical discretionary authority to the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners, enabling them to accept a national board examination in connection with the licensing of dental hygienists in the District of Columbia.

Your committee is of the opinion that this same authority should be granted with regard to the licensing of podiatrists in the District of Columbia, for the same reasons; namely, the elimination of a needless duplication of theoretical testing with a consequent saving of time and expense on the part of the District of Columbia Board, and also the alleviation of needless hardship on the part of applicants who may have been out of school for some years and yet can demonstrate professional competence by satisfactory performance on the practical demonstration test, which would still be required of all applicants.

HEARING

At a public hearing conducted on February 28, 1964, no opposition was expressed to the enactment of this legislation. This bill is identical to H.R. 9962 of the 88th Congress, which was passed by the House on March 9, 1964—House Report No. 1223—and also to H.R. 1699 of the 89th Congress, approved by the House on February 8, 1965—House Report No. 22.

The following letter, written on January 10, 1967, expresses the D.C. Commissioners' renewed endorsement of this proposed legislation.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1964.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended.

Existing law requires that the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners give an applicant for license as a podiatrist certain examinations consisting of practical demonstrations and written and oral tests. The Board has determined that the examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners is at least as comprehensive and exhaustive as the tests given by the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners. The National Board of Podiatry Examiners is composed of 12 members, of whom 6 represent the Federation of Podiatry Boards, 3 represent the Council on Education of the American Podiatry Association, and 3 represent the American Association of Colleges of Podiatry. Assisting the national board in developing its examinations are 13 groups, each consisting of 3 or 4 members and including outstanding examiners or educators in various fields covered by the examinations. The national board examinations cover the following fields: anatomy, histology, embryology, bacteriology, biochemistry, chemistry, pathology, pharmacology, materia medica, physiology, dermatology, syphilology, jurisprudence, ethics, economics, orthopedics, footgear, podiatric medicine, physical medicine, therapeutics, podiatry-chiropody, hospital protocol, radiology, foot pathology, diagnosis, surgery, and anethesia. The U.S. Army and the U.S. Navy accept the national board examination in considering applications for commissions in those services. The national board program is recognized by the following States: Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Carolina, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The Commissioners recommend the amendment of the Podiatry Act so that the District Board of Podiatry Examiners may in its discretion, waive both the written and oral tests or either such test of an applicant for license as a podiatrist who holds a certificate from the National Board of Podiatry Examiners, providing such person successfully passes the practical examination administered by the District Board of Podiatry Examiners.

It is expected that the examination conducted by the national board is to be at least as comprehensive as that conducted by the District Board. However, since this might not always be the case, the bill requires that the District Board, in exercising its discretion in waiving the written or oral test or both such tests, satisfy itself that the examination given the applicant by the national board was at least as comprehensive as that required in the District of Columbia.

The acceptance of the examination conducted by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners will benefit the District as well as the applicant. By reason of their national character, the national board examinations have a tendency to provide a uniform and consistent measure of the qualifications of persons seeking licensure. The composition of the examination tends to reflect the teaching of the theory of podiatry on a nationwide basis. The resources in personnel and equipment available to the national board make possible the rapid evaluation and dissemination of the results of the examinations. The expense of printing the examinations, furnishing materials, securing administrators and proctors, and payment of shipping charges and all other costs involved in the testing program are sustained by the national board.

The Commissioners are informed that the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners will have complete freedom in connection with interpreting the national board grades, and that there is no objection to the District Board's supplementation of the national board's examinations with any other examination deemed necessary to fulfill District requirements.

Section 2 of the bill is intended to coordinate the proposed amendment of the act of May 23, 1918, as amended, with the requirements of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952, relating to reorganization of the government of the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners anticipate no increased cost to the District as a result of the enactment of the bill.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT—QUIE OFFERS MISLEADING FIGURES TO GARNER VOTES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of 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, the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative QUIE, in introducing his third substitute to H.R. 7819, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967—the bill to extend the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965—inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 20, 1967, a table purporting to show the comparative distribution of funds among States under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as now constituted and under his proposed amendment. According to Mr. QUIE, all States except New York and the District of Columbia would benefit from the block grants proposed by the Quie substitute. However, the claim of increases reflected in Mr. QUIE's table is utterly false.

The major fallacy in Representative QUIE's statistics is that he compares authorizations for the block-grant substitute with what he imagines the administration will request in appropriations for fiscal year 1969. An honest comparison of amounts States would receive under two alternative proposals should compare like with like, authorization with authorization.

The attached table compares authorizations under the Quie substitute with authorizations under the four titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which it would replace.

Several things are clear from this table. First, the $3 billion lump-sum figure in the Quie substitute is actually a substantial decrease in Federal assistance to elementary and secondary education—a cut of $281.5 million from the existing authorization.

Second, 25 States would receive substantially less money under the Quie substitute than they would receive under ESEA. The Department of Defense Overseas Schools and the Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools would be excluded altogther. The States thus hurt include all the Southern and border States, with the exception of Maryland, and some of our Nation's biggest and most populous States—New York, California, Illinois, New Jersey, and Texas, for example. It is precisely these States—States with low per-pupil expenditures for education or States with the largest numbers of educationally disadvantaged children enrolled in school—which need Federal assistance the most.

The table referred to follows:

Comparison of authorizations under H.R. 7819 as approved by the House Committee on Education and Labor and under the proposed substitute by Representative Quie (H.R. 8983), fiscal year 1969 [1]

	Committee bill	Quie bill	Net gain or loss (col. 2 minus col. 1)
United States and outlying areas	$3,281,467,883	[2]$3,000,000,000	$281,467,883
50 States and the District of Columbia	3,198,470,325	2,910,000,000	288,470,325
Alabama	106,719,767	74,984,127	31,735,640
Alaska	5,467,596	4,113,410	1,354,186
Arizona	25,664,306	30,283,668	4,619,362
Arkansas	65,786,875	39,088,258	26,698,617
California	208,855,676	206,119,222	2,736,454
Colorado	26,914,439	31,768,327	4,853,888
Connecticut	26,705,283	28,098,959	1,393,676
Delaware	6,897,339	6,390,385	506,954
Florida	94,349,862	88,597,972	5,751,890
Georgia	118,208,361	88,063,650	30,144,711
Hawaii	8,308,769	11,671,947	3,363,178
Idaho	10,360,644	14,094,094	3,733,450
Illinois	127,666,495	119,475,294	8,191,201
Indiana	55,880,401	76,079,751	20,199,350
Iowa	44,788,350	44,191,479	596,871
Kansas	30,089,487	35,134,269	5,044,782
Kentucky	87,489,613	62,954,095	24,535,518
Louisiana	97,811,654	78,535,534	19,276,120
Maine	14,643,927	17,471,949	2,828,022
Maryland	43,129,420	50,996,592	7,867,172
Massachusetts	49,776,056	60,738,670	10,962,614
Michigan	95,459,641	132,509,268	37,049,627
Minnesota	58,866,056	61,379,507	2,513,451
Mississippi	99,529,772	52,013,966	47,515,806
Missouri	$72,835,424	$64,100,525	$8,734,899
Montana	11,162,661	13,277,485	2,114,824
Nebraska	23,072,816	23,124,793	51,977
Nevada	4,197,514	4,506,765	309,251
New Hampshire	6,762,289	10,254,911	3,492,622
New Jersey	70,762,078	70,052,005	710,073
New Mexico	22,277,154	23,384,655	1,107,501
New York	286,213,671	164,309,713	121,903,958
North Carolina	150,361,444	100,797,585	49,563,859
North Dakota	14,648,447	13,340,319	1,308,128
Ohio	110,928,936	159,489,128	48,560,192
Oklahoma	47,998,215	40,586,581	7,411,634
Oregon	23,349,587	29,127,896	5,778,309
Pennsylvania	141,557,132	157,773,688	16,216,556
Rhode Island	11,097,377	11,211,904	114,527
South Carolina	89,735,037	56,841,559	32,893,478
South Dakota	16,517,657	14,122,708	2,394,949
Tennessee	103,901,688	74,748,791	29,152,897
Texas	222,871,660	198,291,363	24,580,297
Utah	10,975,409	21,925,807	10,950,398
Vermont	6,627,603	7,260,951	633,348
Virginia	89,751,592	77,159,025	12,592,567
Washington	32,580,281	43,028,933	10,448,652
West Virginia	48,384,092	36,279,296	12,104,796
Wisconsin	52,157,299	67,615,259	15,457,960
Wyoming	5,381,397	5,899,625	518,228
District of Columbia	12,992,076	6,734,337	6,257,739
Outlying areas	82,997,558	90,000,000	7,002,442

[1] Estimated authorizations based on:

Title I, estimated 5 to 17 population; low-income factor, $3,000 per annum; AFDC 1965; estimated ADA handicapped children (January 1967); estimated migratory children of migratory workers (FTE 1965); juvenile delinquents (January 1967); dependent and neglected children (January 1967); estimated children 5 to 17 in foster homes supported by public funds (January 1967); and 50 percent State or national average estimated CE per pupil in ADA 1966–67 (except migratory children). Estimated authorizations for administration are 1 percent of estimated authorization for programs or $150,000, whichever is greater. Amount for outlying areas estimated at 2½ percent 50 States and District of Columbia amount.

Title II, estimated distribution of $150,000,000 to the 50 States and District of Columbia on the basis of total public and estimated nonpublic K to 12 enrollment, fall 1966. Amount for outlying areas estimated at 3 percent of 50 States and District of Columbia amount.

Title III, estimated distribution of $500,000,000 to the 50 States and District of Columbia with a basic allotment of $200,000 and the balance distributed 50 percent on the basis of the 5 to 17 resident population, July 1, 1965, and 50 percent on the basis of total resident population, July 1, 1965. Amount for outlying areas estimated at 3 percent of 50 States and District of Columbia amount.

Title V(A), estimated distribution of $56,000,000 with 15 percent ($8,400,000) withheld for special projects, 2 percent ($952,000) of the balance withheld for outlying areas, and the remainder ($46,648,000) distributed (a) 40 percent ($18,659,200) among the States in equal amounts and (b) 60 percent ($27,988,800) distributed on the basis of the total K to 12 public school enrollment, fall 1966.

[2] Estimated distribution of $3,000,000,000 with 3 percent reserved for the outlying areas and the balance distributed on the basis of the State products of (1) fiscal year 1968–69 NDEA allotment ratios which are based on total personal income per school age (5 to 17) child for 1963, 1964, and 1965 with allotment ratio limits of 33⅓ and 66⅔ percent, and (2) estimated 5 to 17 populations, July 1, 1965.

AMERICAN TRADITION IS NOT TO "TURN TAIL AND RUN"

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, so many people are trying to tell us we have to stop the war. They burn their draft cards, they burn the flag; they do all kinds of things we used to consider only a traitor would do.

It was like seeing a new sun go up to have a telegram from one of my constituents whom I shall not name as I have not had time to contact her to ask her permission—but this is what she wired me:

> We may not "demonstrate" in public, nor make speeches with such "dramatic" embellishments as burning draft cards, but regardless we far outnumber those who advocate "peace without honor." Americans have a tradition of finishing what we do—we've never "turned tail and run," and we certainly do not want to start now.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A U.S. DIPLOMATIC ACADEMY

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a bill to establish a U.S. Diplomatic Academy in the Department of State to be known as the John Foster Dulles Diplomatic Academy for Peace. The courses at this academy would be designed to adequately train young men and women to become officers and employees in the diplomatic service of the United States. The courses would equal the curriculum prescribed for the granting of a baccalaureate degree, and would specifically include education and training in all aspects of communism and the science of counteraction to communism.

Mr. Speaker, the world today is a far different world than it was 100, or 50, or even 10 years ago. Scientific and technological advances have brought nations so close that distance is immaterial, and communications are instantaneous. The geography of the world has changed, and new nations have come into existence with new desires of nationalism and self-determination. All of this has exposed the great lack of knowledge and understanding of one nation of another, of the things we have in common, but more important of the differences, in needs, wants, and ideologies. We are, in effect, sitting in each others backyards, yet, with the exception of a few experts on international politics, we know very little about each other.

It is essential, now more than ever, that we concentrate our efforts on the science of peace and diplomacy—that we provide more of our people who are involved in international affairs with the special tools and methods necessary for the waging of peace through effective, skilled diplomacy. This is no less a science than that of waging war. Since 1802, when the U.S. Military Academy at West Point was established, we have trained young men in the science of war. It is just as necessary that we now establish the means to train our young people in the science of peace and all that it involves.

My bill would provide that the Secretary of State set up an academy and appoint a staff to include a superintendent, a dean of the academic board, a dean of students, and such professors needed to carry out the purposes of the act.

Students between the ages of 17 and 21 would be nominated and appointed in much the same manner as that used at our military academies and would include a certain number of students from Canada, the American Republics, and the Republic of the Philippines. An oath of allegiance would be required of all students. They would receive the same pay, allowances, and emoluments as is now provided for cadets at the U.S. Military Academy.

A Board of Visitors to the Academy, composed of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, three Senators, four Members of the House, and six persons designated by the President, would visit the Acadamy annually and submit a written report to the President and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the need for adequately trained people to meet the present and future requirements of our diplomatic service will be realized, and that my bill will be given favorable consideration.

STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK

Mr. BUTTON. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last December 13 an outstanding free world political leader, former Prime Minister of Poland Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, died in neighboring Chevy Chase, Md.

At the time of his death Mr. Mikolajczyk was serving as president of the Polish Peasant Party and was honorary president of the International Peasant Union, an organization he had organized 18 years ago.

Mr. Mikolajczyk should have died in a free Warsaw rather than an exile from the tyranny now prevailing in his homeland, Poland. Unfortunately, the power of the Soviet Army, not the will of the Polish people, prevails today behind the Iron Curtain.

The spring 1967 issue of the International Polish Union publication will be a special issue honoring this great Polish patriot and international peasant leader. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD excerpts from an article which will appear in that spring publication, written by Mr. Robert B. Soumar, managing editor.

A GREAT LEADER

Stanislaw Mikolajczyk was born in German Westphalia, but he spent half of his unusually interesting and tense life living abroad. Perhaps his love of his nation grew even greater as a result of having to pass so many years outside of Poland. His father was a miner in Westphalia. As a child, Mikolajczyk's parents told him about the land of his forefathers. The stories seemed like fairy tales, and he dreamed of the day he could return to his people and to the land. This dream soon came true. His family went back to the German-held Poznan province and bought a small farm. At last they possessed a piece of Polish land. Throughout his life Mikolajczyk was concerned with the problems of the Polish village. The problems of the Polish village paralleled the aims of the Polish nation: to live again in an independent and democratic Poland, where the Polish peasant, the backbone of Polish patriotism, could live freely and with dignity.

Mikolajczyk died in the United States. But thousands of miles away, millions of peasants from the Baltic to the Adriatic prayed fervently for the peace of his soul. In defiance of the communist government, these people, yearning for freedom, celebrated masses for Mr. Mikolajczyk in cities and villages throughout Poland. For East Central European people, Mikolajczyk remains a symbol of the unending peasant struggle against communism and for peasantry's political, economic and social freedom. East Central European peasants feel, however, that the death of the valiant leader is an immense and irreparable loss for the people and for the cause of their liberty.

Besides paying tribute and honor to the great statesman, the free world press emphasized Mikolajczyk's tragedy: his lifelong struggle for a free and democratic Poland, and a better lot for Polish and world peasantry—a struggle still unfinished at his death.

At the end of World War I the young Mikolajczyk fought as a volunteer in the revolutionary struggle for independent Poland. Two years later he fought the Bolshevik invaders.

Although his prewar political ascendancy in Poland was rapid and spectacular, his major role in Polish and world politics came during World War II.

WORLD WAR II

1939. Again it was a fateful hour for Poland. As an enlisted soldier, Mikolajczyk defended his country against Nazi hordes. From the defeated Poland, he made his way to Paris where he assumed the duties of Vice-President and Acting President of the Polish National Council (Polish Parliament) in exile. The President of the Council was the famous piano virtuoso and great Polish patriot, Ignace Paderewski.

After the defeat of France, Mikolajczyk reached Great Britain and became a Vice-Premier and Minister of the Interior of General Sikorski's Polish government in London. When General Sikorski was killed in the Gibraltar plane crash in 1943, Mikolajczyk became the Polish Government's Prime Minister. He headed the government during the war period, a very crucial period for Poland. In its obituary on Mikolajczyk the London Times praised his balanced judgment and democratic views, and went on to note the high esteem in which he was held by the allied leaders.

As Prime Minister of the London Polish government, Mikolajczyk was faced with great moral responsibility. It was the Polish nation that first took arms against Nazi aggression and with unbelievable bravery and terrible human and material sacrifices continued to fight the occupation forces. Hun-

dreds of thousands of Polish guerrillas harassed the German army. Millions of Poles had been massacred and Mikolajczyk was sending Polish divisions to fight side by side with victorious Allied armies. But what would be the recompense for all these sacrifices on the part of the Polish people? Would their own allies deprive them of the taste of victory? Would they be deprived of the right to rebuild an independent Polish state? Mikolajczyk faced such a situation and the coming events filled him with alarm.

The tension between two uneasy allies—Poland and Soviet Russia—was rising and the unfortunate fate of Eastern Central Europe was already taking shape. Exiled Poles in London were facing a very difficult situation and Mikolajczyk's political struggle extended to a multitude of fronts. Soviet Russia, then Poland's war ally, had made a pact with the Nazis only a few years earlier in which Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia agreed to eliminate the Polish state and divide it between themselves. There was the tragedy of the Katyn massacre of 10,000 Polish officers by the Soviets. Then came the fateful Warsaw uprising against the retreating Nazi army so cruelly sabotaged by Stalin. A quarter of a million Polish people—the cream of Polish democratic leadership—perished in Warsaw. and the city remained a mass of ruins.

It became very clear that the Soviets were playing a false game. Mikolajczyk's government and the Polish people ceased to be masters of the destiny of their country. The Western allies were defending their own interests and were blind to the fact that their interests were exactly parallel to the interests of Poland and other East Central European nations. Mikolajczyk, in spite of all reverses, struggled heroically to keep Poland, just liberated from the Nazis by the Red Army, from becoming a communist state.[1] Before the Yalta Conference he went to Washington and pleaded with President Roosevelt, warning him of the new Soviet danger. He was in frequent contact with Churchill and went to Moscow twice to see and negotiate with Stalin.

The major issue at the notorious 1945 Yalta Conference dealing with the East European question was the problem of Poland. Poland and Mikolajczyk were the focal points of controversy between Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin. For Stalin the problem was clear: victory for Mikolajczyk would mean a democratic Poland and the defeat of Stalin in his plans to communize Eastern Central Europe. President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill finally yielded to Stalin's stubborn stand and Mikolajczyk, his London government and the Polish nation lost. At Churchill's insistence, Stalin agreed that Mikolajczyk could be a member of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity dominated by the communist so-called "Lublin Committee". In his memoirs Churchill said that the Lublin Poles were mere pawns of the Russians; yet he urged Mikolajczyk to join the provisional government.[2]

Mikolajczyk finally consented to go to Poland. He knew the danger of his enterprise only too well. During the War the Polish underground helped his son to escape from a Nazi concentration camp and smuggled him to London. Mikolajczyk's wife spent the war in Nazi concentration camps. She was finally liberated by the American army and came to London. Mikolajczyk left his wife and son in Great Britain and went alone to Poland to lead the struggle against the communists.[3]

RETURN TO POSTWAR POLAND

In the communist-dominated coalition government, Mikolajczyk became Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture. His return to Poland was the return of a glorious son and saviour. He became a legendary figure, a symbol for all the forces that wanted to save Poland from communism. The communists were a small group of conspirators. But all the physical and moral strength of the Polish nation was powerless against them. Although Mikolajczyk's popularity was immense and he had behind him a powerful peasant party which represented the great majority of voters, Mikolajczyk soon realized that he could not control the instruments of power. As in other parts of Eastern Central Europe, the communists, following the classical advice of Lenin, took over all power-controlling positions in the government. The masters of Poland were the Soviet Army and police, and the Polish communists who controlled the Polish army and police and the administration of the country.

Mikolajczyk also realized that as a member of a communist-dominated coalition government, his hands were tied. Violence and subversion were the communist tools in the election campaign. The outcome of the 1947 elections was falsified by the communists. In protest, Mikolajczyk resigned as a member of government and went into resolute open opposition. In doing so, he was attempting the impossible. In exposing the communists as traitors to Poland, he became at the same time an outspoken critic of the Soviet takeover. The communist terror, the burning of villages, the arrests, intimidation and even murder of his most active supporters made Mikolajczyk's position less and less tenable. He fought the Red tide until it overwhelmed Poland in the fall of 1947. When he learned that he was to be arrested and executed, Mikolajczyk escaped to the West. His flight was the only alternative to awaiting a death sentence from a Polish military court.

MIKOLAJCZYK IN EXILE

In 1948, Mikolajczyk, reunited with his wife and son in London, chose Washington, D.C. as the seat of his manifold activities. After his arrival in the United States, he wrote a series of 40 articles entitled: "The Coming Russian Terror", which was published by more than 200 newspapers in both Americas, Europe and Asia. He wrote a book, "The Rape of Poland" which has been published in a number of languages.

Mikolajczyk organized his Polish Peasant Party in exile with regional organizations in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany, Scandinavia, Switzerland and later in Latin America and Australia. All these organizations, along with the peasant underground in Poland are still a very active homogeneous body, and Mikolajczyk's program continues to be its moral and political guide.

In 1948 Mr. Mikolajczyk was elected the first President of the International Peasant Union, an exile organization of agrarian parties from ten Soviet-captive countries. In 1950 he became President of the Polish National Democratic Committee.

PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEASANT UNION

It is difficult to describe in only a few lines those sixteen years of effort by the indefatigable President of the International Peasant Union. He was a tireless and eloquent spokesman against communist tyranny, a staunch advocate for the cause of democracy and the unity of nations in East Central Europe.

The International Peasant Union was formed twenty years ago with an impressive, European-wide organization. Its central office was in Washington, D.C., but branch offices were located in New York, London, Paris, Rome and Munich and, in addition, there were regional councils in other European cities. The free world press and democratic political organizations welcomed the enterprise with great interest. The vehement reaction of the communists and immediate attacks on the organization underscored its importance.

The prewar predecessor of the I.P.U. was the International Agrarian Bureau in Prague, popularly known as "Green International". Members included agrarian parties from nineteen European nations. The peasant parties' organized prewar struggle against communism and any form of unrepresentative dictatorial government was a valuable heritage for the new organization. It gave the International Peasant Union the needed prestige in the free world.

Mr. Mikolajczyk, as the President of the International Peasant Union, assisted by Dr. George M. Dimitrov, its Secretary General, members of the organization's Central Committee, political representatives, officials and I.P.U. publications, made full use of this political advantage. Enriched by his postwar experiences in Poland, where he fought so bravely against communists, he was the leader best qualified to stir resistance behind the Iron Curtain. Mikolajczyk was largely responsible for organizing the Polish resistance to communism and it is a movement which is still dramatically alive.

The I.P.U. brought the message and knowl-

---

[1] When Mikolajczyk escaped from Poland in 1947 he described his struggle for independent Poland in his book: "The Rape of Poland", published in the U.S.A. and translated into a number of languages. Churchill, commenting to Mikolajczyk on the book, declared: "You wrote bitter things about me, but I cannot say that all of these were not true. My duty was to advise you from the point of view of British interests, and you had a choice to follow the advice or not." Churchill's remark was quite cynical, but such remarks are often the rule in international politics.

[2] The Yalta agreements and Mikolajczk's and Poland's tragedy were extensively reported in postwar literature. Churchill in his war memoirs and Mikolajczyk in his book "The Rape of Poland" dealt with the problem thoroughly.

[3] From the great number of letters of sympathy sent to Mr. Mikolajczyk's son, Marian, and to the International Peasant Union, the letter of W. Averell Harriman, U.S. Ambassador-at-Large is pertinent to the abovementioned problem:

DECEMBER 15, 1966.

DEAR MR. MIKOLAJCZYK: I am distressed to learn of your father's death. I have known and worked with your father since the days in London, first when he was Deputy Prime Minister under General Sikorski and later as Prime Minister of the Polish Government in exile. I have ever been impressed by his courage, patriotism and devotion to his ideals.

We went through many trying times together in Moscow attempting to negotiate with Stalin an agreement for the independence of Poland. Unhappily none succeeded. I saw him just before he left Moscow to go to Warsaw to assume the position of Deputy Prime Minister in the coalition government. He told me then that although he had grave concern over the good faith of the Soviets and of the Polish communists, and feared that the attempt at a coalition would not work, he felt that the chance had to be taken for the possible protection of the freedom of the Polish people. He told me as I said goodbye and wished him well, "You may never see me again."

He escaped before he was arrested and carried on gallantly, loyal to his commitments to his people.

I greatly valued my association with him over the years and will ever respect his memory. He exemplified the finest qualities of Polish gallantry.

I send you and the members of your family my deepest sympathy in your great loss.

Sincerely,

W. AVERELL HARRIMAN.

edge of conditions behind the Iron Curtain to those in the free world, and especially to developing nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America, who were in danger of becoming victims of communism.

Since its foundation, the International Peasant Union's main objective has been and still is to help the East Central European people to freedom. Broadcasts to countries behind the Iron Curtain have greatly helped the morale of the resisting peasantry. The organization developed an extensive publication activity. Bulletins, documents, booklets, memoranda and manifestos addressed to peasants of Asia, Africa and Latin America in English, French, German and Italian were sent to 22 overseas countries. Conferences and round-table discussionss dealing with problems of communism, the democratization of Eastern Central Europe and the reconstruction of its agriculture, have been held in various parts of the free world. Naturally the organization participated in the efforts of the European Movement. Representatives of the International Peasant Union have been speakers at the Congresses of International Federation of Agricultural Producers and Confederation of European Agriculture.

The I.P.U. Congresses are held each second year in various cities of the United States and Europe. They are attended by free world political leaders from the United States, Europe and Asia.

Mr. Mikolajczyk and the International Peasant Union were ceaselessly attacked by the communists. It is the best proof of his and the organization's popularity among the Soviet captive nations from the Baltic to the Adriatic.

Mikolajczyk was often attacked in the free world as well, mostly by those who failed to understand the problems and dangers of communism. Ten years ago, the situation in Poland was explosive. There was the Poznan uprising, and evidence of unrest in Hungary (which later became a revolution). When Gomulka came to power in Poland, the Western world was unduly optimistic, hoping that miracles would happen and that freedom for the East European people was just around the corner. While preparing for the memorable Fifth Congress of the International Peasant Union in Paris, (the Congress was held during the Hungarian Revolution) Mikolajczyk warned that credit for the upheaval in Poland should go to the resisting Polish nation. No credit should go to the Polish Communist Party, nor to Gomulka. "Gomulka was put in power in Poland to save Poland for communism and for the Soviets," declared Mikolajczyk. For this evaluation of the situation in Poland, Mikolajczyk was strongly attacked by the West and by Polish exiles. But Mikolajczyk knew Gomulka well. Gomulka saved Poland for communism and no other communist leader is so trusted in Moscow. Gomulka became a counselor on all major international moves of the Soviet leaders. This is one example of how Mikolajczyk faced the reality of a situation, and, when attacked by East or West, relied upon his own moral strength.

DID MIKOLAJCZYK FIGHT IN VAIN?

When he decided to join the coalition government led by the communists—as related heretofore—he knew very well that he had little chance of saving Poland for democracy. Only his great courage, immense popularity in Poland and love for his people led him to try his chances in post-war Poland.

But Mikolajczyk, in his two and a half years of a really heroic struggle showed the Polish people the way. Helped by the Catholic Church, he organized the peasants' resistance into a force which still miraculously opposes its enslavement. The communists were unable to force the peasants into collectives and the peasantry is at present the backbone of the Catholic Church's remarkable resistance to communism. Could the collectivized peasants support so staunchly the present successful Church resistance against communist regime? Certainly not.

MIKOLAJCZYK'S FAREWELL

Even in the final months of his life when he was gravely ill, the fate of his people was uppermost in Mikolajczyk's mind: In celebration of the millennium of Poland's Christianity, his broadcast to the Polish people shortly before his death echoed grief and melancholy over the fate of his country and his hope for its better future.

Mikolajczyk spoke with unusual emotion:

"This year we celebrate a rare occasion—a millennium of Christian Poland. A millennium is a very long period of time. Many generations have passed. Our nation has lived through great victories and disasters, ascents and falls, pride and shame, dignity and humiliation, joy and suffering, hope and despair. Thus the centuries have formed and shaped our national character and our national spirit within the framework of Christian principles and ideology. . .

"The reception of Christianity in Poland was a very wise move on the part of Mieszko I. It protected Poland from extermination by Germany and opened the way to progress and civilization—a civilization in which the Church played a large role. . .

"My people of Christian Poland, wherever fate has thrown you, no matter how bitter your life is, no matter what work you do or will do, do not be led astray by the Communist hypocrites. Always try to learn the truth at its source and not from lying Communist propaganda. Persevere by the side of your leaders; leaders who fight for the freedom of Poland in difficulty and danger. . .

"A free Poland will rise, and a free people will undertake to build a just motherland for all her children. And in this Poland, the people will create a "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people", as Abraham Lincoln did for the American people. Happiness and joy will return to our country. The nightmare of Communist tyranny will disappear and man will once again become his neighbor's brother. . .

"The Green Banners, decorated with the picture of Our Lady of Czestochowa that are denied to us today, will again flutter over Polish soil. The work-hardened hands of the peasants will again lower the banners to honor those who risked their lives and fought with dignity for freeedom and justice. . .

"The Peasant Festival in Poland was always a great day. Hundreds of thousands of peasants, carrying green banners adorned with images of Mary, the Mother of God, and carrying golden ears of wheat and clover, flocked to the churches all over Poland.

"Joy filled the hearts of the peasant masses. Despite want and distress, the breath of spring and the sight of nature awakening to a new life brought hope to their hearts. The peasant huts were decorated with bundles of sweet flag and the fragrance of meadows' flowers filled the air. . .

"I am speaking to you with joy . . ."

But Mikolajczyk's voice was feeble and broken, and the broadcast was his last message to his people. Last December 13th Mikolajczyk's heart failed and the struggle of the great Polish patriot came to an end. The masses which were celebrated for Mikolajczyk all over Poland were the message of the Polish people that Mikolajczyk's heritage remains the Voice of Free Poland.

Mr. Speaker, this great patriot for the cause of freedom, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, did not see, within his lifetime, the fulfillment of this dream of restoration of freedom to Poland and other enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain but he left a rich legacy. The memory of his personal sacrifice and perseverance will remain an inspiration to the millions of people still struggling to end the tyranny of communism.

May he rest in peace. May his memory be honored for all those who continue the great struggle for freedom. May the Lord bless and keep him.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. BUTTON. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, H.R. 9036, to be known as the Social Security Amendments of 1967. This bill provides for an 8-percent across-the-board benefit increase retroactive to January 1 of this year. This is the maximum amount possible without the addition of further burdens on wage earners through an increase in the payroll tax.

The bill also contains an automatic increase in benefits to compensate for advances in cost of living. Since wage increases usually precede or are coexistent with advances in other cost-of-living factors, the gain in additional covered workers near the maximum social security wage base would not necessitate increase in cost as a level percentage of payroll. My bill provides that whenever the Consumer Price Index rises by 3 percent or more in a calendar quarter, there would be a corresponding increase in benefit income.

To encourage recipients to help themselves through outside earnings, H.R. 9036 would raise the allowable outside earnings from $1,500 to $2,400 a year without loss of social security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now because our senior citizens have watched their fixed pensions, annuities, savings, and social security benefits shrink in purchasing power because of inflation. This plan will allow for a realistic increase in benefits without further jeopardizing the financial integrity of the system.

BILL FOR SVETLANA NOW UNNECESSARY

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the good—though somewhat tardy—judgment of the State Department in admitting Svetlana Stalina to the United States on a temporary but indefinite visa has now made academic my private bill

to grant her political asylum. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have written the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee indicating that further action on H.R. 7600 is unnecessary.

Many of us in the Congress felt that when Miss Stalina requested asylum in the United States, it should have been automatically extended to her. Certainly this action would have been in keeping with our traditions.

To have denied her refuge in the United States might have had unpleasant consequences if at some future time another controversial figure in a Communist country sought asylum in the United States. Miss Stalina may have no wish to be a pawn in the cold war and her wishes should be respected. To make a circus out of her decision to leave the Soviet Union would not go unnoticed among those who seek solitude in their asylum.

I would not want this opportunity to pass without expressing my personal appreciation to George Kennan, who volunteered to serve as intermediary between Miss Stalina and our State Department. Ambassador Kennan has performed outstanding service to this Nation in his 40-year career as a member of the Foreign Service. At one time he was our Ambassador to the Soviet Union and later to Yugoslavia. His major contribution to our foreign policy was the doctrine of containment which he proposed to the President in 1948. In volunteering for this difficult responsibility, he demonstrated again his willingness to serve the best interest of the United States.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Legislature has directed that its resolution urging the reconsideration and amendment of the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965, Senate Journal Resolution 21, be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

With the permission of this body, I am attaching the official notification of this action, signed by William P. Nugent, chief clerk of the Wisconsin Senate, and a copy of the Wisconsin Legislature's joint resolution, and I respectfully include them to be printed in full:

WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE,
SENATE CHAMBER,
Madison, April 18, 1967.

Hon. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHADEBERG: Upon direction of the Wisconsin State Legislature I am transmitting to you a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 21, memorializing Congress to reconsider and amend the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-285) for the purpose of making it more flexible and workable.

This Resolution was adopted by both Houses of the Wisconsin Legislature.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
Chief Clerk, Senate.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 21

Memorializing Congress to reconsider and amend the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-285) for the purpose of making it more flexible and workable

The legislature of the state of Wisconsin enthusiastically approves and is desirous of co-operating in carrying out the general plan for roadside beautification under the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965, the objectives of which are primarily the same as Wisconsin's long established and continuing program to construct and maintain highways that serve and attract our resident population and many tourist guests. Nevertheless after careful study it appears that the means and methods prescribed by the act for achieving its goals, including the proposed rules and standards for its administration, not only completely change or nullify historic Wisconsin methods of controlling roadside outdoor advertising, but pose an economic and financial impact so adverse to highway construction and roadside control in Wisconsin as to make compliance therewith untenable; and, on the other hand, noncompliance therewith will result in a severe retardation of the Wisconsin highway construction and improvement program. The reasons for this are patent.

Heretofore and for many years in Wisconsin, billboards, junk yards and unsightly structures along the interstate highway system have been controlled by legislative zoning under the police power. The Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 requires that states conforming to the act must control the same along both the interstate and federal primary systems, and fails to permit an exemption for local control within incorporated areas, thereby increasing the number of miles which would have to be controlled in Wisconsin from about 460 to 6,000 miles, affecting approximately 44,000 billboards and 451 junk yards. It further requires that such controls must be exercised not later than January 1, 1968, by removing about 40,000 of these billboards, which would be rendered illegal under the federal act, upon payment of just compensation to the owners thereof and also to the owners of the land on which they are maintained, and by screening and landscaping the junk yards or, in the alternative when that cannot be done successfully, removing them after just compensation has been paid to the owners.

This in itself would be an insurmountable undertaking by the state, but the real dilemma is that the cost of such control program will approximate $20,000,000 of which Wisconsin will have to pay one fourth, and that the entire $5,000,000 plus an undeterminable amount for future cost of such controls will be diverted from construction of Wisconsin highways to the beautification program. Not included in these figures are the undetermined amounts necessary to control areas where no signs presently exist or for signs installed after the passage of this act on October 22, 1965.

Another unpalatable phase of the federal act is that if a state conforming thereto fails to meet the deadline or elects not to conform in effecting such controls it will forfeit 10% of its otherwise allotted federal highway construction aids annually until it complies.

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That for the purpose of seeking to improve the workability of the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 to make the act sufficiently flexible to better recognize the variations in conditions between states, to minimize so far as practicable the wholesale nullification or revision of historic state legislation governing control of roadside billboards and junk yards, to give the right to exempt control within incorporated areas, to give states further time in which to meet deadlines for accomplishing effective control of roadside billboards and junk yards, and to enable states to exercise control over roadside billboards and junk yards by legislative zoning under the police power as an alternative to condemnation or payment of damages, the legislature of the state of Wisconsin memorializes the Congress of the United States to reconsider and amend the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 accordingly; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each house of the Congress and to each Wisconsin member thereof.

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

This Joint Resolution requests the Congress of the United States to reconsider and amend the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 for the purpose of making it more flexible to meet the conditions of the several states and particularly to enable states to control roadside advertising and junk yards by legislation instead of paying damages for removal thereof and to extend deadlines for accomplishing effective control of advertising and junk yards along federal highways under the act.

KAREN PESARESI, MANHATTAN, KANS., NAMED 1967 ALL-AMERICAN HOMEMAKER OF TOMORROW

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, it was a proud day for Kansas last Thursday when Miss Karen Pesaresi, an 18-year-old high school senior from Manhattan, Kans., was named the 1967 Betty Crocker All-American Homemaker of Tomorrow.

Karen was chosen from an original field of 580,000 senior girls representing nearly 15,000 of the Nation's high schools. She became the State finalist for Kansas and competed with 50 other winners representing each State and the District of Columbia. She will receive a $5,000 scholarship from General Mills, the sponsor of the program.

It was my pleasure to meet Karen and her teacher chaperone, Mrs. Tyra Davis, last week when a reception was held in Washington for the 51 finalists. They then went to Colonial Williamsburg, Va., where Karen's selection as the All-American Homemaker of Tomorrow was announced.

All those who met Karen and visited with her at the reception know that this honor went to a deserving young lady. She will wear her title well and she will be an inspiration to all other young ladies who see homemaking as one of the greatest of callings a woman can follow. My colleagues and I salute her and wish her well as she becomes

even better qualified as a homemaking expert through her studies at Kansas State University in her hometown of Manhattan.

In order that all my colleagues can know about the sterling qualities of Karen Pesaresi, I include with my remarks an account of her background and training which appeared in the Manhattan, Kans., Mercury.

The account follows:

The 1967 All-American Homemaker of Tomorrow is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Karl Pesaresi, 810 Moro, Manhattan. She has two brothers, Karl, 20, and Walter, 16. An honor student throughout junior and senior high school at Manhattan High, she ranks in the upper five percent of her class of 331, has participated in numerous extra-curricular activities—including Future Homemakers of Tomorrow and several musical activities and groups—and represented her school at Kansas Girls State.

Music plays a big part in her life. She has taken piano lessons for 11 years, teaches piano herself, and is a three-time superior winner at the National Federation of Music Clubs Junior Division Festivals. She has also received "one" ratings at the State Music Festival.

In addition to other piano work, she sings in Manhattan High's "Pops" Choir—a select group of 23 boys and girls—and in the school's Robed Choir and the First Presbyterian Church choir, and is a violinist in the school orchestra. She has been awarded three music scholarships to the Sherwood Music School Summer Seminars in Chicago.

Miss Pesaresi lists cooking—"even though I used to hate being in the kitchen"—housecleaning, and sewing as her favorite homemaking duties. She has been making many of her own clothes in recent years.

Elaborating on her feeling that good management is a homemaker's greatest asset, she says, "A woman in the home must be well-organized and able to manage everything from time to money to energy. If, in addition, she has a career, the problem of management increases. The well-organized homemaker will be an asset to her family and friends."

Miss Pesaresi has been saving most of the money she earns through piano teaching and her part-time job at a dress store for her education. She plans to major in home economics at Kansas State University, and go on to graduate school. Her choice of a major was influenced by what she describes as the "practicality" of a home economist.

National awards in the annual Betty Crocker Search for the American Homemaker of Tomorrow, now in its 13th year, are made on the basis of scores in a written homemaking knowledge and attitude examination taken by all participants in early December and personal observation and interviews of state winners during an Eastern tour climaxed by the awards dinner. This year's tour included Washington, D.C., and Colonial Williamsburg.

MRS. TOM BUCHANAN, WASHINGTON, KANS., NAMED TOP KANSAS WOMAN JOURNALIST OF THE YEAR

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, it pleased me to note that Mrs. Tom Buchanan of Washington, Kans., has been named the Kansas Woman Journalist of the Year by the Kansas State University chapter of Theta Sigma Phi, national honorary society for women in journalism.

Mrs. Buchanan is a columnist and a part-time assistant on her husband's paper, the Washington County News. She was chosen by previous winners of the award and received the recognition for her accomplishments in community and writing fields.

Mrs. Buchanan has combined the raising of a family of five children with her newspaper work. She has previously received the first place award in a National Federation of Press Women feature story contest and has also won the group's award for editorials, news stories, publicity, her weekly column, and for advertising writing.

The Kansas Woman Journalist of the Year graduated with honors from Sterling College in 1950 where she was editor of the yearbook and president of the student government board.

Knowing Mrs. Buchanan and how she has reared her fine family, while at the same time making a significant contribution to journalism in Washington County and the State of Kansas, I join in recognizing her for her achievements. I commend Theta Sigma Phi for naming her Kansas Woman Journalist of the Year.

PROTECT FISHERIES RESOURCES OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to protect the fisheries resources of the Continental Shelf from indiscriminate use of underwater explosives. As presently written, the law requires private firms who want to conduct underwater seismic tests for purposes of oil exploration, to obtain a license from the Secretary of the Interior. The job of the Secretary is to see that marine life and other marine resources are adequately protected while the search for oil goes on.

A disturbing gap in the law, Mr. Speaker, is the omission of Government agencies from the requirement of permission from the Secretary. Agencies such as the National Science Foundation, it appears, could conduct underwater blasting for experimental purposes, without any concern for fish and shellfish resources in the area. Since the Secretary of Interior has been given responsibility in our Government for protection and development of all underwater resources, it seems only fitting that the law should apply to public agencies as well as private.

While it would not interfere with the military departments in their carrying out of overriding defense responsibilities, my bill would bring other Government agencies under the supervisory authority of the Secretary of the Interior. Licenses would be issued to these agencies for underwater seismic work on the same basis, and under the same protection, as they are to private firms. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this measure will serve to promote development of new underwater riches, while conserving and protecting those which we already have.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9062

A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require certain agencies of the United States to obtain authorization from the Secretary of the Interior before undertaking geological and geophysical explorations in the outer Continental Shelf

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1340) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Any agency of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "Any military department of the United States, any other department, agency, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the United States government authorized by the Secretary,"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "As used in this section, 'military department' means the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and the Coast Guard.".

PRIVATE PENSION PROGRAMS

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for many years, public and private policy has been concerned with the welfare of the American worker and his family, both during and after he has completed his working life. Concern in providing financial support for the aged has been exemplified in our country through the development of various institutional arrangements, the most prominent and well known of which is the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, which is more commonly known as social security. Over nine out of 10 workers, totaling over 80 million persons, are now covered or eligible for coverage. Over 90 percent of the persons now turning 65 are eligible for benefits and this figure has been increasing yearly. Up to date, social security has been successful in carrying out the intent evidenced by the Congress in providing a basic floor of protection to assure the aged worker and his family of freedom from want.

One of the greatest developments in our post-World War II economy has been the tremendous expansion and acceptance of the idea of personal income spreading. Income spreading consists of taking the income a person is likely to receive during his lifetime and spreading it forward for expenditure purposes to the earlier years from the anticipated earning years and spreading it backward

for expenditure, again from the earning years to the years of retirement. It consists of taking the income during the earning years and pooling it with other people's income against the common risks to income stability which may result from misfortune such as a premature death, or a debilitating accident or sickness. Finally, it consists of permitting erratic income resulting from the nature of a man's talents and hence to his type of employment to be "equalized" in respect to the Federal income tax's graduated rates.

All of these factors which bear upon income spreading have seen remarkable development in the post-World War II years in our society. Pensions and retirement systems are examples of spreading income into the future from the earning years to the years of retirement. Insurance, whether it is life insurance, health insurance, accident insurance, or otherwise, illustrates the pooling and spreading of income to protect against common risks. Consumer credit, which is in essence a post-World War II development, is an example of spreading income forward in anticipation of later earnings. Consumer credit, I might add, is finally being recognized, as it should be, as a method of saving in itself, as well as a means of providing the needs at the time they are needed of the new and young families for the home and consumer durables. I might digress a little further to point out that consumer credit for education, which on a large scale is a relatively new development, is one of the wisest capital expenditures a person can make based on his anticipated future earnings.

Congress, to a large extent, has followed the obviously sound policy that the workers of this country should be encouraged to adequately provide for their superannuation beyond the basic floor provided by social security to the extent that each person feels is reasonably adequate for his particular circumstances, through a combination of personal thrift and investment, through insurance, and through private retirement programs. In 1942, Congress provided an impetus for private retirement plans by clarifying the tax treatment of such plans in the Internal Revenue Code. In the years following, business and labor responded with great initiative. Today well over 25 million people are covered under private pension plans, and estimates are that by 1980 total coverage will exceed 42 million employees. Equally important is the growth that private pension plans have experienced. In 1950 less than 10 million employees were covered in plans with some $12 billion in assets. Today, the assets of these plans are approaching $90 billion.

The retired employee is now assured of greater independence in the twilight of his life, with greater freedom of choice as to where he lives, how he spends his money and the manner in which he lives. Employers benefit through higher worker morale and an expanded market for goods and services among the retired. The working employee has a greater sense of security, both in terms of his retirement years and in terms of the knowledge that he can devote the fruits of his labor today to the education and development of his family, knowing that his elders are more secure. But on top of all this, the Nation's elderly are becoming a more positive force in the economy rather than placing a burden upon it, particularly to the extent that the retirement programs derive their benefit payments from invested savings and their earnings. Further, these savings provide the financing for a great deal of the economic growth in the society.

Private retirement programs were given a further boost with the passage of H.R. 10, which represents the culmination of the efforts of my former colleague from New York, Mr. Keogh, and others to extend private retirement-plan coverage to a group consisting of 20 million self-employed and their employees on a basis comparable to that offered those employees by others.

Today, the capabilities of the private sector to provide adequate income spreading programs to accommodate our elderly citizens is being seriously challenged on several fronts. Like many of the highly successful accomplishments of our society, the rapid growth of private pension programs has been accompanied by certain difficulties, not the least of which is the entrance of the Federal Government into the retirement field. The administration is presently pushing proposals in social security which would encroach upon an area which can be more capably handled by the private sector and which, being a pay-as-you-go system, can neither provide the same amount of benefits nor the pool of savings to finance future economic growth for the society that the private funded programs can.

The President has requested increases in social security benefits averaging some 20 percent and corresponding increases in supporting payroll taxes. These benefit increases far exceed the increase required to keep pace with inflation. The President's proposal would therefore greatly expand social security as a retirement program. It would break the traditional and sounder policy that social security provide merely a base or floor income in retirement years. If implemented, it could be the first step toward the development of social security alone as a complete retirement program, substantially supplanting private savings and private pension programs. If there were no better way to provide for the retirement of our senior citizens, I would favor the expansion of our social security program to do the job. It can be a fundamentally sound system for providing income assurance against indigency among the aged. However, it has, even today, grown beyond its original purpose of protecting against and eliminating indigency past 65 and in the process changed some of its basic assumptions and so endangered its fundamental soundness.

The expansion of the social security program can be justified neither on the basis of providing more adequate retirement for the aged nor on the basis that it is a welfare program. There are better and more appropriate vehicles for both of these purposes. Social security cannot properly be developed as a welfare program as it does not incorporate a true needs test. As such, it justifies its benefits on the basis of the needs of a few. This is the basis on which the program has expanded through the years; it is the basis on which Medicare was added to social security.

By pushing social security further into the retirement business, the greater efficiency and flexibility that attach to pension or retirement programs in the private sector are ignored. The returns to the individual per dollar contributed, both by himself and his employer, are greater under a private program than under social security or any other Government retirement program. The money funded in the private programs is more efficiently managed and more wisely and fruitfully invested. Funding is in fact absent from the social security system. The funds on hand are barely sufficient to meet benefit payments for 1 year. Such funding as does exist in Government programs can only be invested in sterile rather than living investments; namely, Government bonds. Further, there is a healthy competition among fund trustees and fund managers. There is a healthy competition among companies and among unions to provide better benefits under more imaginative programs. This competition works continuously to improve private programs.

Other challenges to the operations of the private pension programs are directed at specific aspects of the programs. Criticisms have been directed principally at funding policies among the programs, at vesting and portability provisions in the plans, at the management and financial policies and practices followed in administering the plans, and at the insurance or lack of insurance for plan participants against the loss of vested rights from the termination of pension plans or from the loss of fund investments.

In January of 1965, the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds submitted a report on private employee retirement plans. The report suggested a need to regulate the specific terms of the pension arrangement between the employer and employee on the basis that the present arrangements did not properly protect the participant's rights under pension plans and tended to reduce labor mobility. The report contended that inadequate vesting and portability provisions in many plans tended to tie the worker to his employer and subjected him to the loss of his pension if his employment should terminate either voluntarily or involuntarily. The report contended that many plans were inadequately funded and did not provide the participants with sufficient insurance against loss due to the termination of plans.

The Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress held hearings in April and May of 1966 on private pension plans. The subcommittee delved extensively into the specific provisions of many of the large pension plans and heard further testimony from Government officials. The subcommittee notably did not hear directly from representatives of the many

smaller pension plans and did not hear from the various banks, insurance companies, and so on who act as trustees of fund assets. During the hearings, Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, indicated that his Department was conducting a number of research projects relating to private pension plans and including studies on the funding of the plans, the reasons for the termination of private plans, and other areas.

As a result of the Joint Economic Committee hearings, the committee staff prepared a report, entitled "Old Age Income Assurance: An Outline of Issues and Alternatives," which suggested as a primary alternative some rather radical departures from our present public policy on retirement programs, which now provides for a limited or base social security "retirement" system with a superimposed structure of private programs. The report suggested that this present setup be replaced by a needs-related program, which would convert the existing tax exclusions and exemptions for the aged to tax credit equivalents and would eliminate the public assistance payments we have now, and by a work-related program comprising a two-tier social security program consisting of a basic compulsory plan and a voluntary supplementary plan. The tax credit idea is intended to provide the aged with a guaranteed annual income. Private pension programs could merge under the proposal with the Government-run voluntary supplemental plan or operate independently but preferably under Government regulations similar to those recommended by the President's Committee.

Hearings were held in March of 1965 by the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes of the Senate Special Committee on Aging relating to the extension of private pension plan coverage. As a result of the hearings, the subcommittee reported their findings and made a number of recommendations on the extension of private pension plans. Most of the recommendations dealt with amendments to the tax laws covering the self-employed. Some of these recommendations were incorporated in the Keogh bill. The subcommittee also recommended consideration of the recommendations of the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds in the light of their effect in promoting the expansion of private plans and recommended that the President's Committee study ways in which private pension plans may be extended.

A few months ago, the Treasury Department issued proposed new regulations—announcement 66-58—governing the qualifications of private pension plans for tax deductions on corporate contributions made under the plans. Most significantly the proposed regulations provided for a new formula for integrating private programs with social security. Under the new formula, many companies would be required to pay either larger pensions to those with low incomes or provide for reduced pensions for those with moderate and high incomes. Because of the large number of comments received on the proposed regulations, the Treasury Department formed an advisory committee in January of this year to study the problem further.

More recently, President Johnson proposed that the financial administration of the private plans be regulated and included this proposal in his message on consumer protection. Also, a rather comprehensive bill was introduced in the Senate on February 28 by Senator JAVITS, which would establish a Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission to administer provisions establishing minimum standards and regulations on vesting, funding, management, and reinsurance, and creating a voluntary program on portability.

A number of other bills relating to private pension plans have been introduced in the 90th Congress including S. 69 which provides for a study of pension portability, H.R. 686 which provides for the insurance of private pension benefits, H.R. 688 and S. 186 which deal with the tax benefits on pension plan contributions, H.R. 692 and S. 1255 which relate to reporting under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, H.R. 4462 which would require the vesting of benefits in private pension plans within 10 years, H.R. 1119 which requires the submission of records relating to pension plan stock purchases, and S. 1024 which relates to the fiduciary responsibilities of pension plan management.

These criticisms and proposals regarding private pension plans raise a number of important and fundamental issues involved in public policy in this area. The most basic issue raised involves the relationship between government and the private sector in providing for the retirement of our aged. I will review what I said before because I feel that this issue is most important. It is essential that we develop the private pension plan as the primary source of retirement for the aged beyond the floor provided by our present social security system. This course insures the individual the freedom to choose the type of retirement provisions he desires and a means to provide for them, it provides for a program which is more flexible and adjustable for individuals and groups with varying needs and circumstances, and finally, it provides the most efficient and economically desirable process for providing for the retirement of our senior citizens. I would actually like to see our emphasis of private retirement programs carried one step further by providing that each individual be given the option of choosing between participation in the social security system or establishing his own program which as a minimum must provide at least the benefits he would receive under social security—just as is presently provided for the Federal civil service employees. I have introduced legislation which would accomplish just such a thing—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 7, 1967, pages 5729–5731.

The proposals to regulate the specific terms of the pension arrangement raise some delicate issues relating to the optimum steps which may be taken to promote the advancement and effectiveness of private pension programs. On the one hand, these programs should both protect the rights of the individual participants by providing for vesting and portability on a reasonable basis and provide for ample safeguards against the loss of vested benefits. In protecting the participants' rights, consideration should be given to preservation of the mobility of our labor force and to the free utilization of the financial assets of the funds for their own benefit and that of the general economy. On the other hand, the employer and employee, either individually or through his union organization, should be free to negotiate, to a large extent, pension arrangements the same as other terms of employment such as salary, vacation, insurance, hospital and medical benefits, and working conditions are negotiated. The employer should be free to utilize his pension arrangement to attract and hold employees. Both employer and employee should have the flexibility to design pension arrangements according to their particular situation and circumstances, such as the other employment benefits provided, the nature of the work, the status and the size of the employer and the industry and so on. These two basic considerations on both hands should be carefully balanced against each other in formulating any regulations to control private pension programs. Both sides of the picture should be carefully reviewed so that these plans may continue to develop and improve. Care should be taken to see that regulations and controls do not discourage the establishment of new programs covering additional workers. Excessive requirements as to funding and vesting and reinsurance may only make it difficult for new plans to start with reasonable contribution rates and with provision for adequate retirement benefits, and difficult for existing plans to expand their benefits and coverage.

Funding and vesting are different animals in mushrooming new industries and in declining old industries and in stable long-term growth industries. Equity and fairness do not require that an employee get back everything that he or his employer contribute when he terminates his employment after several years, but merely that he get what he bargained for under informed, noncoercive, and fair bargaining procedures. Not all employers can afford early vesting.

Finally, before any regulations are imposed upon private pension programs, the need for regulation should be clearly established and the extent of the regulation should be commensurate with the need. Regulations which are directed at remedying abuses by a minority should not hamstring or work hardship on those who already do or would comply with the standards set.

The plans of many employers already conform to many, if not all, of the standards suggested for private pension programs. For example, every study of pension fund management to date, including the 1961 report to the Commission on Money and Credit and the 1965 President's Committee report indicate that such funds have been well managed and that most abuses that have been reported in employee benefit funds have been in the area of health and welfare funds that were nonqualified under the Internal Revenue Code and handled by

individual trustees. The great majority of qualified private pension funds are administered by banks and trust companies as corporate trustee or as agent for individual trustees and these are staffed by experienced personnel schooled in the high traditions of fiduciary responsibility, backed by financial integrity and supervised by several National and State governmental agencies. Another substantial segment of private pension plans are funded through arrangements with life insurance companies and these too are managed by the same type of experienced personnel and are supervised by regulatory authorities. The 1965 report to Congress of the Labor Department under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act indicates that in 1965 only four indictments were brought by the Justice Department under title 18 of the United States Code, dealing with embezzlements, kickbacks, and false reporting. Many standards for the handling of pension funds have already been established under the Internal Revenue Code, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act and Federal and State laws in regard to banking, insurance, and trust law. These existing controls and checks and the relatively low level of abuse in the financial management of private pension plans should dictate the type and scope of any regulation imposed. The establishments, where the need exists, of the minimum standards at levels which are reasonable in relation to varied circumstances and situations throughout all our industries and which provide for ample flexibility for the negotiation of pension arrangements is a desirable goal. However, it is my hope that in any study conducted by the Congress on private pension plan legislation be one of objective inquiry and not subjective questioning designed to serve a preconceived and uninformed opinion.

In spite of the work of the President's Commission on Corporate Pension Funds and the additional studies of the Labor Department and the studies performed by the Congress, such as the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee in 1966, there needs to be considerably more data obtained and a much more developed dialog on this subject before the Congress can determine the best course of action to follow. We in the Congress have not heard, for instance, in any precise terms and from those who are best informed, such as the trust and insurance companies administering private pension programs, what the impact of minimum standards on vesting and funding would be on currently unfunded plans with relatively long vesting requirements. What would be the costs and benefits of such plans if certain minimum standards were established? How could presently existing and potential plans exist or develop under such controls? What type of portability formulas for transferring retirement credits could be developed and how could they best be administered? All of these questions and many more must be answered before we can intelligently carry the dialog forward to fruition.

The bills introduced by Senator JAVITS and others may hopefully lead to a thoughtful development of the facts and issues and a resolution of the problems in this area. The future of the private pension plan as a moving force in our economy and as an efficient mechanism for providing for retirement is at stake.

In considering legislation which would regulate private pension programs, thought must be given to coordinating the scheme designed for these programs not only with social security but also with legislation in other related areas such as unemployment compensation laws, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and the proposed Human Investment Act, particularly with respect to providing for those workers over 45 or 50 who lose their jobs before they are eligible for retirement, the pension programs for the self-employed, and our tax laws relating both to private pension plans and the tax structure for the aged. The interrelationships among these areas is discussed to some extent in my dissenting minority views at page 79 in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 15119, the Unemployment Insurance Amendments of 1966.

One of the significant areas which is not adequately provided for under legislation to date relates to the problems of the preretirement worker over age 45 to 50. Technological advances, including automation, and other factors leave many of our preretirement workers over this age with obsolete skills. In many cases these people cannot be retrained for comparable jobs in other skills. In other cases, comparable jobs or jobs which they can handle physically are unavailable. Where these workers are capable of being retrained in usable skills and where their retraining is economically practical, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the proposed Human Investment Act, and other programs are designed to provide much of the need in this area. However, there is no satisfactory provision made to assist the workers who cannot be retrained or otherwise employed. Unemployment compensation, as it should be, is limited to providing temporary relief for the worker who can find further employment. For the worker who cannot find a job this compensation only briefly delays his problem.

Welfare is not an appropriate answer for the worker who may have savings, investments, and other assets which would disqualify him under a needs test until they have been eaten away. In effect, the worker in this category is no longer employable in comparable work and has been forced into early retirement. In most cases, these workers have credits under social security and in many cases under private pension programs and in varying extents savings and investments in some cases. However, these credits are not usable until a later age and savings in most cases will not stretch over the remainder of the worker's life or even until he is eligible for a pension.

The most appropriate remedy for the worker in this situation lies in provisions for early retirement. This worker has lost his wages because of age or because of a disability by virtue of age and is threatened with indigency. This is the very case that our old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program was intended to cover. This is the appropriate case for the early utilization of credits under pension programs. The bulk of the workers in this category will have substantial credits under social security. Legislation both in the social security and pension areas which reflects the needs in this area merits careful consideration in the Congress along with any study of retirement legislation.

A second problem confronting the older preretirement worker is the difficulty he experiences in finding employers who are willing to utilize his skills during the relatively short worklife that he has remaining. Presently, pension plans qualifying for special tax treatment, may not defer the coverage of new employees for more than 5 years. New employees, who are near retirement therefore must be covered by qualified pension plans within 5 years even where they may be entitled to substantial pensions in connection with previous employment. The cost to the employer in providing coverage for these people may discourage hiring or reduce the employees preretirement compensation in wages below that which he requires. In these situations, where the new employee is already entitled to pensions under previous employment, employers should be able to negotiate pension coverage freely so long as the employee's pension credits are above a certain level. Portability of pension credits would provide one solution to this situation. The problem needs further study, however.

The problems relating to late retirement should be considered at the same time we look at early retirement. In this connection it is important that we consider the process by which the wage earner emerges into retirement status. Just as the newcomer does not always enter the work force abruptly or at any particular age the retiring worker does not always assume retirement status abruptly or at a specific age, such as 62 or 65. Many persons are ready for retirement or desire retirement at a relatively early age. Others are capable of and desirous of working into their later years. In many cases the transition from working to retired status is appropriately performed by a gradual process where the worker moves from full employment to part-time employment to full retirement over a number of years. Age 65 or age 62 are not magic numbers which automatically signal retirement. They are average retirement ages which provide a benchmark for actuarial computations and for establishing retirement program policies.

Our social security system is not readily or properly adaptable to provide the flexibility necessary for providing for gradual retirement at varying ages. The system is designed to insure, albeit social insurance, the wage earner against the loss of wages due to full retirement or disability. As such, the earnings limitation in the system cannot be eliminated so as to provide equitably for late and gradual retirement. Similarly, the law, in its present form as a partially social program, cannot, at reasonable costs, equitably provide for

adequate, early retirement. On the other hand, private pension plans are adaptable for these purposes. Most private plans presently permit earnings after retirement. Many of them provide for much earlier retirement than the social security system. It is essential that this type of flexibility be preserved in the retirement system we design.

These are just a few of the problems involved in Federal retirement policies which need review in Congress.

I have discussed this subject in a number of previous speeches including a talk on "Pensions and Employee Benefits" before the American Pension Conference in New York, in 1962, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 1, page 304. In most instances that I have discussed social security, I have discussed it in relation to the whole pension picture. The current hearings in the Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 5710 contain numerous references which I made to the role of social security in our retirement programs. In introducing H.R. 6697, which provides for a voluntary retirement system in lieu of social security, I included a previous talk entitled "Politics Can Destroy Social Security." This appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7, 1967, pages 5729–5730.

It is my hope that an expanding and in depth dialog will progress on the role that private pension plans, social security, and all of our retirement programs should play in a comprehensive retirement program for the elderly.

THE NO-WIN WAR

Mr. BUTTON. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, reporting on U.S. losses of aircraft in Vietnam to date, an Associated Press release of April 22 stated:

> The United States has lost 1,300 planes and 808 helicopters through combat and accidents in the Vietnam war, U.S. military headquarters reported Saturday.

Of the 1,300 planes lost, 500 were lost in combat over North Vietnam and 107 were shot down in South Vietnam. The remaining 621 planes were lost in both North and South Vietnam to nonhostile causes such as accidents and operational mishaps.

Of the 808 helicopters destroyed, 334 were shot down by enemy fire, five in North Vietnam and the remaining 329 in the south, with 474 helicopters lost to accidental crashes or destroyed on the ground by mortar and guerrilla attacks.

It is depressing enough to view these figures in the light of our present "building bridges" policy with the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations who supply the North Vietnamese with the vital supplies of war. But we here at home cannot possibly sense the reaction of those who put their lives on the line in Vietnam.

The cold tabulation of aircraft losses referred to above can never approach the sense of loss of even one of its pilots. How one such pilot, whose aircraft is no doubt listed in the figures above, felt about the Vietnam war, was graphically reported by Carolyn Barta, in the Dallas Morning News of April 15. Capt. Brooke M. Shadburne, a U.S. Marine Corps helicopter pilot, who was killed on April 5 during an evacuation of wounded, was concerned about dying in vain in a no-win war. For those who agree with his views, these words from a State Department pamphlet of 1961 entitled, "How Foreign Policy Is Made," are pertinent:

> We are a government "of the people, by the people, for the people." This means that all decisions ultimately must pass the test of public acceptance. This also means that periodically the people avail themselves of their right to change the men through whom they govern themselves.
>
> This is an important fact in our foreign relations. It puts the world on notice that America is capable of continually revitalizing its leadership with fresh, new, and vigorous men, armed with a clear mandate from the people.

I include the article, "Pilot Worried About Dying in Vain in No-Win War," in the RECORD at this point:

PILOT WORRIED ABOUT DYING IN VAIN IN NO-WIN WAR

(By Carolyn Barta)

Gordon Shadburne looked Tuesday at the University of Plano building that will be named in honor of his brother, and at a letter written before the brother was killed in Vietnam.

"Thanks in advance for writing a story about my brother," he said. "If the public becomes aware that we must make a policy of going into Vietnam to win, then his life will have meant something, and his death will not have been in vain."

Capt. Brooke M. Shadburne, U.S. Marine Corps helicopter pilot who was killed in Vietnam April 5 during an evacuation of wounded, was concerned about dying in vain for a "no win" war.

In a letter to Gordon and his mother, Mrs. Helen Shadburne of Plano, postmarked March 19, Capt. Shadburne wrote of his frustration at having to fight a "no win" war, his concern for his young family in Houston and his ideas on how to win the war.

He wrote of the party-going general, and in contrast the tragedy of pathos of the victims of the Vietnam nightmare.

"For close to a month now, I have been flying the commanding general of the entire Marine forces, both ground and air, in Vietnam, I have ferried every dinner guest, carried or observed everyone that dropped in for an interview.

"I have carried him to all his social functions and to all the visits he has made to operating units. And to this date, I haven't seen any effort being put into the war.

"What war?" Capt. Shadburne asked.

"It's a little hard to believe until one goes into the hospital to help hand out the Purple Hearts every week and you see the legless, armless, eyeless cripples. I saw one guy who will have to have his neck in traction, flat on his back the rest of his life.

"Big handsome guy, he could move his eyes and talk—and that is all. The rest of his life.

"What life?"

Capt. Shadburne wrote about soldiers who are "waiting to get hit by new Russian weapons while the general attends the New Year's sports festival, traveling the half mile of good road by helo (helicopter), not car—a helo that could have guns and rockets on it and be supporting the ground forces."

The 27-year-old pilot explained in his letter that he is "not one to jump to conclusions." But, after a summer and a winter in Vietnam and 600 combat missions, Capt. Shadburne offered a few recommendations for ending the war which seems, instead, he said, to have become a game:

"Cut off all of North Vietnam's sources of supply by sea, air and land.

"Bring them to their knees to stop the inflow of men and arms to South Vietnam.

"Make a huge, ruthless, mighty sweep through South Vietnam to clean out the remaining diehard, and by then underfed and under-supplied VC guerrillas.

"Then and only then, rearm, train and supervise the Arvin (Army of the Republic of Vietnam). Teach the children, aid the homeless, help in agrarian reform. Only then will it do any good."

"The moves outlined sound harsh," Capt. Shadburne wrote, "but so is being shot through the chest with a Chi Com AK47 in South Vietnam.

"And the irony of it all," he added "is that if we took a truly firm stand we would be respected as a nation."

Capt. Shadburne wrote of the "fun new rules of the game" which say that helicopter pilots and mechanics get to return to Vietnam after six months duty in the States.

He said he couldn't see "coming back after six months stateside to this kind of war. I plan to turn in my regular commission resignation next month and hope they will buy it.

"As it stands now, the world is my oyster. All I've got to do now is return long enough to open it."

Capt. Shadburne's oyster won't be opened. But the University of Plano hopes that it will honor his death by helping other young men and women to open their own worlds.

The university will grant a scholarship each semester to a political science major, and will offer scholarships to Capt. Shadburn's three youngsters, who are not yet of school age.

Friday, at 3:30 p.m., the University of Plano will dedicate its liberal arts building to Capt. Shadburne, naming it "Brooke Shadburne Hall."

THE ADMINISTRATION'S "FEAR GAP"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the administration has been spreading misinformation in an attempt to block passage of the Republican-sponsored plan to allocate Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, incorporated in my measure, H.R. 8983, to amend the administration's measure, H.R. 7819, to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—ESEA—through the 1968–69 school year.

The credibility gap of the administration is only too well known. Now the administration has resorted to a "fear gap" to try to avert its first major defeat in the 90th Congress. The misinformation the administration has circulated about the effect my measure would have on pupils in private schools has produced the fear. Mr. Speaker, the administration has deliberately misinterpreted the Republican-sponsored measure because the administration fears a defeat on this legislation would be a major blow and set a pattern which

would be followed through Congress this year in other legislation.

The Republican plan, laid out in detail in the April 20, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, has attracted widespread support. It would return Federal funds to States through block grants rather than categorical grants. This would result in more efficient use of Federal aid to elementary and secondary school pupils.

Mr. Speaker, my plan would not take benefits away from private school pupils, as the administration has caused to be circulated in widespread rumors. The Republican plan continues all the benefits of the present law for private school students.

Children in private schools must be included in the program. No State plan could be approved unless it met requirements designed to safeguard private school children, because the funds must be used for the benefit of students both in public and private schools to the extent consistent with the number of children attending each. This is exactly the same as provided in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

My proposal includes another safeguard, the so-called bypass mechanism. If a State could not legally provide for the loan of textbooks, instructional equipment and materials for private school pupils and teachers, the U.S. Commissioner of Education would arrange for such loans on an equitable basis from the funds allotted to the States. This is exactly the arrangement which works successfully in the present Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

It is also claimed that the funds under the Republican block grant amendment would no longer be utilized for educationally deprived children to the extent that it has heretofore. This also is not true, since at least 50 percent of the funds going to States must be used for special programs for educationally deprived children. This would mean $300 million more for educationally deprived children than is presently the case.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the administration has chosen to try to manipulate private school administrators by planting the seeds of fear that children in those schools would lose Federal benefits if the Republican-sponsored measure became law.

This latest maneuver is typical of the cynical disregard for fact which has come to characterize the operations of the administration. The administration is trying the same power play in order to defeat the Republican plan to save the faltering war on poverty. The administration has been planting false rumors the Republicans only want to kill the war on poverty, which is 180 degrees removed from the truth. The Republicans want to make the war on poverty truly effective.

Mr. Speaker, a recent story uncovered the fact the present administration is spending at least $425 million a year for public relations. With nearly a half a billion dollars at their disposal, it is easy to understand how the administration can mount huge campaigns whenever any of its programs are threatened, as in the case of the amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We who present constructive alternatives to administration proposals, whether in aid to education or the war to end poverty, can only continue to present the truth. The truth is, relative to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, that the Republican plan is sound and will bring more benefits to pupils in both private and public schools.

TEACHER CORPS ENDORSEMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, continued education has become an essential but highly burdensome expense for many teachers today in order to keep their present job or to meet the ever more stringent requirements for advancement. Certainly the cost of these additional courses represent for the teaching profession a justifiable and necessary business expense and as such should be accorded its proper place as a tax exemption. Our teachers are unfortunately underpaid as it is and so I urge my colleagues to support a bill I introduced today to make our tax structure more equitable by letting them deduct such expense including certain travel, from their gross income for tax purposes.

FEDERAL SUPPORT TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, recently some splendid remarks on Federal support to higher education were delivered to the Mason-Dixon district annual conference of the American College Public Relations Association, by Mr. Leo S. Tonkin, president of Leo S. Tonkin Associates, Inc., a respected Washington educational consulting organization.

The remarks of Mr. Tonkin were notable for their clarity and constructive suggestions in dealing with the complex area of involvement of higher education institutions in federally supported programs of community service and international activity.

I commend the reading of this speech by all those interested in the role of higher education in America.

The speech referred to is as follows:

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION: SOME CONSIDERATIONS AND CAVEATS

I was delighted when my good friend, Jim Butler of The Johns Hopkins University, invited me to speak to you today. For one thing, I welcome the opportunity—however short-lived—to leave a sometime frenzied Washington and revisit this historic and splendid community of Williamsburg. For another, there was given to me an opportunity to discuss with you some of the new directions in the Federal Government's support of higher education, and to raise some considerations and caveats about your possible involvement with federal programs.

All of you have concerned yourselves at one time or another with the relationship of your institution to the Federal Government, and with the difficult questions of federal involvement with higher education generally. Few of you need to be reminded that the federal commitment is enormous and varied—or that it steadily grows larger and more complex. As the United States Office of Education is now celebrating its centennial, we might refresh our memory about the magnitude of the Government's effort.

The Office of Education tells us that today it administers a $4 billion budget, involving over 75 educational programs. We've come a long way from the post Civil War days of the first Commissioner, Harry Barnard, whose first budget was less than $19,000! Of this $4 billion, probably 40%, or $1.6 billion, is directly devoted to institutions or students of higher education. I will merely mention some of the recent authority for this financial assistance.

One very important source of construction funds for institutions is the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. In Fiscal Year 1967, ending June 30, 1967, Congress provided more than $722 million to carry out the purposes of the Act. Over one-half billion was earmarked for outright grants to aid the construction of undergraduate and graduate academic facilities; $200 million was made available for construction loans.

Federal support for educational research activities is of growing importance to higher education institutions. Is your school interested in curriculum research or in the training of educational researchers? If so, you probably know of the millions of dollars allocated to such research and training under the amended Cooperative Research Act. Are your school's interests directed toward library research, education media research, or research on education of the deaf? There are laws authorizing federal support for each of these.

In addition, there is nearly $30 million currently available to support research and development centers which will tackle major problems of education. It was perhaps inevitable that the Office of Education should recently borrow a page from the Department of Defense and call for proposals to establish educational *policy* research centers. There are now "think tanks" in education's future!

Financial assistance for students derives from two major pieces of legislation—both of them administered by the Office of Education—the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the National Defense Education Act. Under the former, $112 million was appropriated for educational opportunity grants to enable promising high-school graduates of exceptional financial need to attend college. $134 million was made available for payments to college students from low income families who are working part-time for the college. And $43 million was provided to pay the costs of interest and insurance on student loans provided through commercial lenders.

The National Defense Education Act appropriation for fiscal 1967 includes $190 million for student loan funds, and $2 million for loans to educational institutions unable to meet the matching requirements of the student loan program. Thousands of students in this nation are the grateful and better-trained beneficiaries of this form of aid.

I might note, in regard to Federal support of students in higher education, that the Office of Education is not the only supplier of student support. In 1964, I compiled a report for the House of Representatives Select Committee on Government Research entitled

"Federal Student Assistance in Higher Education." In that study, using 1962–63 data, we found that over 300 Federal student support programs existed and these programs were administered by some 30 separate federal agencies. While the largest area of support programs, as expected, derived from NDEA student loans, the next largest area of funding stemmed from Government research and development grants to colleges and universities. When a faculty investigator is chosen to perform a research project, he very often picks a number of student assistants, and this form of support was surpassed only by National Defense student loans. It would be interesting to see what this situation is today in 1967.

So much for just a few of the outstanding public laws aiding higher education.

NEW DIRECTIONS

I turn to the question, "What is new about the Federal involvement?" What, we may ask, are the underlying concerns of Congress as it continues to elaborate upon an already complex and sometimes confusing pattern of public laws?

Historically, one may depict a pattern of *selective* Congressional response to the educational needs of a nation challenged to fulfill its potential at home and to maintain a position of pre-eminence in the community of nations. One is tempted to view in this fashion the enactment of the multitude of public laws aiding higher education since 1960. But this view of things would overlook an important new direction in the philosophy and exercise of governmental authority.

I suggest to you that in recent years, the U.S. Congress has shown a strong inclination to deal with the *totality* of problems affecting this nation at home and abroad. It is no longer content to leave things as they have been or are likely to be without governmental action. Let me discuss this more inclusive, activist orientation of Congress—first, in the domestic context of our urbanized society, and second, in the context of responses to the world at large.

In the communities of this nation, the presence—to cite but a few contributing factors—of pollution, unemployment, poverty, crime, discrimination, inadequate transportation, substandard or overcrowded housing, and the lack of adequate educational and cultural resources, has led to crises and disaster. You need no examples from this speaker to remind you. The youth in our cities seem often to have been made the unwitting victims of a hostile society before, during, and after their formal educational experience. Too often, the result is a destroyed or severely debilitated capacity for productive, creative adult life, and either a denial of or substantially diminished opportunity for participation in the rewards of citizenship.

Faced with this panoply of problems, Congress has developed an intense concern with the well-being of our *society*, and communities. This concern translates itself into an array of laws which focus upon social ills in the common effort to root out and eradicate them. Virtually all these laws look to *creativity* and *innovation* in diagnosing and remedying social ills. Nearly all of them rely upon the anticipated results of research in the problem areas.

And so we come back to the institutions of higher education in America, upon whose abilities to innovate and create in response to the public need, the success or failure of these new laws depend. Let me illustrate.

By enacting a national program of supports and incentives for the several States under the State Technical Services Act of 1965, Congress evidenced its concern that advances in science and technology be made available to American business, commerce, and industry. It was left to the States, in cooperation with universities, communities, and industries, to aid in the diffusion and use of such advances by providing pertinent technical services for both new and established business, commerce, and industrial establishments.

All accredited institutions of higher education in a participating State are invited to submit proposals for providing technical services under the Act, including the sponsoring of industrial workshops, seminars, training programs, extension courses, demonstrations, and field visits designed to encourage the more effective application of scientific and engineering information.

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is designed to assist in the solution of "community problems" through the involvement of community service programs of colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are looked to for performance of educational services, the conduct of educational research programs, and the programs of continuing and extension education for adults.

Title IIA of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorizes the Community Action Program. The avowed purpose is to help communities mobilize their resources for a coordinated attack on poverty and its interrelated causes and symptoms. Institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for a grant for the development, conduct, and administration of a community action program. Perhaps more important, under the Act, they are eligible for grants to *train* the specialized *personnel* who will be implementing such action programs; and, they are eligible for grants or contracts for *research* and *demonstrations* relating to poverty and avoidance of it.

In another field of endeavor with special meaning to our communities, one finds the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, which provides grants for projects that will demonstrate techniques and methods which, it is hoped, will make a real contribution to the prevention or control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses. Colleges and universities are among those eligible for assistance. Further, the same law provides for grants to train personnel who are working with delinquent youth; university-based training centers; curriculum development, and workshops, institutes and seminars are among the supported activities. The educational orientation is obvious. I might add that this law expires with the close of the current fiscal year. Proposed legislation will provide for continuation and expansion of these demonstration and training grant programs, as well as grants for facilities and other aids.

A related effort is underway because of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. Any university interested in establishing a degree program in police science may apply for a grant that will enable it to achieve this result. The recent report of the President's Crime Commission will very likely stimulate additional and broader supports for higher education institutions in the battle against crime.

Government support for the humanities was focused in 1965 with the enactment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act. Previously, the Office of Education had administered programs of support, under laws, such as the Cooperative Research Act, the National Defense Education Act, and the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1963. Additional help was furnished scholars through the facilities, services, and incomparable resources of the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution.

Now, for the first time, however, there is express recognition by Congress, to quote from the Act, that "the encouragement and support of national progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiatives, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government." In addition to enlarging the responsibilities of the Office of Education with respect to education in the arts and humanities, a new agency, the National Endowment for the Humanities, was authorized to award fellowships and grants to institutions or individuals for training and workshops in the humanities, and to foster by grants or other means, public understanding and appreciation of the humanities.

In response to the legislative mandate, the Endowment has defined three initial objectives. To borrow from its First Annual Report:

"The third objective . . . is the improvement of the teaching of the humanities in schools, colleges, and universities and also among the public at large in order to infuse our present activities with the wisdom that is the product of the humanistic outlook. This is probably the most important of the objectives. . . , since it brings the humanities to bear on important questions; but it is also the most difficult to accomplish. It is necessary that inspiring teaching in schools and colleges excite the initial interest of citizens in the whole subject of man and his activities and their best expression."

Once more the relationship of the university to the public interest is at the very heart of the new commitment to a better society.

I suspect enough has been said of the role institutions of higher education are being asked to play in the carrying out of national purpose, as exhibited toward our communities. Congress says, in effect, that considerations of national interest compel the declaration and definition of broad policy objectives which will make for better communities, as well as the financial support of such objectives. But the new ideas, the new applications of knowledge, the actual assistance to the community, and in a word, the success of such efforts, hinge upon the capabilities of our nation's colleges and universities. Upon their willingness to respond to the urgent problems of a free society hinges the ultimate realization or defeat of the American experiment in democracy.

It is but a small step to the articulation of such objectives in America to the realization that this nation and its institutions of education have a mission of similar importance and urgency beyond the confines of the national borders. Indeed, the American scholar has been invited from that proverbial "ivory tower", into the "workshop" of America and the "vineyards" of the world. As Marshall McLuhan says: "The university is fast becoming not an isolated bastion but an integral part of the community. Eventually, nearly every member of a community may be drawn into its affairs." Or as Thorstein Veblen has noted:

"The university is ideally and in popular apprehension a corporation for the cultivation of the community's highest ideals and aspirations."

The point to remember is that in the breadth of the American vision, the scholar's community is no longer circumscribed by his academic walls but now extends into our society and the community of mankind.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

In our international society, education is of dominant importance. Since the end of World War II, federal assistance to students, scholars, and schools has accelerated the training of specialists in foreign languages, area studies, and the problems of emerging nations. The State Department, USIA, and AID have played key roles in making this assistance so effective. In 1965 alone, it is estimated that nearly 4,000 faculty members were assisted while studying or engaged in research abroad, or applying their skills to the problems of emerging nations. About

18,000 students studied abroad at foreign institutions of higher education. Nearly 100,000 foreign students and scholars were either studying or teaching at our own schools.

The International Education Act of 1966 splendidly builds on these earlier programs of assistance. It gives a new thrust to programs of assistance at the undergraduate and graduate levels. It provides new central direction for the government's commitment to the cause of international education. I want to read to you the introductory words employed by Congress in the International Education Act, because I believe you will find them both meaningful and hopeful. Here they are:

"The Congress hereby finds and declares that a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between Nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this generation and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research, to assist in the development of resources and trained personnel in academic and professional fields, and to coordinate the existing and future programs of the Federal Government in international education, to meet the requirements of world leadership."

How does the Act operate to translate the declaration of purpose into tangible results? The answer is found in Titles I and II of the Act. Title I authorizes new institutional supports for international education in our colleges and universities. At the undergraduate level, a program of grants is authorized to help institutions plan, develop, and implement broad programs to strengthen and improve instruction in international studies. Suggested elements of these programs include teaching, research, and curriculum development; expansion of foreign language courses; overseas training of faculty; student work-study-travel under university supervision and planning; and visiting faculty and scholars.

At the graduate level, support is authorized for the establishment, strengthening, and operation of Centers of Advanced International Study. These centers will stress research and training in international aspects of professional and other fields of study. Any institution of higher education is eligible for such grants, but the apparent intent of Congress is to place public money with those universities which already have made an investment in programs for which support is asked.

Title II consists of amendments to three other education laws—NDEA, HEA, and the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. In each instance, the law has been altered to broaden support of existing education programs by the addition of international dimension.

The authorized financial support for the Act includes $1 million for FY 1967, $40 million for FY 1968, and $90 million for FY 1969. I must regretfully add, however, that, so far, no funds have been appropriated pursuant to these authorizations.

The administration has sought to remedy this situation by requesting a supplemental appropriation of $350,000 to implement the Act this fiscal year. In addition, the President has requested in FY 1968 a $36.5 million appropriation for the International Education Act which includes $5.9 million in grants for undergraduate studies, and $13 million for graduate studies under Title I.

This is a very commendable response to the realities of the world we live in and the role of the United States in that world. The involvement of this country in international affairs has never been greater, or more significant, than today. More and more over the past twenty years, the information and advice of authorities in such fields as economics, food production, industrial planning and development, education and health, are essential to our nation's foreign policy, not to mention the growth of stable democracies in the underdeveloped regions of the world.

It is clear that more must be done to strengthen the capacity of our higher education institutions to provide the types of support deemed essential by the Federal Government. That is why the principles of support enunciated in the International Education Act are so commendable. Now that the legal basis for support is embedded in public law, let us hope that appropriations will follow without delay.

I suggest *now* is the time to "Get involved!" in the cause of international education. If, as President Johnson has said, "The spread of learning must be the first work of a nation that seeks to be free", then those of you entrusted with this task must work creatively to assure that the new ground plowed by the International Education Act bears fruit. I speak for no interest when I suggest that you exercise your right to be heard before the Congress to secure the much-needed appropriation for this Act.

The very distinguished Chairman of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Education, Wayne Morse, clearly asks for your ideas and support in a recent statement to the American Association of Junior Colleges:

"Many of us believe and have acted on our belief that Washington, D.C., has no monopoly upon wisdom in the field of education legislation. Many of us feel quite strongly that initiatives for programs should arise from and be modified by the educational community of this nation."

Now is the time you should be creatively involved in planning now the future of international education studies at your campus. While the orientation of the Act is toward the international community, its impact is clearly domestic. Thus, the task of planning is yours, and the results of this planning will be in daily evidence on your campus. Indeed, the spirit of international learning and the advancement of knowledge are the only sensible and effective ways to achieve the peace and stability that we all so desperately seek in our troubled world.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND COORDINATION

For a moment, let us turn to some considerations about your institution's involvement with Federal programs. In my experience as a planning consultant and a federal relations adviser to educational institutions, I have found that *long-range planning* and *program coordination* are essential to the schools' well-being.

One of the finest things the Federal aid programs have done is spark in-depth and long-term thinking about the institution—its needs, and its goals. There is a need for much more of this kind of thought. For if you seek involvement with Federal programs, and hope to obtain public funds, and more importantly, if you wish to preserve an independent frame of reference for the values and traditions of the institution, you must be able to define the proper relationship of the federal program to the overall objectives of the school.

Such planning, of necessity, directs you to the best use of federal funds, as well as to the sorting out and weighing of alternative futures for the institution. Once you have set your objectives and articulated your needs, then you may proceed to match them as well as possible to appropriate funding programs. In this way, your academic mission is protected; the philosophy and values of the institution remain your own.

On the need for long-range planning, therefore, my advice to you would be to emulate the wisdom of the great French Marshal, Lautaugny, who once said to his gardener: "I want you to plant that tree tomorrow." And the gardener said, "It won't bear fruit for a hundred years." "In that case," said Lautaugny, "plant it this afternoon." That is how I feel about your long-range planning—start it *today*!

The other aspect of your involvement which merits close attention is coordination of effort. When you get to the point of considering a particular Federal program, take care to learn if other university activities may be germane, and whether other departments and personnel could usefully be involved. Checking and consulting with others in advance is much more effective than trying to smooth ruffled feathers at a later date! This kind of coordination is, or probably should be, the express responsibility of an academic planning officer at your institution.

Another area for coordination is with the community and geographic area served by the institution. Much of the community-oriented legislation requires cooperation with local and regional groups having similar interests; in any event, it makes good sense to pursue a policy of cooperation with such groups.

Finally, by your awareness of the community thrust of much federal aid legislation, you will tend to consider designing federally-supported projects with an eye to extending the benefits to the largest number of citizens of the community. For example, the National Endowment for the Humanities provides grants for research in the humanities. With some careful thinking about the objective of the Endowment such as that of imbuing the public at large with humanistic values, you should be able to envision the involvement of, say, the young children in the community who may otherwise never have exposure to cultural opportunities. This is coordination of effort in the public interest as well as your own.

To summarize, let me merely state for you five points of inquiry which are raised by my office concerning every proposal for federal funding of interest to our client institutions:

First, does this proposal serve an academic need?

Second, does this proposal meet any community need?

Third, is this proposal effectively related to other school activities?

Fourth, what funds may be available for the proposed project and what are the strings attached?

Fifth, have alternative projects been considered and priorities consciously set?

CAVEATS

This is the perfect place to raise some strong *caveats* about the entire government—higher education aid picture. Just as overextended supply lines are the plague of any field army, so an overextension of academic involvements can disrupt the educational goals of your school. It *is* possible to overcommit your strengths and talents to the needs of the community or the Federal Government and thereby dissipate or dilute the effectiveness of those resources required for the primary mission of your institution.

Perhaps David Henry, President of the University of Illinois, best sums up the feeling here by saying:

"Many institutional representatives are concerned that although colleges and universities have not been sufficiently and directly enough assisted in their main job of teaching, research and public service, new projects (which will draw heavily upon the resources of higher education for implementation) have had a higher priority than these perennial activities."

It would be unfortunate, indeed, should the students and scholars of your school be the victims, rather than the beneficiaries, of community involvements.

I have carefully avoided till now any suggestion that higher education is a partner with the Federal Government in the pursuit of programs to benefit the nation. Personally, I think the term is rather overworked and abused. There are many cases of no genuine partnership at all.

Too often, a Federal program prompts a school to follow a new direction which it had never planned or hoped to follow until the advent of the program.

Too often, a Federal program is keyed to expansion of the student body of the school, with the result that an unwitting recipient of funds must admit more students than in its own judgment was desirable or feasible for the nature and resources of the institution.

Too often, the grantee under a Federal program is required to carry on with a project long after Federal funds are available, with the result of a sudden ballooning of financial burden after several semesters of assistance.

And too often, a Federal program forces the recipient school to commit its own scarce funds in satisfaction of matching requirements, when these dollars could be better employed elsewhere. As Frederick Bolman, Director of Special Programs of the ESSO Education Foundation, has wisely noted, "The most genuine need for Federal investment may lie where the least ability to match exists." Sadly, Federal matching requirements work to the most frequent disadvantage of those of our smaller and developing institutions that need the funds the most.

In short, too often there arises an *incompatible commitment*. The promise of Federal dollars is sometimes a lure for the unsuspecting.

At this point, some might say, if the Federal program is not in the school's best interests, then it shouldn't apply, it shouldn't get involved.

To say this would be a tortured oversimplification of a very real dilemma for many schools.

First, it is virtually impossible for a college or university not to assume some responsibility both for service to the nation's communities and the education of its youth. No school can afford to ignore the new interest of the Government and the pressing needs of our society. Our nation and its communities urgently rely upon higher education for new responses to the problems of America and the world beyond. Douglass Cater, Special Assistant to the President, wisely says: "The university which seeks to reclaim an image from the past or to retreat behind campus walls and 'make its garden grow' will be sadly out of tune with the times."

Second, the problem of federal program participation diminishes as the institution defines its long-range interest. As you project your school's future, you invest the school with an identity that permits a rational response to opportunities for Federal funding. The more you recognize the needs and travails of your community and world, the more surprised I suspect you will be as to how much your institution can contribute to their amelioration and solution, and this will be truly meaningful education to your students.

Third, all of us know that community and public support are essential merely to keep the doors of academia open for business. A school needs money to survive, and state and federal dollars provide a splendid source of that increasingly hard to find capital funding.

The problem then is how to become a stronger educational institution even while one accepts the responsibility of community service and seeks federal support in the process. How does the institution maintain a *true* partnership in league with the Government?

THE SHARED-INTEREST APPROACH

The burden clearly rests on those of you charged with the responsibility for development of the institution. That burden is to implement a shared-interest approach between the Government and the school in whatever program involvement you may choose. Insist to the full extent possible upon a program structure which fosters the educational interests of your school even while it benefits the community.

It is highly likely that the school would plan to do this sort of thing in any case; it is, therefore, asking little of the school to envision similar community involvement when it develops a proposal for federal funds.

Now, admittedly, many of the new programs authorized by law do not allow such a shared-interest approach. And this is wrong. More and more institutions of higher education, almost of necessity, are sacrificing educational quality on the one-way street to community involvements.

The Federal programs would be less onerous to the academic community if they were made more rewarding to the affected institutions. It is up to you to insist on true support for your school and faculty when you accept increased community service. This holds for community service in the international as well as the national sense.

I might note here that a very sensible federal statutory provision in this regard is contained in Sec. 700.15 of the Regulations of the State Technical Services Act. That provision reads:

"Federal financial assistance under the Act or the regulations in this part may be granted to any designated agency or participating institution in support of a technical services program presently funded by State or other non-Federal sources and operating therein when such program is modified or expanded in light of the objectives of the Act."

This indeed encourages a shared-interest approach to educational involvement via Federal dollars. All parties concerned can benefit—the school might receive funding for an on-going, already budgeted program if it ensures that its offering is modified or more closely attuned to the intent of the Act. The Government benefits by getting a needed job accomplished. The community benefits by having expanded interest accorded its problems by the local educational institutions.

Through testimony to Congress, through active participation in policy formulation with the administering agencies, through your own planning and designing of balanced projects, in all these ways, you can strive to read some life and substance into the idea of a mutually productive relationship between the Federal Government and American higher education.

The task is a challenging one. There are signs that it is being done—but nowhere near the level of accomplishment which is now required. Take up the challenge in the months and years to come. Federal funding holds promise of building stronger institutions of education, a better America, and a more stable, peaceful international community. Realization of the promise depends on America's educational leadership to respond with creative and innovative programs that will occasion increased and truly beneficial support from our federal government.

THE TEACHER CORPS IN DANGER

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Washington Post ran an excellent editorial on one of the most inspiring and moving experiments this country has undertaken during these exciting years. I refer to the Teacher Corps, a program by which the same spirit of dedication and selfless public interest that made the Peace Corps a worldwide success can be directed toward this country's needs for teachers, especially in those areas in which there are large concentrations of disadvantaged youngsters.

Six years ago, John F. Kennedy asked the people of America to ask what they could do for their country. People of all ages responded with an enthusiasm and a disregard for personal profit which thrilled us all. Young people in particular, but not young people alone, volunteered in great numbers for the Peace Corps, and brought to the people of the developing nations concrete proof that Americans were interested in helping them. The same willingness of Americans to give of their time and their energies to help their own fellow citizens has been demonstrated in the VISTA program, and in the initial response to the Teacher Corps.

Shortly, the House will be considering the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967—a bill which will, if enacted as reported, continue the Teacher Corps program. We are also on notice that we will be asked to pass judgment on a Republican substitute, advanced by my good friend, the able and distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. One effect of his substitute will be to bring to a halt the Teacher Corps experiment for the foreseeable future.

I think this would be, for the excellent reasons which the Post editorial sets forth, a deeply tragic decision for this House to make. The Teacher Corps needs all the support it can get. I hope our friends on the other side of the aisle will reconsider their plans to wipe out the Teacher Corps.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I referred be printed at the end of these remarks.

TEACHING TEACHERS

Congress ought to give thoughtful consideration to a report just released by the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. The report is an appraisal of the Teachers Corps during its first year of operation; and it is strikingly enthusiastic about the performance and the potentialities of this fledgling group in a period when it was peculiarly handicapped by problems of organization and by inadequate funds. At the same time, the report is something more: it is an insightful discussion of the special problems of teaching "disadvantaged" children.

A major educational challenge confronts the country. Public school systems in every major city are flooded today with the flotsam of a vast new migration—from rural areas to urban centers. Many of these migrants, uneducated, even illiterate and accustomed to agricultural employment, are wholly unequipped for participation in an industrial economy; and often, in consequence, they find themselves crowded into decaying neighborhoods, unemployed, exploited and des-

perate. Their children, often, are in a real sense disinherited—deprived of any cultural stimulation or any incentive to learn.

It is for these children that the schools must today undertake a special task—a task analogous to but different from the task accomplished by the public schools at the turn of the century in making the melting pot a reality for the children of the migrants from Europe. "For centuries," the report of the Advisory Council observes, "schools have dealt almost wholly with students who have valued learning and have come to school in search of it. Among the children with whom the Teacher Corps works, the first task is not so much to *teach* them as to *reach* them, in order to persuade them that they can learn—and that learning can be useful, interesting and rewarding."

The Teachers Corps recruits idealistic and committed young college graduates who want to do this specialized and difficult type of teaching; and it trains them for the task in participating universities and in the public schools of disadvantaged neighborhoods which have asked for their help. During the past school year, some 1200 Corps members have served in 275 schools in 111 school districts in 29 states, serving in each case at the invitation of a local school system. Usually they work in teams of three to ten interns, headed by a team leader who is an experienced teacher. They are subordinates of the local school authorities, conforming to local rules and practices, paid at a rate equal to that received by the least experienced teachers in the local school district.

The Teachers Corps brings with it not only specialized training and some fresh ideas; even more significantly it brings the ardor of dedicated young people. It has made a great beginning; it can, if it gets the chance, render even richer service in the future. But it will be obliged to go out of business entirely by the end of June unless Congress quickly votes to extend its life and to give it the supplemental appropriation it needs to carry on through the summer. No better investment could be made toward the education of the disadvantaged.

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION—H.R. 7098

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1967, I introduced a bill, H.R. 7098, to provide a $10 million supplemental authorization for adult basic education for fiscal 1967. At that time, I fully expressed my concern over the need for a supplemental because of the peculiarity in funding of this program. Many States did not have sufficient time to submit fully developed plans in 1965, the first authorization year, and the bulk of the ABE appropriations for that year was carried over to be added to the 1966 allocation. Thus most States had a higher level of expenditures in 1966 than are possible with only the normal funding in 1967, and this unfortunate situation has already caused elimination of important facets of ongoing adult basic education activities.

The dire effects of this reduction of funds available in 1967 is well described in a summary compiled by Mr. James Le Vine, administrator for adult education in the Hawaii Department of Education, and submitted to me by Mrs. E. Leigh Stevens, chairman of the Adult Education Advisory Council in my State. I ask unanimous consent to insert this compilation in the RECORD at this point as an illustration of the importance of a supplemental ABE appropriation for 1967.

STATE OF HAWAII,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 13, 1967.

To: Mrs. E. Leigh Stevens, Chairman, Adult Education Advisory Council

From: James Le Vine, Administrator, Adult Education

Subject: *Reply to Questions in Your February 27 Letter from Rep. Patsy Mink.*

Q–1. *What is the program for $114,819 federal allocation?*

A–1. Enrollments in adult elementary classes were 3,750 in FY 1964; 3,949 in FY 1965 and 10,006 in FY 1966. On the strength of enrollment increases and expected expansion of federal fund availability, 14 federally-funded positions were added to our staff last year. Cost of these positions for fiscal 1967 is $117,981. The federal allocation of $114,819 will almost (not quite) cover the cost of the 14 positions. State funds are presently supporting all other costs of the program including hourly pay of part-time teachers and supervisors, operating expenses of 57 centers on 6 islands and free books for ABE and NYC students. Current program data for first half FY 1967 is shown in attached Exhibit 1.

Q–2. *What is the program the $10 million supplemental would support?*

A–2. Help maintain and reimburse existing program. In November-December 1966, when we learned that $114,819 was to be our PL 89–750 allocation for fiscal 1966–67, we informed our Board of Education that to maintain the then-existing level of ABE program and personnel until June 1967 would require $100,000 more than had been allocated by federal and state sources combined. To avoid a drastic cutback, the Board authorized us to "borrow" the amount from D.O.E. reserve funds with the understanding we effect all possible savings.

Accordingly, we have stopped all expansion, cancelled 6 planned teacher-training workshops, left vacant our ABE Program Specialist position (Phyllis Hole left in November), cancelled placement of 2 ABE teachers at Oahu Prison, increased the mininum size of ABE classes, depleted our reserves of textbooks; curtailed travel, mileage, staff conferences and supervisory visits; postponed opening a new school center (Hauula) and belayed plans for a summer session.

Q–3. *Request for breakdown of A.E. budget.*

A–3. See Exhibit 2, 2A.

Q–4. *Listing of kinds of courses (services) Federal ABE funds made possible.*

A–4. (1) Previously only elementary grades 1–6 were tuition free. Now all elementary classes to grade 8 are free, including free books. New classes include Preparation for 8th grade diploma, Pre-high school remedial reading, speech improvement, arithmetic; ungraded adult elementary classes, sign language, basic parent education (courses tailored to local needs such as child care, consumer education, etc.), experimental classes such as teaching reading through sewing, teaching spelling through typing.

(2) A pilot language lab. facility was installed at McKinley.

(3) An "independent study center," using programmed instruction under teacher supervision is under way in Kailua library. This is an ungraded class with flexible scheduling in which students can enter and exit without reference to traditional semesters or class hours.

(4) With capability of paying a small rental fee where necessary, several churches and other private buildings are being utilized for daytime classes.

(5) Added funds for school supervisory staff have made it possible to operate numerous small branch centers (see Exhibit 1) in housing projects, hospitals and out-of-the-way places on all islands, bringing educational opportunity closer to the people needing it.

(6) A pilot ETV program "Operation Alphabet," five one-half hour programs per week, is under way aimed at teaching the 3 R's to people who can understand and speak English but cannot read and write. Plans and production is also under way, to add another one-half hour per week of locally produced programming.

(7) In coordinating with Operation Alphabet, special classes for newcomer ethnic groups (Samoan) utilize a Samoan teacher or aide to follow up on the ETV lessons.

(8) Special classes have been designed and operated in cooperation with local NYC and other anti-poverty groups to serve a variety of special needs. Additional services of the D.O.E. have included free testing, special instructional materials, classroom equipment for use in a non-school facility, etc.

Q–5. *Number of planned programs curtailed (abandoned) due to reduced FY 67 budget.*

A–5. See A–2. Major items:

Two full time ABE teachers for Oahu Prison.

Local teacher training workshops and plans for U.H. Summer Institute.

New school center, Hauula (full time principal and steno).

Summer session ABE classes.

State ABE Program Specialist (position being left vacant).

State Conference of ABE program administrators.

All school centers told in December to stop recruitment beyond number of classes they had in first half of 1966. Estimate 30–40 classes were thus curtailed.

Family-life program (State Program Specialist and steno. to develop new program).

Q–6. *What programs will have to be dropped if we only receive $114,819 federal money in FY 1967?*

A–6. No existing classes will be dropped in the remainder of FY 67. State deficiency appropriation is underwriting current service needs (less curtailed activities) as explained in A–2 and A–5.

Q–7. *How much additional funds needed in remainder of FY 67 to continue present level of services?*

A–7. Approximately $100,000 would be needed to repay the advance (deficiency appropriation) the State is providing to keep the program intact.

Q–8. *If the supplemental appropriation for ABE is not approved, what services will be curtailed for next four months?*

A–8.

	Est. amount
Reimbursement to State for deficiency approp	$100,000
Teacher training (in-service & U.H.)	3,000
Summer session ABE classes	50,000
State ABE Program Specialist vacancy	3,000
State Conference ABE Program Administrators	600
Reserve supplies ABE books	5,000
Program reviews, supervision, evaluation (6 islands)	700
	162,300

INCREASED INCOME TAX EXEMPTION PROPOSED

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may ex-

tend 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago Congress provided for a personal income tax exemption of $600. In theory, this amount was the minimum needed for a decent standard of living and was not to be taxed.

Maintaining an adequate standard of living on $600 a year in 1947 was, I suspect, extremely difficult. In 1967, it is impossible.

Over the last 20 years, the cost of living has risen 50 percent. The price of bread has nearly doubled. Milk costs 38 percent more than in 1947. The price of apples is up 70 percent.

Today we are fighting a war on poverty based on the supposition that a family of four cannot live on less than $3,000 a year. A family earning less lives in poverty.

But the personal income tax exemption has not been changed. The result is an absurd situation. We say, on the one hand, that a family of four requires a minimum income of $3,000, yet we exempt only $2,400 of that income from Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the $600 exemption is out of touch with reality and it should be changed.

Increasing the personal exemption to $1,200, as I am proposing, would place our income tax structure on a more up-to-date basis. Such action would eliminate the inequities resulting in part from today's unrealistically low exemption.

In dollar terms, a change in the personal exemption would mean substantial savings to families in lower tax brackets. For example, a family of four, earning $8,000 a year and claiming a standard deduction, would save $418 from their tax bill if the individual exemption were doubled.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would increase the individual income tax exemption to $1,200. I hope my bill, or similar legislation, will be considered this year.

SPEAKING OUT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the noisy minority have had its say. Now is the time for the vast, quiet, and responsible majority to be heard.

This is the point of an excellent editorial that appeared recently in the Lawrence, Mass., Eagle-Tribune. I commend this newspaper for its courageous and thoughtful editorial stand.

The fact is that those who protest America's involvement in Vietnam accurately reflect only one aspect of the majority's thinking—namely, the overwhelming desire shared by all Americans to find peace in Vietnam.

But what is the best path to peace?

Is peace achieved by continual sniping at President Johnson?

Is peace achieved by irresponsible charges and by such outrageous acts as burning our flag or marching the Vietcong's banner down Fifth Avenue?

The Eagle-Tribune rightly notes that—

> The dissenters, the harassers of the President, actually are prolonging the war they oppose. Thus, they seem to be defeating their purpose, unless they think they can persuade the President to bow to their will.

The right to protest is basic in a democratic society. But the right to be taken seriously rests upon the merits of the argument.

The American people have soundly rejected extremists on both sides of the Vietnam arguments. Our people reject those who call for a U.S. withdrawal just as strongly as they reject those who want to dangerously escalate this war:

Instead, the people stand with the President and his policy of seeking an honorable solution to the conflict, while defending the security and freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

But the time has come for the responsible citizens in our midst to shed their silence and speak out to defend the policies that make sense and hold the best possibility of leading to peace.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this timely and important editorial from the Eagle-Tribune in the RECORD.

LET THE PRESIDENT KNOW

No American President in wartime, since Abraham Lincoln valiantly coped with a divided nation in the War Between the States, has been so cruelly harassed as President Johnson by bitter foes of his policy among the American people.

Americans traditionally in time of foreign war stand solidly and firmly behind their President and the government he personifies, but not now.

Even in the Congress loud voices are raised against the Vietnam War policy. Such conspicuous senators as the majority leader, Sen. Mansfield, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Sen. Fulbright, and of course that ambitious junior senator from New York, speak out again and again against the Administration's policy.

The noisy reformers eager for all the tax money Washington can collect so they can spend it to reform the domestic scene and all the civil rights advocates and demonstrators attack the President for his war policy. Draft-dodging students join in the hostile chorus and of course the beatniks who are either innate or professional protesters.

Prof. Galbraith, accepting the chairmanship of Americans for Democratic Action, reduced dissent to the lowest level when he based it on danger to the Democratic Party in the President's policies. The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King undertook to raise it to the level of a nation-wide revolution of civil disobedience. Secretary General Thant of the United Nations persistently encourages harassers of the President and promotes throughout the world distrust of and hostility to American purpose by calling for what amounts to American surrender.

Effect of these performances, in the name of noble dissent but contemptuous of the need for unity in a time of crisis, is the portrayal for American enemies in Moscow and Peking and Hanoi and anywhere else they happen to be influential of a great nation divided by a great issue.

Clearest effect of this portrayal of division is to convince the enemy that the United States will quit. Thus the dissenters, the harassers of the President, actually are prolonging the war they oppose. Thus they seem to be defeating their purpose, unless they think they can persuade the President to bow to their will. Galbraith's warning of political danger could have been principally an appeal to the political mind of the President.

Indeed, the persistent harassment of the President makes sense only in terms of the opinion that the President can be harassed into a change of policy of the kind they demand.

There is a fact that they ignore and that the enemy does not see. These harassers of the President constitute a noisy minority. The great majority of the people stand with the President as in foreign wars they have always stood with the man in the White House. They recognize the commitment to South Vietnam, they recognize the danger to the United States of a Communist victory in South-east Asia, they understand the President's military purpose to convince the enemy that he cannot win and that therefore he should consent to negotiations for peace. But they recognize that no peace is tolerable that does not prevent the Communist conquest of South Vietnam and that therefore the enemy must be made to accept such a peace.

In this situation, a great American need is declarations to the President of support from the great but silent rank and file. The President needs encouragement, he needs to know that the people are behind him in his quest for peace with honor. An unceasing flow of letters from the people to the President is in order during this ordeal he is undergoing because of noisy, unpatriotic dissent.

THE HOPALONG CASSIDY OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, last week's newspapers quoted the Hopalong Cassidy of the Republican Party, Governor Romney, as saying that there is a "better way than L.B.J. and the people know it."

Very clever. It rhymes. It is short. And it is memorable. We will probably be hearing a lot more of it in the months ahead.

In fact, it may very well take its rightful place someday in the hall of fame of Republican slogans.

Remember that great example of campaign alliteration: "Free Speech, Free Press, Free Soil, Free Men—and Fremont"?

And who can forget "Win With Willkie"?

Or Thomas E. Dewey's perceptive analysis of the public sentiment in 1944: "Time for a Change"? Now there was a slogan. Governor Dewey was back at it again in 1948 with a new slogan: "Biggest House Cleaning in History." Unfortunately—for him—he neglected to say whose house should be cleaned.

And who can forget dear old Dick Nixon's catchy bit of political euphe-

mism: "Experience Counts"? It might have counted, too, if President Eisenhower had been able to think of just one major decision that Mr. Nixon had participated in. He asked for a couple of weeks to come up with one—but to my knowledge he never did.

And, of course, every American over 10 still remembers Barry Goldwater's contribution to the hall of fame: "In your heart you know he's right." That may have been the most honest Republican slogan of them all. He was so far to the right that the public could not see him.

So now we have a new face on the political scene—and a new slogan: "There is a better way than LBJ." I congratulate Governor Romney. To me, that is every bit as good as, "Life, Liberty, and Landon"—and I predict it will be just as effective.

The Republicans have certainly proven that they are the party of slogans. If that is the way they want it, it is fine with me. The Democratic Party is content to be the party of ideas.

PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S WAR AGAINST POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people overwhelmingly support the President's war against poverty. They do so knowing that in America in the 1960's there is simply no justification for perpetuating the forces which keep a minority of our people from realizing their hopes and ambitions.

We have learned an important lesson: namely, that it is not enough for most Americans to have the opportunity to go as far as their talents can take them. But we must enlarge this opportunity to give every American a chance.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is working toward these noble ends. I believe that they are doing a credible job in an area where progress is slow and often difficult.

But our people understand that the progress we seek will not happen overnight—there are simply no miracles in the difficult struggle to eliminate conditions of poverty from our land.

Yesterday I received a copy of a resolution adopted by the National Board of the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty. The board is headed by three distinguished Americans—Mr. Walter Reuther, Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, and Mr. Robert S. Benjamin. I wish to share this resolution with my colleagues in the House and with all the American people. For it says all that must be said about our unwavering commitment to win the war against poverty and to push ahead—against all political obstacles placed in our path—to accomplish our purpose and create a better America for all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this resolution, adopted on April 11, in the RECORD.

CITIZENS' CRUSADE AGAINST POVERTY

(Resolution on the war against poverty adopted at the meeting of the National Board April 11, 1967, Washington, D.C.)

We commend the President for sending to Congress a bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act and strengthen the role of the Office of Economic Opportunity in the over-all War Against Poverty.

However, we are distressed to hear from some quarters attacks on the fundamental purposes and methods of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Some want to dismember this agency, tearing apart its vital parts and programs and indiscriminately transferring them to other agencies. Others would dilute or eliminate the Community Action Program, the most creative and dynamic experiment in the national strategy to overcome poverty.

In the light of these criticisms we would like the nation to recognize that a program of such ambitious goals could not be undertaken without problems. In social experimentation, just as in scientific experimentation, errors of judgment are inevitable. However, criticism, where valid, should not become a pretext for eliminating or destroying the effectiveness of an approach that is fundamentally sound.

We therefore reaffirm the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty's strong support of the War Against Poverty in general and of the Economic Opportunity Act in specific.

We support the principle of a separate and independent Federal agency responsible for coordinating the over-all attack on poverty. To protect its integrity and assure its effectiveness, this agency should be retained within the Executive Office of the President.

We support the strengthening of the Community Action Program as a primary instrument for the re-creation of "communities," and the mobilizing of local public and private groups for planning and administering a comprehensive and coordinated attack on poverty. We urge that funds for the Community Action Program, including its especially commendable programs for agricultural workers and Indians, be greatly increased.

We reaffirm the principle of "maximum feasible participation", urge its incorporation in other programs, and support its implementation through flexible funding of independent grass roots organizations. This principle recognizes for the first time the importance of giving the poor a meaningful voice in planning and administering programs designed to serve their needs and vests within local communities greater responsibility and initiative for local poverty programs.

We commend the Administration for recommitting our nation to the eradication of urban and rural poverty. In the light of the magnitude and urgency of the task, we call on Congress to provide a substantial increase of funds over the request of $2.06 billion.

Firmly believing that the eradication of poverty is essential to the achievement of a democratic society and to the fulfillment of our American heritage, we call upon the nation, both public and private sectors, to expand substantially its commitment of energy and resources to the War Against Poverty.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LI

Mr. PATTEN. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I question whether the Military Establishment is making full utilization and maximum use of the potentialities and talents of its available personnel. A study by the Comptroller General of the United States in 1964 estimated that about 35,000 trained enlisted personnel were misassigned throughout the Army, with the result that $48.7 million in training costs had been wasted. The study concluded that these personnel were not utilized in duties commensurate with their military or civilian training and/or experience because of a personnel management system that generated misassignments. Some examples of improper assignments that were found, are as follows:

1. A serviceman entered military service in 1950. In 1951 he attended the Army Medical School and was trained as a medical specialist which requires knowledge of ward and clinic management; routine care of patients; emergency treatment procedures; and the ability to read and interpret medical records, charts, and diagnostic reports. The serviceman received "excellent" efficiency ratings in performing these duties. In September 1960 he was assigned to the noncommissioned officers' club at Fort Lawton, Washington, as a cook-mess steward and was working there at the time of our review. The Army is currently training additional medical specialists at a cost of over $1,000 per student.

2. A serviceman attended school for about 8 weeks and was trained as an automotive repairman. He was assigned to Fort Devens, Massachusetts, and performed duties as an automotive repairman for about 5 months. In August 1962 he was assigned to the duties of a mail clerk even though his unit was not authorized a mail clerk in its table of organization. The Army is currently training automotive mechanics at several schools at an estimated cost of $1,400 each.

3. A serviceman enlisted in the Army in February 1961 for schooling as a construction draftsman. This specialty involves drawing working plans for the construction of bridges, airfields, roads, etc. He completed the course, receiving an efficiency rating of "excellent," and was assigned to Fort Belvoir, Virginia. Because there were no openings in his occupation, he was assigned to the duties of a clerk-typist. During an interview, the serviceman expressed a desire to have remained in the occupation for which he had enlisted. During fiscal year 1964 the Army has scheduled construction drafting courses of 9 weeks each for more than 400 individuals at an estimated cost of $1,200 per student.

4. A serviceman received 12 weeks of training in aircraft maintenance during 1961. He served overseas as an aircraft mechanic for 13 months and received an "excellent" efficiency rating. Upon his return to the United States, he was assigned to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Because that installation already had more aircraft mechanics than were needed, he was assigned to the duties of a clerk-typist. The Army, worldwide, is short of personnel with aircraft maintenance training and is currently training additional aircraft mechanics at a cost of about $2,000 each.

5. Prior to entering the Army in October 1961, a serviceman had earned a college degree in building construction and had worked as a civilian for 3 years with the United States Army Corps of Engineers where he performed the duties of a draftsman and

construction inspector. Upon completion of basic military training, he was assigned to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, for on-the-job training as a construction draftsman which involves drawing working plans for the construction of bridges, airfields, roads, railroads, piers, buildings, and heating and ventilating systems. Upon arrival at Fort Belvoir in January 1962, the serviceman was assigned to the duties of a clerk and subsequently to those of a clerk-typist. We interviewed the serviceman to determine what duties he was performing and whether he had ever been utilized as a construction draftsman. The serviceman stated that his principal duties were typing, filing, and a little drafting. During fiscal year 1964 the Army has scheduled construction drafting courses of 9 weeks each for more than 400 individuals at an estimated cost of $1,200 per student.

ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES OF IMPROPER UTILIZATION OF ARMY ENLISTED PERSONNEL

(NOTE.—Military training is printed in roman; duty assignments are printed in *italic*.)

FORT BELVOIR, VA.

Construction draftsman (8 weeks): *Clerk-typist.*

Clerk-typist (8 weeks): *Truck driver.*

Medical specialist (12 weeks): *Personnel clerk.*

FORT DEVENS, MASS.

Ordnance supply specialist (10 weeks): *Light vehicle driver.*

Aircraft maintenance (5 weeks): *Truck driver.*

Automotive maintenance (8 weeks): *Cook.*

Aircraft maintenance (4 weeks): *Field communications crewman.*

Clerk-typist (8 weeks): *Hobby shop.*

FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

Aircraft maintenance (13 weeks): *Clerk-typist.*

Aircraft maintenance (13 weeks): *Military policeman.*

Military policeman (8 weeks): *Physical activities specialist.*

Radar repairman (20 weeks): *Data processing repairman.*

FORT HUACHUCA, ARIZ.

Electronic instrument repair (12 weeks): *Clerk.*

Clerk (8 weeks): *Radar repairman.*

Field radio repairman (25 weeks): *Administrative specialist.*

ADPS programing specialist (10 weeks): *Light vehicle driver.*

FORT SILL, OKLA.

Tracking and plotting radar operator (8 weeks): *Clerk.*

Clerk (8 weeks): *General supply specialist.*

General supply specialist (10 weeks): *Wheel vehicle mechanic.*

Automotive repairman (14 weeks): *Duty soldier.*

Lithographic plate making (7 weeks): *Military policeman.*

Clerk (8 weeks): *Printers helper.*

Construction draftsman (8 weeks): *Personnel specialist.*

FORT LAWTON, WASH.

Clerk (8 weeks): *Light vehicle driver.*

Light vehicle driver (8 weeks): *Missile crewman.*

Medical specialist (7 weeks): *Personnel clerk.*

Machinist (12 weeks): *Missile crewman.*

FORT HOOD, TEX.

Aircraft mechanic (5 weeks): *Cook.*

Cook (8 weeks): *Infantryman.*

Track vehicle mechanic (10 weeks): *Personnel clerk.*

FORT RILEY, KANS.

Automotive recovery specialist (7 weeks): *Lifeguard.*

Missile systems repairman (7 weeks): *Clerk.*

Track vehicle mechanic (10 weeks): *Truck driver.*

Engineer parts specialist (14 weeks): *Physical activities specialist.*

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General's study found that the basis of the Army's system of assigning personnel to specific installations is the assumption that all personnel already assigned there are performing the duties of their primary military occupational specialties. Improper utilization of personnel by installation and unit commanders, however, negates the effectiveness of this system. For example, the data available to assignment authorities may indicate that a vacancy exists in a unit because no personnel were assigned with the occupational specialty needed for that vacancy. An individual with the necessary qualifications would therefore be assigned to that unit or installation. If the installation commander, however, is already utilizing another enlisted man, without the proper training, in that vacancy, this fact would not be reflected in the data available for assignment purposes until the occupational specialty of the misassigned enlisted man is changed to agree with his duties. Thus, when the newly assigned specialist reports to the installation, there is no vacancy in his specialty, and he is assigned duties other than those for which he is trained and at that point two men are misassigned.

While these practices were observed in 1964, there is no reason to believe that they have been corrected. On the contrary, I fear that misassignments probably are as great or even greater today than they ever have been.

Mr. Speaker, failure to utilize skilled personnel in occupations in which they have been trained or have had prior civilian experience results not only in unnecessary training costs, but also, in immense manpower waste. The proper utilization of servicemen should have appeal to the Defense Department economists, for this would result in tremendous financial savings. Furthermore, by increasing the efficiency of the Armed Forces, military manpower needs can be reduced substantially, so much so, that I seriously doubt whether the 2.7 million figure cited as a minimum requirement for the 1970's is a sacred one.

WARSAW GHETTO

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, before I talk about the Warsaw ghetto, I think it would be appropriate to consider the conditions out of which the uprising of 1942 emerged. It is important, I think, because the Warsaw uprising lives with us, not only as history but as a meaningful experience in the ongoing relationship between the Jewish people and the non-Jewish world. The question naturally comes to mind of whether society has changed in such a fashion that there will never again be the oppression that drove men to the desperate acts which were performed in Warsaw 25 years ago. I fear there is evidence that the changes which have transpired in the past quarter century have not been so profound that we can relegate the Warsaw ghetto uprising to history and leave it there.

I am thinking specifically of the news from Germany, the Soviet Union and even Poland. In Germany, the signs indicate that hatred is again on the rise. A neo-Nazi party is actively campaigning for support. It is not powerful and we can only pray that it will not become powerful. But it is there and it has a substantial number of loyal followers, who propagate the notion that Nazi Germany really didn't behave so badly during World War II and that Auschwitz and Treblinka are just the fiction of anti-German pamphleteers. In the Soviet Union, there are equally disquieting signs. The Jewish religion is suppressed. Jews are denied the rights given other citizens. Jews cannot emigrate to Israel. And the existence of anti-Semitism in Poland can still be documented today. For instance, the recent dedication of a monument at Auschwitz in memory of Nazi victims, found the Polish Prime Minister, himself a survivor of Auschwitz, devoting his 40-minute speech solely to the resurgence of neonazism in West Germany. The only official speaker to mention the Jewish martydom was a French Jew who spoke in French and whose views were not translated into Polish.

I am not suggesting that we are on the threshold of another wave of the kind of conditions that produced the Warsaw uprising. But I remind you of these events to convey to you that this anniversary is not simply a day of memoriam but must also be an occasion to renew vigilance. Let us enjoy what we have today in the Western World but let us not forget that we are Jews and, being Jews, that we must forever be alert to the presence of hate, the kind of destructive hate that we must resist. The kind of hate from which came that great epic of Jewish heroism, the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

After the conquest of Poland in 1940, the Germans were cognizant of two factors in their approach to the Jewish question.

First, a latent anti-Semitism already existed in Poland. Non-Aryans were tolerated but not accepted into the larger Polish community; often they were socially ostracized.

Second, the wisest tactic to be used against an enemy was "divide et impera," divide and rule. By exploiting Polish contempt of the Jew, the Germans hoped to turn Christian Pole against Jewish Pole and vice versa. If the appeal to base emotions was not sufficient, the Germans had another device ready: the death penalty to any Pole who aided or sheltered a Jew.

The Germans also had a strategy outlined for the Jews. Cleverly and systematically, they allowed the Jews to believe they were safe within their com-

munity in the Warsaw ghetto; life would go on as before. Classes were held, plays were staged, factories bustled with activity. More than that, the Germans even permitted a Jewish government, the Judenrat, and a Jewish police force, something that had never been known before in Poland.

A witness to the scene, Marie Syrkin, observed in her memoirs that "to some the ghetto even appeared as a shelter," stating that some who had escaped from Warsaw to Soviet territory, "returned to the Warsaw ghetto of their own accord. They had heard that an autonomous Jewish community had been set up in Warsaw."

Or another writer, Mary Berg, describes her reaction to the Jewish police force after 5 weeks in the ghetto:

> I experience a strange and utterly illogical feeling of satisfaction when I see a Jewish policeman at a crossing—such policemen were completely unknown in pre-war Poland.

Conditions, however, were hardly idealistic and more people began to realize this with each passing day. Jews numbering 400,000 were living in cramped and squalid quarters. Food supplies ran short, typhoid fever began to spread, nerves and fear reached new heights. The slightest provocation to the Germans meant instant death. Help from Polish friends was slow in coming—an occasional package thrown over the ghetto wall, a forged document, a temporary shelter. One factor remained constant—death, whether it was from starvation or disease or bullets. In 1942, a new element was introduced: mass evacuation of the Jews. Between July and October of 1942, about 30,000 Jews were transported to Treblinka, Auschwitz, Belsen, and Majdanek.

Any illusions the Jews once held about their fate or about German policy were now dissipated. Several people had escaped from the concentration camps and came back to relate the horror they had seen. The policy of appeasement was useless. If death had to come it was best to meet it head on and to die fighting rather than to submit passively. Suddenly, the young men took over the leadership of the remaining Jews in the ghetto. They knew no lethargy and recognized no self-delusion. In a manifesto to the world, the Jewish fighting organization declared:

> Every doorstep in the ghetto has become a stronghold and shall remain a fortress until the end! All of us will probably perish in the fight, but we shall never surrender. We, as well as you, are burning with the desire to punish the enemy for all his crimes, with a desire for vengeance. It is a fight for our freedom as well as yours; for our human dignity and national honor, as well as yours. We shall avenge the gory deeds of Auschwitz, Treblinka, Belsen, and Majdanek!

The Jewish fighting organization assembled the young and the strong, drilled them in defense and guerrilla tactics, dug out a system of tunnels and communication centers. All was done clandestinely, in the night, when no German dared to enter the labyrinth of the ghetto.

The will to fight had been awakened, what was direly needed next was weapons. A strong spirit was not enough to stop German tanks, Molotov cocktails might.

Weapons were bought, stolen, borrowed and then smuggled into the ghetto. Rifles sitting at the sides of German officers in barbershops were pilfered from underneath their noses. Hidden caches of arms were uncovered by resistance groups in forests and brought back into the ghetto. The Jewish fighting organization appealed to the Polish underground resistance, the Polish Government-in-exile, the Allies, the United Nations, everyone they could think of. They hoped that once resistance to the Germans commenced within the ghetto, all of Warsaw would respond to the spark and take up arms against the common enemy, the German.

The 60,000 Jews of the Warsaw ghetto were to be sorely disappointed. The Polish underground felt the time was not ripe for a large-scale resistance. Without adequate preparations and planning, resistance at this point could mean the destruction of all Warsaw. To risk the lives of so many to bolster the morale of the last remaining Jews in the ghetto was too great a cost. At best, the Poles could supply the Jewish fighting organization with some of their arms, some of their men, and as much psychological support as possible. Leaflets were issued and distributed through the underground. A Council for the Assistance to the Jews was established. These were all good measures but they were not enough.

The Polish Government-in-exile issued protests and the Allies signed a declaration denouncing Hitler's actions. Documents, however, would not save the remaining Jews in the ghetto.

On April 19, 1943, when the Germans entered the ghetto to finish their evacuation of all the Warsaw Jews, not passivity but a hail of bullets greeted them. The small number of Jews, poorly armed and new to the methods of war staged a last valiant stand which was to cost the Germans lives, morale, and prestige. A daily average of 30 German officers and 1,190 men were involved in the month-long operation, well equipped with tanks, guns and grenades against only handfuls of Jewish youth, equipped with homemade bombs and stolen guns. Tens of thousands of civilians were holed up in shelters fearfully awaiting the outcome. General Stroop was infuriated by this new development—the ghetto was to be razed to the ground. Planes shelled the crumbling walls from above, German engineers set buildings ablaze from below. By May 1943, Stroop could report with satisfaction that the Warsaw ghetto no longer existed.

Physically, the Jews were indeed vanquished, spiritually they had conquered. They had shown that the human spirit, despite horror and shock and disillusionment, could not be broken. Somewhere a will to fight, an optimistic vein lived on.

That optimistic vein, that will to live on in spite of grief and disappointment, these are the qualities that have enabled the Jewish people to survive 2,000 years in an inhospitable world. The Warsaw ghetto, 25 years ago, recalls many ages of cruelty. It also recalls many ages of determination and hope. The Warsaw ghetto must be a reminder that, no matter how comfortable life may appear, there is a lurking danger which may sweep every comfort away. It is only by remembering we are Jews, being alert to both the glories and menaces of holding on to Judaism in a non-Jewish world, that we will continue to survive as a people and to thrive.

"THE BITTER HERITAGE"

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion about the history of our involvement in Vietnam. Recently Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., published a brief volume entitled "The Bitter Heritage" in which he went to some effort to disassociate the late President Kennedy from our present policy. In my judgment there has been a fundamental identity of principles from President Kennedy to President Johnson and I was pleased to see this continuity emphasized in a review of Professor Schlesinger's book in the New Leader, May 8, 1967, by Prof. I. Milton Sacks, of Brandeis University—one of the Nation's two or three outstanding authorities on Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place this item in the RECORD at this point:

CONTAINMENT IN THE POLYCENTRIST SIXTIES

("The Bitter Heritage Vietnam and American Democracy 1941–1966," by Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., Houghton Mifflin. 126 pp. $3.95. Reviewed by I. Milton Sacks, Associate Professor of Politics, Brandeis.)

Arthur Schlesinger's *The Bitter Heritage* is not so much a book as a broadside in the domestic political controversy over Vietnam. Those looking for a work of history will not find it here; the author himself has specified elsewhere that "it is too soon to expect an authoritative account of the evolution of American policy toward Vietnam." Instead, he has chosen to provide a partisan analysis of the Vietnam war and some prescriptions, loosely defined as "De-escalation," for ending it. So it is as a pamphleteer, who with more than a trace of zeal attempts to disassociate President John Kennedy from the indictment, that he advances a scathing critique of American policy which is only partially mitigated by qualifying phrases.

The analysis rests on the fundamental proposition that the American commitment to South Vietnam is a self-created one. History, according to Schlesinger, reveals that we have always been beset by "illusions" which "continue to mislead us" in dealing with Southeast Asia. The "logic of our own history . . . prescribes two tables of priorities for the United States—one based on strategic significance, the other on cultural accessibility. And by both standards Western Europe and Latin America are the parts of the world which matter most to the United States." He then speculates that: "We could survive the subjection of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Eastern Europe or Polynesia by a hostile power or ideology, but if either Western Europe or Latin America were organized against North America, our position

would be parlous indeed. And Western Europe and Latin America are the parts of the world to which a common intellectual tradition gives us a hope of reciprocal understanding."

In view of these words, one may wonder why Schlesinger so scornfully rejects the label of "neo-isolationist" which he says the "Administration has called the critics of its Vietnam policy." All the more so, since he approvingly quotes Walter Lippmann, who has specifically repudiated his own previous "one-world" concepts to denounce the alleged "global messianism" of current American policy makers.

In any event, from these premises, the rest of the argument flows easily. In World War II, President Franklin D. Roosevelt (correctly or mistakenly, it is not clear) regarded it a vital American interest to stop the threat to Southeast Asia of a "powerful militarist state dedicated to the establishment of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere." Once that threat disappeared, "an internal revolt of Vietnamese nationalists, even if led by Communists" did not in Schlesinger's view "threaten all Southeast Asia." Thus we are said to have mistakenly supported the French, exaggerated the danger of Chinese intervention, invented the fallacious domino theory, and after the French defeat and withdrawal drawn a line which no "vital strategic interest required . . . be drawn where it was." In fact, Schlesinger speculates that "Had Ho taken over all Vietnam in 1954, he might today be soliciting Soviet support to strengthen his resistance to Chinese pressure, and this situation, *however appalling for the people of South Vietnam*, would obviously be better for the United States than the one in which we are floundering today." (Italics mine—I.M.S.)

This is based on a provocative new theory that the "containment of national Communism in the polycentrist sixties will be very different from the containment of international Communism in the monolithic forties. . . . The most effective bulwark against an aggressive national Communist state in some circumstances may well be national Communism in surrounding states." He stops short of suggesting that the creation of such states should become a prime objective of American policy.

Returning to the realities of South Vietnam, Schlesinger notes that once the U.S. was mistakenly committed there in the aftermath of Geneva 1954, it supported President Ngo dinh Diem. He proved to be incompetent, but his misdeeds were concealed from a preoccupied President Kennedy who "accepted the cheerful reports from men in whom he had great confidence." Then an American President, having honestly promised in the 1964 election campaign not to send American boys to Asia, was driven to repudiate his pledge because he "apparently" had not allowed for "continued decay in the military situation." The bombing of North Vietnam and the increase of American troops in South Vietnam (unhappily already numbering over 15,000 in President Kennedy's day) was begun in February 1965 to avert "total collapse," although one simply does not know if the situation "was really all that grave . . . actuality or myth."

President Johnson says he seeks a negotiated settlement, but he is wedded to a bombing policy that seemingly has no justification at all other than "transient" effects, we are told. Worse still, the President has surrendered his options to the workings of "the escalation machine," which inevitably will lead to war with China, "direct Soviet entry into the war in Vietnam," and even nuclear war. Needless to add, the Vietnam war has also divided the American people, liquidated the promise of the Great Society and raised the spectre of the revival of McCarthyism. In the final chapter matters turn out to be better than portrayed, however, and Schlesinger ends on an upbeat note in the true American lecture style.

Unfortunately, in presenting his current view of American policy toward Vietnam, Schlesinger appears to have forgotten what he forcefully wrote only a short while ago. In his personal memoir, *A Thousand Days*, he attributes Hanoi's 1960 intervention in the South to the fact that "the success of Diem's economic policies convinced Ho Chi Minh that he could not wait passively for the Diem regime to collapse." The present book simply refers to the belated character of Ho Chi Minh's 1960 intervention in the South as being due to the unrealiability of the Vietnamese guerrillas in 1958. In this book, too, President Kennedy was fooled by optimistic 1962 reports from American officials. In *A Thousand Days* the Australian Communist writer W. T. Burchett, was cited to show that 1962 was "Diem's year" and that "The American advisers and the helicopter war had increased the cost of guerrilla action, and the Vietcong almost reached the point of giving up in the Mekong delta and withdrawing to the mountains."

And if we are to understand Schlesinger's current view about the strategic importance of Laos and Vietnam, what are we to make of his earlier treatment of Laos in *A Thousand Days*? "For Laos had an evident strategic importance. If the Communists gained possession of the Mekong Valley they could materially intensify their pressure against South Vietnam and Thailand. If Laos was not precisely a dagger point at the heart of Kansas, it was very plainly a gateway to Southeast Asia. . . . It was essential to convince the Pathet Lao they could not win and to dissuade the Russians from further military assistance. In view of the pacifist inclinations of the Royal Laotian Army, moreover, it would be hard to induce the Pathet Lao to call off the war. . . . But as the Pathet Lao moved forward, it became a question whether Moscow could turn the local boys off even if it wanted to. In any case, the United States had no choice but to stiffen its position, whether in preparation for negotiation or for resistance."

President Kennedy then chose to send in the troops. Why was that gesture not "overcommitment," a move toward "land war in Asia" or any of the other pitfalls invoked against our policy in Vietnam?

Indeed, why was it necessary at that time for President Kennedy to affirm that "Moscow must not misjudge the American determination to stop aggression in Southeast Asia," or the height of wisdom to assert, "We must never be lulled into believing that either power (Russia or China) has yielded its ambitions for world domination. . . . I trust the United States has learned that it cannot ignore the moral and ideological principles at the root of today's struggles." Has Schlesinger really forgotten the considerations which led President Kennedy to emphasize American limited war capabilities?

Anyone reading only this book would never know that Schlesinger had earlier concluded, as a final judgment on President Kennedy: "No doubt he realized that Vietnam was his great failure in foreign policy." Nor is Schlesinger's position any clearer when one looks back at the introduction he wrote for *The Politics of Escalation in Vietnam*, whose thesis he now apparently accepts uncritically. At that time he said of the authors, "They do not, in my judgment, give due weight to military necessities that at times have rendered an enlarged American role imperative, nor do they always see that negotiation gestures out of Hanoi can be exercises in political warfare too. . . ." Would that this sentence had found a place in *The Bitter Heritage!*

Nor is it helpful in understanding the Vietnam situation for Schlesinger to resurrect the old chestnut about the military: "The Joint Chiefs of Staff, of course, by definition argue for military solutions. They are the most fervent apostles of 'one more step.' That is their business, and no one should be surprised that generals behave like generals." It is particularly unhelpful when he goes on to cite General Ridgeway, General Gavin and others where it suits his purpose and finally to ask, "Why had our military leaders not long ago freed themselves from the omnipotence of air power, so cherished by civilians who think war can be won on the cheap?"

All of this is not to deny that there is much of value in Schlesinger's indictment. We are in a difficult situation in Vietnam and he has correctly identified many errors made in the past that plague us today. But one is forced to deplore his failure to practice what he preaches. He quite properly "hates to see intellectuals and liberals preparing the way for a new McCarthyism by debasing the level of public discussion and substituting stereotypes for sense and rage for reason." Why then attack Dean Rusk for believing in the monolithic character of Communism when the State Department has not held that view for a number of years?

Of course, Schlesinger offsets the logic of some of his own positions by opposing simple withdrawal and recognizing that "military action plays an indispensable role in the search for a political solution." He even goes so far as to affirm that "We must have enough American armed force in South Vietnam to leave no doubt in the minds of our adversaries that a Communist government will not be imposed on South Vietnam by force."

But the main thrust of his arguments, unfortunately, stems from his basic position that our commitment in Vietnam was wrong to begin with, and that all of our actions should be guided by George Kennan's judgment that "There is more respect to be won in the opinion of this world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than by the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or compromising objectives." The debate Schlesinger has joined will find its ultimate resolution in the future as a consequence of the sacrifices that brave Americans are making in the defense of South Vietnamese freedom, and peace and stability in Southeast Asia. We shall all see whether in accomplishing that objective, we have indeed won more respect in the opinion of the world.

ROBERTSON: 20 YEARS AS CHIEF PAGE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives under the direction of William M. "Fishbait" Miller has a very capable and efficient staff. It is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Members a recent article in the Roll Call commending a very important and capable staff member, Turner Robertson, majority chief House page:

ROBERTSON: 20 YEARS AS PAGE

(By Lorraine Petty)

Turner N. Robertson, celebrating his 28th year on Capitol Hill, says the House Page System hasn't changed much, in the 20 years he has served as Minority and Majority Chief Page.

There are still exactly 50 pages, although the current group is a little older. They still run errands for House Members and they still work long hours and follow the same procedures, under the supervision of Robertson and Tom Tear, present House Minority Chief Page.

But Robertson, after these twenty years, may see major changes in the page system. The Congressional Reorganization bill, now before the House, would require pages to be high school graduates. House pages now must be at least high school juniors. If the measure is passed, the Capitol Page School would be phased out, as present pages graduate.

Lack of after-hours supervision and long working hours for the young boys, plus Congressional reluctance to authorize spending for a new school-dormitory, led to the new minimum age proposal.

Critics say unexpected problems may result from raising the age, without increasing the number of pages.

At 18, they point out, boys are usually either headed for college or the draft. Finding page applicants then might be difficult.

Others wonder whether college students could spare enough time to work the long hours required by Congress. Current pages go to classes from 6:45 AM to 9:45 AM and are on duty the rest of the day until the House adjourns. Even part-time college students couldn't arrange such early class hours. Two shifts of 50 pages each, might be necessary if college students were used.

Some critics also suggest college students might not be quite as enthusiastic about performing menial tasks.

The tasks, according to Robertson, have remained the same, over the past 20 years, but the workload has increased. The physical number of pieces of legislative materials has increased and pages now cover a wider territory since the Rayburn HOB and the New Senate Office Building were built. "Service is still satisfactory," says Robertson, "but not as quick."

Pages duties include placing under each Member's chair, copies of the Congressional Record and all bills, reports, hearings and other materials related to legislation up each day for House consideration. Thereafter, pages await the call of House members, who ask them to pick up and deliver a vast assortment of items (all within the Capitol Hill complex).

Robertson, who supervises the 30 pages serving Democratic House members, came to Capitol Hill April 6, 1939. For the next 10 years, he held a series of patronage jobs under Rep. John H. Kerr (NC).

Then House Minority Leader Sam Rayburn (Tex) appointed him Chief Minority Page on Jan. 1, 1947. He became House Chief Majority Page when Rayburn was made Speaker; then reappointed by current Speaker John W. McCormack (Mass).

A number of his former charges became Members or Hill aides. Rep. David Pryor (Ark) was once a page under Robertson's supervision, as was former Rep. Jed Johnson (Okla). Robertson also recalls two Congressional staffers who were once in his charge—Lee McElvain (Aspinall, Colo) and John Henry (Pryor, Ark).

THE CUBAN HOAX AT EXPO '67

Mr. PATTEN. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, during the next few days, newspapers throughout the country will focus attention on the opening of Expo '67, the World's Fair marking the Canadian centennial. One exhibit which is bound to attract much attention is that sponsored by the Castro Government of Cuba. Indeed, in yesterday's New York Times, an article by John Lee pointed out that U.S. citizens visiting the fair can "enjoy Havana cigars or Cuban rum drinks" even though the purchase of such items "either for consumption in Canada or import into the United States would constitute technical violation of a law prohibiting trading with the enemy."

Communist bloc nations have in the past used such international exhibitions for propaganda purposes; Expo '67, to be sure, will be no exception and, in fact, will offer the Cuban Government its first opportunity to show off its wares at an exhibit of this type in the free world. A poignant statement by Mr. Inocente Andrés Collazo Toledo has been brought to my attention. It concerns, among other things, the outright deceit which has been employed by the Castro regime in assembling its exhibit.

Mr. Collazo formerly served as the representative of Cuban Chartering Enterprises in London, a post he had held since January of 1964. His responsibility in that post was to charter free world vessels for the Cuban sea trade—not an easy task in view of the effectiveness of the Maritime Administration's blacklisting and the boycott action of Western Hemisphere dockworkers against vessels involved in the Cuban trade.

Last month Mr. Collazo asked for—and was granted—political asylum by the U.S. Embassy in the British capital. In the aforementioned statement, given to the Economic Research Bureau of the Movimiento Unidad Revolucionaria, he points out that, while he was serving in London, he came into contact with a Cuban official whose mission in London was to purchase stereo components to be displayed at the Montreal fair as Cuban-manufactured consumer items. The deceit is further compounded by the fact that not even the wood for the cabinets to house the stereo equipment is of Cuban origin; the latter was purchased in the Congo. Thus, a non-Cuban item will be displayed as if it were entirely of Cuban manufacture.

Worse still is the fact that to the casual observer it will appear that such items are available to all Cuban citizens. This could not be further from the truth. As Mr. Collazo states:

> The government will display a number of Cuban products [which] the Cuban people have never heard of.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of our colleagues should take time to read Mr. Collazo's statement as its scope is much broader than just Cuban participation at Expo '67. He confirms the effectiveness of our policy of virtually isolating Cuba economically and, at the same time, he adds emphasis to the widely held belief that the Cuban economy is in a completely chaotic state. I trust that all of our colleagues will afford themselves the opportunity of reading the statement by Mr. Collazo.

Mr. Collazo's statement follows:

STATEMENT

My name is Inocente Andrés Collazo Toledo and in January 1964 I was appointed CUFLET (Cuban Chartering Enterprise) Representative in London, England, a position I held until March 1967, when I defected.

When I left Cuba in January 1964 I left behind a bad situation, both in the political aspect and in the economic aspect, but some of us still doubted that this was the end of the Revolutionary promises we had heard; some of us still had some hope.

In December 1965 I returned to Havana for a two month vacation and this is when I realized how bad things really were, because although reports reaching me in London described the situation, they fell short of the real picture I had the opportunity to see.

Scarcity was widespread. Little food and less variety even among Cuban crops, no shoes, no cloth. I arrived in Cuba just after Castro's announcement about the free exit; he had said in September that all those who wanted to leave the country could do so without fear of reprisals and that he would set up facilities in Matanzas province in order that those having relatives abroad could be picked up.

I guess that Castro had figured that a few thousand would take advantage of his offer, but I am sure he never realized what the true situation was. From his point of view, it would be an embarrassing situation for the United States, but his offer became a boomerang that came back and hit him. For a moment it seemed that everyone was going to leave, so the government started to make it tough for those who wanted out.

These measures were not even popular with government officials, because everyone had some relatives who had applied for exit permits and papers and who had therefore been fired from his job. For one, I had the opportunity of getting a close look at these measures as my own sister had applied for an exit permit and I witnessed the treatment she received from the authorities. For example, when they went to her home to make the inventory of the furniture she was kicked out of the place and not even the food on the stove was she allowed to take with her as she left. The government officials shouted at her when after interviewing her to see if she wanted to remain, she refused and insisted on leaving. Thank heavens she was able to reach the United States and now, after more than three years we have been reunited here in Miami.

I returned to London completely frustrated with the Revolution and convinced that whatever hopes or even dreams I had had before were impossible. I was sorry for all those left behind in Cuba. By February 1967 I had reached a determination: I had to break loose from the Cuban government and I would ask for political asylum from the United States Embassy. It had taken me some time to reach this decision. I had had my doubts and I had been concerned for the uncertainties of the immediate future. But, I could not postpone abandoning my post any longer. I had to take this step, and now I am very happy to have taken it.

This is a summary of the mental processes through which I went before defecting and about the present tyranny that enslaves the Cuban People. I could of course mention its evils, its constant abuses, and its disregard for the dignity of man. I suppose that every one of my fellow countrymen who reach freedom can write a book of his own about this, so I will not extend myself on this subject. However, I am more than happy to answer any questions along this line.

With regard to the economic situation of Cuba, there are a number of facts I came across during the time I was CUFLET Representative in London. I will not refer to all of them, but I will point out some and later on I will be more than pleased to answer related questions.

CUFLET

My task was to charter free world vessels for the Cuba sea trade in order to cover the deficit resulting from the shortage of Cuban and Communist Bloc vessels to handle the volume of trade, and I can add that my task was not an easy one.

The number of shipping firms that are willing to deal with the Cuban government is very limited. The measures taken by the U.S. Government through the "Black List" set up by the Maritime Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce is felt throughout the free world shipping circles.

The boycott action decreed by the dockworkers of this Hemisphere against vessels flying the colors of countries involved in the Cuba trade has also had its effects. As soon as the boycott started some British shipping firms that were at the time considering the possibility of entering into the Cuba sea trade, but that also had regular routes to Latin America, cancelled any such plans.

Another source of harassment are the reports on the Cuban economic situation and free world shipping with Cuba released by Cuban exile organizations. For example, I had the opportunity of seeing several of the newsletters and releases of Unidad Revolucionaria, especially those concerned with shipping. I remember that when Unidad Revolucionaria put out the exposé about Tsavliris shipping firm that firm called me and said: "Here, look at what your friends from Miami keep sending us". Tsavliris is one of the very few free world shipping firms presently chartering vessels to the Cuban government, and thanks to this trade he (Georgios Tsavliris) has been able to expand his maritime business, because after starting out with only two or three vessels he now operates about 12 and has started a salvage enterprise with bases in Greece and the Azores.

When I was in London, most of the charters were made with the following companies: Tsavliris (Tsavliris Shipping Ltd.), Frangistas (Franco Shipping Co. Ltd.), Vlassopulos (Vlassopulos Ltd.), Livanos (John Livanos & Sons Ltd.), Purvis Shipping (Purvis Shipping Co. Ltd.), and Walter Runciman & Co.

Up to 1965 I handled almost 100% of the charters made by the Cuban government through the London CUFLET office. But after that, one of the Greek shipping firms (Frangistas) started to deal directly with CUFLET's Havana office. My experience was that these types of operators charge 20 to 30% over the current charter prices, thus making money at Castro's expense since he has to depend on them for trade transport even if they charge more and even if they use old World War II vessels that suffer constant breakdowns like in the recent case of the Newglad and Newmoat—both belonging to Tsavliris—while on their way to the Persian gulf in December 1966.

Things are worse. I already had received news in London about the measures taken by the Greek government against shipowners and captains of vessels involved in the Cuba sea trade, and to my understanding the owners and captains of the following Greek vessels have been brought to Court: Irene, Barbarino, Alice, Pantanassa, Roula Maria, Sofia, Tina, Eftychia, Andromachi, Kyra Hariklia, Nikolas F., and Nikolis M.

Just as I defected I heard that Frangistas was trying to back away from the Cuba sea trade despite the fact that in 1966 he had visited Havana personally and had promised that the vessels he would be receiving from the Soviet Union would be placed in charter to CUFLET, as was the case of the first one, the Eftychia.

MAMBISAS

Through my work with CUFLET I came in contact with Mambisas (the official Cuban government shipping enterprise). Mambisas has its European offices in Rotterdam, Holland, but they came to CUFLET in London for freight and charters, because many of their return trips to Cuba from the far East were made in ballast.

The new Spanish-built vessels have helped out, but to our surprise, they suffered numerous breakdowns. Further, the defection of 42 officers and crewmembers (including 6 Masters and 10 Chief Engineers) has jeopardized the operation of the merchant fleet.

The Cuban government has been unable to train qualified personnel to replace the officers who have defected. A good example on how this affects the enterprise is the problem with the diesel and fuel oils. Fuel oil is cheaper, much cheaper, than diesel oil; yet, the Cuban vessels have to use diesel oil because their engineers are incapable of operating the ship with fuel oil.

The present partial solution adopted by Mambisas has been to hire eight Soviet Masters, eight Engineers, and fifteen Mates to operate the Cuban vessels.

TRADE

I am no economist or trade expert, but having been three years in London in a Cuban government enterprise I was able to come across numerous government officials who went by and sat with me for a while. And on these occasions we would discuss Cuba. Besides, my trips to Cuba gave me a good insight.

The Cuban economy is in chaos. Let me tell you how things are played up for propaganda purposes. I remember that in 1965 when I was in Havana the authorities were getting ready to hold the Tri-Continental Conference. The government was very busy tidying up the main streets through which the delegates would be taken: La Rampa, Malecón, Galiano, Reina, Monte, Belascoain, and others. It was more or less what they do in Hollywood in the pictures. The set was a facade. The few products available were displayed in the shop-windows, and when no products were available huge revolutionary posters in gay colors were the substitute. You should have seen the streets a block away—empty as ever.

A similar show is the one that the Cuban government is now attempting to put up at the Expo 67 fair in Canada. The government will display a number of Cuban products the Cuban People have never heard of. I met an official who had gone to England to purchase some "Garrard" record-player equipment with which to build several consoles and display them as part of Cuban export products.

To give you an idea about the whole situation, let us take the case of the record-players. The equipment will be purchased in England and even the wood will be imported and for this purpose the Cuban government is now holding talks with Congolese officials (Brazzaville). Hardly a Cuban industry.

Of course, coffee, meat, lobster, fruits, and vegetables—not available for consumption in Cuba—will be available.

It is my own conclusion that Cuban government officials—with the exception of Castro—are convinced that the sugar industry will be unable to pull the country out of the economic crisis, so they are attempting to export anything as long as it means a hard currency revenue: meat (to Italy and Spain), lobsters, fruit and vegetables, furniture, coffee, and the record-players. Not to mention sugar and tobacco.

From talking with other Cuban officials I also concluded that no one knows where the government is heading, nor do they understand what is happening nor what will happen in the future. Perhaps they are too close to see reality. Perhaps they are too much involved in their daily work.

Luckily, I am out of there!

THE TEACHER CORPS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, recently, a poor youngster in Dade County, Fla., was asked what he thought of a class run by members of the Teacher Corps.

"I like it in that class," was the child's reply. "I'm smarter in there."

That comment from a problem student in a low-income school in Florida illustrates some of the findings of a recent study of the Teacher Corps conducted by the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children.

The Council has found:

> Positive warm personal rapport between adult and child is invariably an element in the disadvantaged child's success in the classroom.

This "rapport" is the secret ingredient in the success of the Teacher Corps. The main value of the Corps, according to the Council:

> It is an instrument for harnessing the idealism of an unusual group of young people who, but for the Corps, would never have been drawn to the teaching profession. In apparent contrast to the majority of certified teachers, these young people prefer to work with the special challenge of disadvantaged schools. Through the Teacher Corps, they can put their dedication and their abilities to work in the service of the Nation, the school, and the needy child.

The findings of this national study were graphically depicted in schools in my own State of Florida. A newspaperman working for the Miami Herald described a Teacher Corps man in Dade County as "so excited about teaching you'd think he invented it."

They may not have invented teaching, but they have helped many children discover "how to feel smarter in class."

Each Teacher Corps project in the Nation can show they have succeeded, show where their zeal has excited young minds into accepting the challenge of learning for the first time.

Soon to come before us is the legislation that would enable Teacher Corps men to carry on this invaluable work, and to go into more of the slum schools in our blighted neighborhoods. I would encourage my colleagues to think of the Corps not as a faceless fellowship program, but a dedicated army of young teachers who want to reach these problem children and show them that the way out of their poverty is by learning.

The National Teacher Corps—

Says the Advisory Council's report—

> is too badly needed and too promising to be either discontinued or treated as a tempo-

rary stopgap. Of all the present investments of public effort, few are likely to yield so large a return.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter from Mrs. Janet Dean, president, Dade County Classroom Teachers Association. Mrs. Dean's letter indicates the strong support that the National Teacher Corps is receiving among its colleagues.

The letter follows:

DADE COUNTY CLASSROOM TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
April 10, 1967.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to share with you our concern for the future of the National Teacher Corps. Perhaps I can best do this by bringing you to date on the contribution being made by the NTC teams here in Miami.

Florida has only ten of the special NTC teams—seven in Dade County and three in Broward—working in conjunction with the School of Education at the University of Miami. Every indication that we have points to the success of these special teaching teams. We feel that one of the most valuable contributions made by the program is the experience and training it provides for the intern teacher—training that is not available in any school of education. Student teachers generally learn how to teach the middle-class child. In general, teaching texts are also pointed toward the average middle-class student. As a result, no teacher is ever really prepared for what he will find in teaching the disadvantaged child and few for the gifted child.

The intern teachers we now have in the NTC program in Dade County tell us they are getting superb training. Even more important perhaps, the teachers of the classes from which the children who work with the NTC teams are selected, tell us the real test of success is met. We have learned that the real test is not what happens in the special class, but what happens when the child returns to his regular classroom. A second grade teacher in one of our Dade County Schools sent fourteen of her pupils to the NTC classes. She said, "When they returned, ten were able to continue with the regular studies while four continued to need special attention. But the biggest change has been in the children's attitude. They are much more interested in learning." One of the children who had attended a special NTC class said, "I like to be here. I'm smart in here."

This change in attitude about himself may be the most important contribution any teacher can make to a child who is not successful in school or in society. We are becoming increasingly aware that the difficulty in learning to read is just one part of the complex problem the teacher faces when working with the disadvantaged child. We find that before he can learn to read, he must learn to value reading and before he can value reading, he must learn to value himself.

President Johnson's proposal to extend and enlarge the Teacher Corps is very heartening to all of us who are concerned with and about children. I would urge you to do whatever possible to support the expansion and funding of the National Teacher Corps.

The Dade County Classroom Teachers' Association appreciates your support of education. You will be pleased to know that our present membership of 7,800 continues to make us the largest local association in the nation and I am sure I send the good wishes of our membership to you as I send my own.

Sincerely,

JANET DEAN,
President.

A REPORT ON THE JOB CORPS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Tom Campbell, publisher of Iron Age, the national metalworking weekly, has spent considerable time and effort studying the Job Corps. He has visited a number of centers and talked with both officials and Job Corps enrollees. His editorial and article, "Industry and Job Corps Salvage America's Rejected Youth," presents a comprehensive look at the Job Corps.

I urge all Members to read these articles, which follow:

THE JOB CORPS PAYS OFF: BY RE-CREATING HUMAN DIGNITY!

(By Tom Campbell)

If you are hidebound in your opinion that industry and government can't work together in some areas, forget this piece. And don't read the one inside on the Job Corps either.

But if you believe in miracles, be with us for a little while. If you don't believe what you read at least you will be shaken up. That we guarantee.

Perhaps your first thought was—as was ours—that the Job Corps was a mammoth leaf-raking boondoggle. Most of us let it go at that. Some columnists, editors, hatemongers, youth detractors and hostile people condemned something they knew nothing about.

We had a second thought. It stemmed from the lucky breaks we had along the road of life since 1923. Then, Herb Graham, chief inspector at the Southside plant of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. (who later was research vice president) gave us our first chance. Since then we have known hundreds of men who would have said, "Hire that guy?" But he did; and we got our start.

Later, Dr. Donald A. Laird, Psychology Dept., Colgate University told us, "Tom you can always break into print if you chew hell out of something 'different.' If you have a message based on fact and good will, chances are few—if any—will listen to you." It's still true today.

We checked, interviewed, read thousands of words, saw copies of letters from Corpsmen, looked over the guys running the show, analyzed the budgets, threw quickies at the brains of the setup, made several fellows miserable, changed our own ideas often—and came away convinced.

We were convinced that something that should not have happened—according to sterile, formal and prejudiced rules—not only happened, but it worked. And man, if something works to the benefit of all, don't flyspeck it, argue with it or waste time trying to discredit it. If you do, you will find your "listeners" are "out to lunch."

In case you didn't know it, top industrial companies have contracted to make the Job Corps a success. With the help of government Job Corps people, American industrial giants have succeeded in giving dignity, jobs and a purpose to society's castoffs.

The success has been so strong spiritually—as well as economically—it is living proof of modern day miracles.

INDUSTRY AND JOB CORPS SALVAGE AMERICA'S REJECTED YOUTH

(The Job Corps has been called everything from a boondoggle to a Federal reform school. And, from past experience, was a predictable failure. But it isn't a failure—for one reason: People.)

(By Tom Campbell [1])

"The Job Corps has been called the greatest sociological experiment of the century. This project not only teaches marketable skills, but also creates an entirely new environment for dropouts . . . The Federal government, I believe, was wise in soliciting industry to help in solving that particular problem. We have the capital, the manpower, the skills, technology and the desire to get the job done." (*Harold S. Geneen, president ITT.*)

Take a youngster 16 to 21 years old. He (or she) is a dropout and unemployed. He (or she) probably comes from a broken family—or no family at all. Maybe a police record is involved. He (or she) may be alienated or hostile—or both.

Who cares? Few people, if anyone. Schools want him to conform. Society calls two strikes against him right off the bat; and watches like a hawk. Many companies spurn him—and naturally he spurns them. In many cases we studied, he rejects himself.

Someone Cares. He hears about the Job Corps. Its camps are, in most cases, run by the biggest corporations in the nation. The United States Employment Service looks him over. He gets accepted.

He or she is cleaned, screened and told what's what by a counselor who has been picked by the company and approved, aided, and briefed by the Job Corps.

Now, someone does care—maybe for the first time. This is his first real chance to be salvaged. Or as Vice President Humphrey says, "It may be his only and last chance."

Industry's Role. The boys go to one of 11 major camps, each run by a civilian contractor; of these, nine are large business companies, one is a joint university-company venture and the other is run by a state agency. Unique, eh? Especially when one is led to believe that universities are interested in youth?

The girls go to one of 14 camps or centers, most of which are run by American business companies. Both the men's and girls' camps are urban organizations.

In addition to these are conservation camps where $38 million dollars in conservation has been accomplished already. And besides conservation, these boys are taught trades and educated.

"It is still too early to judge, but we assume, based on our experience, any reasonable degree of success of the Job Corps program will be one of the best investments America could make."

And, "70% of these boys at Camp Parks came from families on relief. Furthermore, 40% of their grandparents were also on relief. If we can break that cycle and can make them tax producers, instead of tax consumers, we have added greatly to the strength of America." (Charles B. Thornton, board chairman, Litton Industries.)

Stick-to-It Rate. Of this major group of society's "we-don't-want-them," about 70% stick to the Job Corps until "graduated." They are trained for a trade, reach for a high school diploma (and get it), become

---

[1] Inside for the Story:

For nearly all of his working life, Tom Campbell has earned his living only one way—by knowing people; knowing what motivates them and why; knowing how they'll react and why; in short, knowing them from the inside—not just the outside.

He spent seven years in industrial and employee relations with Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania. This only whetted his appetite for people. He has spent the last 31 years writing about them for Iron Age. And along the way, he has been active in various youth groups.

The result of all of these experiences is this intensely personal report on the Job Corps.

a forester, return to school, go to work for the Corps or join the Service. Recently a fellow classed as a stupe by his former pals, his former school, and by many others, landed a job as cook for a large Corps camp. Today he makes more than his dad, is happy and is completely salvaged.

Latest figures compiled (and audited) a few weeks ago show: 4637 or 73% of the Corpsmen have jobs because of rehabilitation and teaching at the camps; 1115 or 18% are in the Service and 594 or 9% went back to school after being upgraded by the Job Corps.

PROFILE OF A TYPICAL ENROLLEE ENTERING THE JOB CORPS

Education: Reading score: 4.7 grade level; Years of school: 7

Health: 80% have never seen a Doctor or Dentist; 7 lb underweight.

Previous Behavior: 63% no previous record; 27% minor anti-social behavior; 10% had 1 serious conviction.

Family Pattern: 45% from broken home; 65% from family where head of household unemployed; 50% from families on relief.

Earning Capacity: 90% unemployed; 10% employed at an average of 80¢ hour.

About $140 million worth of contracts held by leading business companies are now in effect. A profit of around 4.5% is realized after the bugs are out. A hardnosed accounting department in the Office of Economic Opportunity goes over the bills and budgets of the Job Corps with a fine tooth comb—and a magnifying glass. Result: an outfit as tightly run as any business.

The Dropouts. Before I forget; many will want to know what happens to the 30% "lost" souls who can't make the grade in the Job Corps? Remember all Job Corps acceptances were taken off the bottom of the totem pole—white and non-white. Here's a rundown on the dropouts:

1. Sixty percent of the dropouts were indirectly helped by their short stay in the Corps. They either went back to school or got a job as a result of their short "adoption."

2. Thirty percent of the dropouts were referred to proper psychiatric, psychological or hospital centers. Half have been salvaged and are on their way to becoming taxpaying members of society; something that wouldn't have happened if they hadn't joined Job Corps in the first place.

3. Of the remaining 10% of Job Corps dropouts, most had eye, teeth and medical corrections and are now telling their sisters and brothers, "Maybe I didn't make the grade, but if you have any sense or guts you better stay in school or you will wind up an outcast and a complete failure."

Personal Approach. One good reason why the Job Corps has such a personal and practical communication with former Corpsmen is due to Dr. David Gottlieb, an associate director of Job Corps. He flits in and out of camp after camp—and doesn't miss a trick.

This guy is trusted and liked by the entire Corps. Some people in education don't care too much for Dr. Gottlieb because of his unorthodox teaching ideas. (He got his Ph.D. in Sociology so as not to upset his educated family, almost all of whom were big domes and successful Ph.D.'s and what have you.)

Dave sees that Corpsmen are trained, taught and cared for at their learning pace and as individuals. That's the main difference between the JC and school.

In the latter you toe the mark as a member of the "group". If you don't, you get the can tied to you, pushed ahead because of physical size or get disgusted and drop out of school. When you do that you are a dead duck, an outcast and a ready pigeon for the police blotter, skid row, drug addiction or human degradation.

From the Top, Down. Dr. Gottlieb ought to know this. He was a dropout himself. Before he went back to school (and eventually got his degrees, wrote books about kids, and became a down-to-earth consultant on youngsters) he went through what they go through: Broke, a bum, a seaman, a cook or a job at anything that made a few bucks. So he knows all the "things" to expect—and correct.

What's that you say? "Why didn't—or doesn't industry come out and yack about its success?"

Some do. But they were scared stiff—at first. They worried about the effect on their image, etc.

But Litton Industries, General Electric, Westinghouse, U.S. Industries, IBM, Federal Electric, Thiokol, RCA, Burroughs, Xerox and others are 100% for JC. They ought to be: They learned how to make it work. Their originial top kicks are strong for it and they can't let go of a tiger—if they wanted to.

Implicit Trust. About the "horror"stories and the "scandals" and the fights, etc? What would you expect from a group that society as much as told to go to hell and burn? Dandies?

You can match the small minority of JC troublemakers (who come out okay in the end) with any underprivileged, privileged or overprivileged group in San Francisco, Rochester, Pittsburgh, Cleveland or any other "nice" place. I know. I've been there.

When I went to the main headquarters in Washington, to shake out some of the answers to the questions I had about the Job Corps project, one thing stuck out: The informality and the implicit trust the various people had in each other.

FANCY—AND FACTS

Certain myths and errors have grown up around Job Corps during the past two years. Here are the most common errors and the facts.

1. The high cost of Job Corps training.

Fact: Present costs range from $6090 for nine months (the average length of stay) to $8120 for a year; next year, these will drop to $5825 and $7765. These costs include everything—capital costs, administration, food, clothing, transportation, medical and dental care, pay and allowances. Common misstatement is that Job Corps costs more than college. However, college tuition is only about a third of the cost of a year's college education, with rest made up by grants and endowments. College tuition does not cover many items included in Job Corps costs.

2. Job Corpsmen don't stay in the program.

Fact: More than 70 out of every 100 complete their training. Retention rate is remarkable in view of dropout history of Job Corps volunteers and compares favorably with other school programs.

3. Corpsmen riot and are in constant trouble with the law.

Fact: The arrest rate for all Job Corpsmen since program began is about 3.5%, which compares with the national average of 6.5% for this age group. The number of "incidents" involving Corpsmen and women has been relatively low but any fracas involving them gets undue attention in press.

4. Corpsmen shouldn't get legal service in case of trouble.

Fact: Job Corps believes its volunteers are entitled to the same basic protection of bail and representation as all other Americans. Bail is paid for by the Corpsmen; maximum limits are set on legal fees and Corpsmen also pay part of this.

5. Job Corps staff members are paid unusually high salaries.

Fact: Job Corps salaries are carefully scrutinized. It must be remembered that Job Corps teaching is year-round, often week-long, with few fringe benefits and no tenure, compared with 9 to 10 month years of conventional teachers.

6. A new program is not needed; let the regular schools do it or have industry train them.

Fact: Most Job Corps volunteers are youngsters that regular schooling could not reach for one reason or another. Completely new techniques and materials are needed to teach them. Many require reading and arithmetic teaching before they can be taught work skills; most need to be taught proper work habits and attitudes, and need the motivation to go on.

7. There are plenty of jobs; let these youngsters find them.

Fact: Uneducated and undereducated, untrained, these young people do not have the tools to find and hold meaningful, regular work. Less than 10% had worked before coming to Job Corps, although nearly all had looked. Most worked short-term or part-time jobs. Without Job Corps or a similar program, most of these young people would remain on the human slag heap, winding up on welfare or in a correctional institution. The modest investment in these young people will be repaid many times over when they become working, taxpaying, self-sufficient citizens.

"I think that jobless youth is a problem that belongs to America—not to government, not to education, not to charities; but to America as a whole As a consequence, I think that part of that responsibility rests squarely on industry.

"It seems to me that economically, any investment to get these youngsters off the street, and proud of themselves, and earning, is certainly worthwhile for all of us." Thomas J. Watson, Jr., board chairman, IBM.

Most unusual. After 31 years in the reporting business, this struck me as quite unusual in either government or business.

So much did this bother me—in view of the concrete evidence of the success now being realized—that I bugged Dr. Gottlieb unmercifully. The air was pretty hot for a while.

The truth was finally out. Dr. Gottlieb, his bosses in Washington, and the counselors and head guys in the camps do what they think is best. They're not hamstrung by a set of fancy rules made up by someone in an ivory tower.

This applies even to the public affairs department—another name for public relations. Most of the guys and gals there are former hard-nosed newspaper people who give you what you ask for. There wasn't anybody sitting on their shoulders Okaying what they said—or asking them why they said it, and why they let an outside reporter run ragged through their department.

Analysis of the first 5,000 placements: [1]

	Percent
Occupations	70.1
Professional, technical, managerial, etc.	3.1
Clerical	7.2
Service	12.6
Farming, fishery, forestry, etc.	5.2
Processing	3.6
Machine trades	8.0
Bench work	6.5
Structural work	14.4
Armed Forces	20.2
School	9.7

[1] Average hourly wage of those on jobs is $1.71 per hour, compared with 80 cents an hour by the less than 10% who worked before coming into the Job Corps.

About 60% of those placed in jobs came from the men's urban centers.

Good—or Else. It was pretty clear to them that your reporter was going to write as he saw it.

But there still was some ingredient that was responsible for the thing that made the project click. It was true that some Senators tried to put the blocks to the Job Corps—because of integration—but this failed. It's true that Vice President Humphrey not only knew what was going on, but he put the

full weight of his office and that of several Senators squarely behind the project.

What Makes It Click. After about 3½ hours of sweaty yakkity yak, we found the missing ingredient. Sergeant Shriver—the top bananaman—decided early in the game that the Job Corps could never get off the ground if it was bogged down by griping, partisan criticism and some good old political torpedo activity.

Mr. Shriver knew his way around before he hit the government. He was smart enough to realize that if he took full heat from newspapers, reporters, Congressmen, and those who would rather die than see integration, the Job Corps idea would not only work, but business companies could get the bugs out and realize a payoff.

Seeing Is Believing. A visitor who knows his onions can sense that his particular project has a minimum amount of fly-specking instructions and ruses set up by people who wouldn't know a person from a hole in the ground—especially the kind of rejects they get into the Job Corps.

You have to see it to believe it. Once you read hundreds of letters from fellows who a year ago didn't amount to a hill of beans to themselves or society, you are sure business and government can cooperate on any project which requires fresh, new, and trial-and-error thinking.

The test: Does it work? The answer: After a thorough check by this writer. Yes!

THE TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS WAR

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last week, in extension of my remarks, I obtained leave to print chapter 8 of the ignominious prowar report against Africa, devised by the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace.

While this foundation is tax free and contributes nothing to relieve the tax burden borne by our people, it is not hesitant in calculating how much tax money and even the number of casualties—American boys—we should sacrifice in any military measures against our friends in South Africa.

If this anti-American front can use its billions, without being a good taxpayer, to tell us where to spend our money and get our boys killed, something smells in New York and Washington, D.C.

This outfit has also dreamed up the new educational TV monster—also tax free. What will it teach—hate Africans and where to do war to appease its insatiable appetite? Congress needs to act, and fast, to eliminate these alien foundations from tax exemption and to investigate warmongering activities. They are a danger to freemen the world over—hiding behind such a fancy title as "International Peace." Andrew Carnegie would turn over in his grave if he were to see the shenanigans being suggested against the people by these "police state liberals."

I include the appendix to the Carnegie booklet on "Apartheid" be printed following my remarks:

APPENDIX—COLLECTIVE MILITARY MEASURES: SOME CALCULATIONS

In Chapter 7, figures were cited as to the estimated costs of various kinds of collective measures and as to estimated casualties. The manner in which these estimates were derived are described in this Appendix.

COST ANALYSIS

Cost estimates of a contemplated operation would be an essential part of the overall planning by a United Nations force staff. Each operation would have to be examined in minute detail in order to arrive at aggregative cost data. These in turn could be used for assessment purposes. Admittedly any cost analysis would rely heavily upon past experiences and involve many crude estimates. Nevertheless, some attention to costing is necessary to appreciate the magnitude of financial resources required. Furthermore the costs themselves would be an element in the policy formulation stage.

In this section, cost data of a *type* blockade force and a *type* military force will be estimated. Ascertaining the costs of all contemplated operations would be beyond the purposes of this study.[1]

The United States experience in the Cuban quarantine provides an illustrative example to formulate criteria for blockade costs against South Africa. These figures are crude estimates of the costs incurred by the United States during the entire period of the Cuban quarantine. According to Admiral Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations during the period, "some 180 ships were directly involved at the height of the Cuban operation."[2] The total estimated cost of the naval operations (including naval air units) for the 28 days in which the quarantine was in effect was approximately $44,500,000.[3] *The New York Times* estimated that the warships actually on station during the blockage period included 3–5 aircraft carriers and a total of 40–50 other warships.[4] (The differences between the *Times* account and that of the *Hearings* was presumably in the number of auxiliary and support ships involved. The 180 ships probably refers to the total ships, including support and auxiliary vessels.)

It is interesting to note that the Cuban coastline is approximately 1,600 miles (that of South Africa, approximately 1,800 miles). The blockade was a partial one, e.g., a quarantine that was essentially a stop-and-search operation to prevent contraband cargoes from entering Cuban waters. Several other factors should be borne in mind. Cuba is located a very short distance from the continental United States. Bases and other facilities were already in existence for the staging and maintenance of military units. And, of course, the Cuban quarantine was an action by a cohesive national military force. The ability of the Cuban military forces to retaliate or contest the blockade was quite limited.

A more detailed cost estimate of individual ships and naval aircraft, in conjunction with the overall cost of the Cuban operation, will assist analysis of a South African operation. The figures are annual operating costs of the vessels, including estimates of support by other vessels, and are based on the assumption that the vessels are prepared for sustained combat operations.[5]

Type of vessel	Cost per year	30 days (cost)	120 days (cost)
Carrier	$14 to $17 million (average $15 million)	$1,250,000	$5,000,000
Destroyer	$2 to $3 million (average $2 million)	208,000	832,000
Submarine	$2 to $4 million (average $3 million)	250,000	1,000,000
Attack transport	$2 to $3 million (average $2½ million)	208,000	832,000
Support ship	$2 to $6 million (average $4 million)	333,000	1,332,000
Cruiser	$6 to $10 million (average $8 million)	666,000	2,664,000

Operation costs for naval aircraft including support of and readiness for sustained combat operations are as follows:

Fighter/bomber (jet aircraft) $300,000 to $600,000 per year aircraft (average $450-000)

30-day period $37,500

120-day period $150,000

In Chapter 7 it was estimated that a force of 50 or more warships with 300 aircraft would be needed for blockade purposes. Using the above figures, the following costs would be applicable:

	Time frame and cost	
	30-day	120-day
Type vessel:		
50 warships to include—		
4 aircraft carriers	$5,000,000	$20,000,000
3 cruisers	1,998,000	7,992,000
33 destroyers	6,864,000	27,456,000
10 submarines	2,500,000	10,000,000
Aircraft: 300 aircraft (includes approximately 100 for air blockade)	11,250,000	46,000,000
Total	27,612,000	111,448,000
Total, 6-month naval and air blockade period	165,672,000	

According to one study, $8–10 per day would be required to maintain one United Nations soldier on a day-to-day basis. The same study notes "Moreover, if the Force were committed, its expenses would certainly leap upwards—depending on the location and level of activity—and costs might go as

[1] Estimates used for computation of force costs are individual judgments based upon a variety of sources. They are dependent upon analysis of overall costs and interpolation of results. These estimates are very crude figures which only serve to focus attention upon the problem of costs and to suggest possible ranges of magnitude.

[2] U.S. Congress, House of Representatives (88th Cong.), Subcommittee of Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings, Part 2*, (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1963) p. 254.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *The New York Times*, 23 Oct. 1962.

[5] The cost figures used in the table are consolidations and averages from numerous public sources.

high as double the 'cheapest' figure."[6] The cost (direct and indirect) of maintaining troops of modern armies varies from $15–20 a day per man.

The cost of the military operation in the Congo averaged approximately $10 million a month.[7] Oversimplifying the cost figures and assuming there was an average of 15,000 troops on duty, the cost per day per man averages $20. These Congo costs, it must be recalled, were for a peacekeeping operation. In sustained operations, involving direct combat between military forces (both regular and irregular forces), a certain percentage of casualties and replacements in both men and materiel would have to be expected.

The following cost estimates are based upon a range of figures utilized by Cannon and Jordan, the Congo operation, and published reports of naval and air operations. These cost estimates are for ground troops employed in a type of direct intervention discussed in Chapter 7.

Ground troops	Time frame (days)	Sustained operations		
		$15 per day	$20 per day	$30 per day
30,000 (assault force)	30	13,500,000	18,000,000	27,000,000
60,000 (followup force)	30	27,000,000	36,000,000	54,000,000
3,000 (air assault)	30	1,350,000	1,800,000	2,700,000
Total ground forces, 93,000	30	41,850,000	55,800,000	83,700,000
Total ground forces, 93,000	120	166,400,000	223,200,000	334,800,000

	30-day period[1]
Naval and air units:	
60 warships and 300 aircraft (identical to blockade forces with addition of 10 destroyer-type vessels)	$29,692,000
45 attack transports	9,360,000
30 to 40 support vessels (average 35)	11,655,000
Total naval and air units	50,707,000
Support aircraft:	
200 transport aircraft[2] (direct assault)	990,000
Require 3,000 total flying hours for direct assault and approximately 3,000 total flying hours for 30-day period (30-day support)	990,000
Total support aircraft cost	1,980,000

[1] A 30-day time frame is used here as being the best indicator of costs for the variety of naval vessels involved. It is recognized that types of naval support and aircraft support will change as an operation progresses. It is also recognized that the size and composition of a force have been greatly oversimplified for the purposes of this study.

[2] Cost of transport aircraft is computed from U.S. Congress, House of Representatives (88th Cong.), Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings, Part 4*, (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1963), p. 781. This document lists the cost of two typical transport aircraft as follows: C124A—3,270 flying hours for total statistical cost of $1,063,338. This averages to $325 per flying hour; C130E—77 flying hours for a total statistical cost of $26,109. This averages $340 per flying hour. The cost for the computation here is $330 per flying hour.

Thus to mount an entire direct intervention operation would require $94,537,000 for a 30-day period.[8]

There are many variations of the force concept employed for the cost estimates. Furthermore, there is a wide range of cost factors which are highly dependent upon the nature of the operation—the intensity of combat, the reaction of opposing forces, and individual nations' cost requirements. To reiterate, this cost analysis is for one type of force and is based on very crude estimates for purposes of adding another element to the overall appreciation of the effort and resources required to conduct military operations.

Another factor must be borne in mind in considering the significance of the cost analysis. These costs are based upon the assumption that most of the forces would come from a single power, or at least powers that have the capability of mounting an operation and have a certain degree of homogeneity of equipment and requirements. If forces were composed of various smaller national contingents, the costs would greatly increase; a longer build-up period, including training, re-equipping, and base facilities would be required. With a major power or powers supplying troops, naval, and air units, the build-up period would be kept to a minimum and costs reduced.

Casualty estimates

The following are the calculations on which the casualty estimates[9] used in chapter 7 were based:

Assault Period up to 15 days: Total per day, 240 personnel; total 15-day period, 7,200 personnel (a percentage of these personnel would be returned to duty).

Consolidation period 15 to 120 days (after assault period): Total per day, 180 to 360 personnel; total 105-day period, 18,900 to 37,800 personnel (a percentage of these personnel would be returned to duty).

[6] Lt. Col. Charles A. Cannon, Jr., and Lt. Col. Amos A. Jordan, USA, in William R. Frye, *A United Nations Peace Force* (New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1957), p. 167.

[7] Lyman M. Tondel, Jr. (ed.) *Legal Aspects of the United Nations in the Congo*, (New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1963) p. 47.

[8] Based on $15 per man per day.

[9] Department of the Army, *FM 101–10*, Staff Officers Field Manual, Part 1 (Washington, 12 February 1959), pp. 336–338. This publication contains statistics that can be utilized for estimating casualties under various combat conditions. The statistics used for the estimates in his paper are as follows:

Average daily admission rate per 1,000 from all causes

Combat conditions:	*Infantry divisions*
Heavy	8
Average	4
Light	2

The statistics are based on experience gained from World War II and Korea. These estimates will vary based upon intensity of combat, enemy capabilities, training of troops, etc. Consequently they should be used with caution.

WASHINGTON STAR HAILS PISCATAWAY PARK BARGAIN

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star long has been recognized for its outstanding editorial policy on conservation and in this special field the Star speaks with a clear and progressive voice.

Today the Star reiterates its consistent support of the cooperative Federal-private landowner pilot program to save the view from Mount Vernon at Piscataway Park. I applaud the Star's editorial, "Potomac Bargain," for its recognition of how significant a bargain completion of Piscataway Park would be because of the 168 donated scenic easements protecting more than 1,190 acres and the large donations of scenic land to the Government.

I highly recommend the Star's editorial of Tuesday, April 25, 1967, to my colleagues:

POTOMAC BARGAIN

In the absence of a last-minute rescue, the long, carefully developed campaign to preserve the Potomac shoreline across from Mount Vernon as a lovely natural park is apt to be scuttled tomorrow in the House. And if that occurs, Congress will be allowing an extraordinary bargain to slip down the drain.

The threat is created by the House Appropriations Committee's inexplicable failure to recommend a $2.7 million expenditure representing the federal government's modest share in the venture. Two foundations, displaying a good deal more foresight than the committee, have generously offered to contribute 500 acres of the expensive shoreline to the government. About 170 individuals have also agreed to donate scenic easements vital to the conservation. These offers will expire, however, unless Congress this year purchases other strategically necessary portions of the proposed Piscataway Park—at a cost that is only a fraction of the true value.

Representative Machen, who has worked in behalf of the park for more than a year, pledges, if necessary, to carry on the fight in the Senate. The actual decision, however, may well be made in the House. Surely, in voting the massive $1.3 billion Interior appropriation bill, some way can be found to salvage this important item while there still is time.

ARMENIAN MASSACRES OF 1915

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, modern man often points with pride to the social and technical accomplishments achieved through his ingenuity and intelligence, but amid the progress and growth of his material world are many appalling examples of man's inhumanity to man. One of the most horrendous of these shameful acts in the 20th century began in 1915 when the Ottoman Empire of Turkey cruelly annihilated the Armenian population that had lived peacefully in Anatolia for centuries. Genocide of a whole ethnic community is not one of the

modern inventions we should hope to pass on to future generations.

Fearing European intervention on behalf of the subject Armenians, the Ottoman authorities decided to dissolve the problem by destroying the Armenian communities. On April 24, 1915, the first arrests of Armenian leaders took place, thus depriving the Armenians of any leadership that might have rallied them to resist the cruelties to follow. The remainder of the Armenian nation was then subjected to murder, starvation, and dispersal until almost 2,000,000 people had been removed from Turkey. Families were separated, men were assassinated, women were abducted for the pleasure of the Sultan's soldiers, and whole villages were destroyed and their occupants removed to hostile environments where they were left to die of disease and starvation. Before it ended, modern history's first genocide had killed nearly 1,000,000 Armenians and relocated an equal number to foreign lands. In 1 short year, an ancient nation had been virtually decimated to a point close to extinction.

Today, there remain a few Armenian communities in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Iraq in addition to the few survivors in Turkey. Russia proudly boasts of its independent Armenian nation made up from the 1915 survivors who fled northward during the holocaust, but these people have only traded one dictator for another. But the Armenia of 1914, a nation of 2,000,000 people, can never be reconstructed. This nation remains in the hearts of its few scattered people and in the memories of all civilized men who abhor genocide.

On this anniversary of the Armenian massacres, let us remember not only the victims of ruthless murder but also the inhuman hatred that threatens all minorities.

QUOTA PROPOSED FOR FROZEN STRAWBERRIES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues from the State of Oregon [Mrs. GREEN, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. DELLENBACK] in recommending legislation today to correct a serious agricultural problem which is threatening the health of the domestic strawberry industry. Under the sponsorship of Senators WAYNE MORSE and MARK O. HATFIELD, similar legislation is being presented today in the Senate.

Our bill will impose a quota on imports of processed, prepared, and frozen strawberries. Each year the quota will limit strawberry imports to 20 percent of the average annual consumption in the United States for the preceding 5 years.

The impact of this legislation is not limited to the State of Oregon. Indeed, strawberries are grown commercially in 28 States, and the National Association of Frozen Food Packers has participated in recommending this action.

Strawberry imports have increased dramatically in the last decade. In 1966, there were imports from Colombia, Sweden, The Netherlands, and Poland—but primarily the domestic market was invaded by Mexico.

During the period 1955 to 1959, Mexican exports of frozen strawberries into the United States averaged 13 million pounds annually. From 1960 to 1964, this average rose to 32 million pounds. In 1965, approximately 50 million pounds of frozen Mexican strawberries entered this country. Last year the total reached 82.8 million pounds, for a 60-percent increase in a single year.

There are many reasons for the Mexican success. Labor costs, both in the fields and in processing, are about 10 percent of comparable costs in the Pacific Northwest. Sugar prices are about half the U.S. average, and containers are also cheaper in Mexico. American farmers and processors cannot compete with the cut-rate labor, sugar, materials, and selling prices of the imported product.

The rapid growth of the Mexican strawberry industry may be attributed almost exclusively to expanding exports to the United States. Faced with this competition, it is apparent that the strawberry industry of the United States needs some assurance that its domestic market will not be completely disrupted if it is to remain in business.

The 20-percent formula we have recommended is a reasonable one. The annual average disappearance of frozen strawberries in the United States for the most recent 5-year period is 272.06 million pounds. During this same period, imports of frozen strawberries from Mexico have averaged 44.5 million pounds annually. In the light of these statistics, an annual quota of 50 million pounds—or about 20 percent—would appear to guarantee a significant market for the Mexican product.

Rather than raise duties to extravagant heights, we have chosen instead to adopt the quota approach. The 20-percent formula will enable foreign exporters to share our growing domestic markets, and at the same time prevent rapid domination of those markets to the detriment of American producers and processors. In the event of a declining market situation, the quota approach holds foreign strawberry imports to a reasonable level.

Mr. Speaker, we have attempted to present a bill today which will assist a domestic industry in maintaining its marketplace, without seriously disrupting friendly trade with our neighbors. We are hopeful that the strawberry import quota legislation will accomplish this goal.

RUSSIAN JEWS HELD IN BONDAGE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is very fitting today, as Jews the world over start observance of Passover, that we here take note of the plight of the Jews held in bondage in the Soviet Union. That bondage, while not as physical as that inflicted upon the ancient Jews by the Pharaohs, is every bit as cruel and persistent. The Communists in direct violation of their own constitution have driven Jews from the arts, business, the military, and public life. They have forbidden the printing of sacred books and teachings, thus making it difficult for Jewish fathers to pass on their heritage to their own children.

The current Jewish pogrom in Russia started with Stalin when before the war he purged the Rusisan Army officer corps of Jews. After the war, despite devout and loyal service by thousands of Jews, Stalin continued his vicious campaign. His death did not lessen the tragic circumstances of Russian Jewry as the persecution continued in each succeeding regime.

Tonight as devout Jews open their Passover ceremonies they will not only be marking the freedom of their ancestors from the persecution of the Pharaohs. They will be praying, too, for the deliverance of their brethren in Russia. We, too, must join in those prayers, just as we must speak out against this abomination, this travesty on the fundamental laws of humanity which is taking place in the Soviet Union. It is fitting and proper that Americans of all faiths join together in expressing their indignation at the persecution of the Soviet Jews. In good conscience there is no other course of action.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I introduced, and this body subsequently passed, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion. I would like to quote that resolution—it is still very much the sense of Congress and all America:

> That it is the sense of Congress that persecutions of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses and fully permit the free exercise of religion and pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

CRITICAL SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge of a momentous decision—whether we should escalate the war another step. It has been officially stated that because of the buildup of enemy forces some steps must be taken to beef up our contingent in South Vietnam. For this reason General Westmoreland has already asked for more troops, and according to reports, which seem to have been well inspired, he wants two divisions more, or about 100,000 men. And this is the decision with which the President is confronted.

Mr. Speaker, some information has come to me which bears on this question, which is before us and before the Nation. And I felt that it was my duty to impart it to my colleagues here, and to the Nation. For it seems appropriate that, on the eve of this tremendous decision, of whether to escalate or not, we should examine carefully the options that are before us.

I have evidence which leads me to believe that one of the factors causing there to be a need for additional troops is the decline in the morale and a serious breakdown in the South Vietnamese Army; and the cause for this is political, not military. It has come to my attention through private Vietnamese sources that there is a desperate power struggle going on in Saigon between Premier Ky and General Thieu. It is aggravating, and perhaps at the bottom of this deterioration in morale. It has particular significance in the sensitive I Corps area around Hue. The struggle between Ky and Thieu involves the Presidency. We should have no quarrel with this development, since it would be a normal process of democracy; except that the fight among the generals seems to have had a chaotic effect upon our military effort.

The chronology of events appears to be as follows: It is reported that sometime last month there was a meeting of the South Vietnamese military, at which time it was decided that General Thieu, not Premier Ky, would be the military's candidate for the Presidency. Premier Ky was angered by this development, his first reaction was to declare that any person intending to stand for the Presidency should not remain in the Army. General Thieu apparently takes the view that withdrawing from the Army would be withdrawing from a power base, and was therefore unwilling to resign. Premier Ky's next move was to form a commission ostensibly to investigate corruption among Army officers, and under this guise proceeded to arrest members of the military who were apparently loyal to General Thieu. General Thieu then formed a counter commission to investigate corruption, and he has also been arresting officers. And thus we have a struggle which has begun to split asunder the South Vietnamese Army and severely affect its morale and efficiency. This has had severe repercussions in the I Corps area. Here is an area which our Marines were so much on top of a year ago that they were able to go off on expeditious of pacification. And that was with even less troops in the area. Recently the U.S. Army has had to rush troops to reenforce the Marines. We have had to evacuate civilians from villages to Hue. And within 2 miles of the American military headquarters at Quang Tri, the Vietcong staged a raid and were able to liberate a great many prisoners. The Vietcong have become immensely successful at their guerrilla tactics. On April 8 it was reported that two South Vietnamese brigades were overrun. According to information passed on to me, these brigades actually surrendered to the enemy because the effect of the political in-fighting has been so bad it destroyed the will of the troops to fight.

Thus we are confronted with a situation in which the South Vietnamese Army is loosing ground, not so much because of the superiority of enemy troops, but because of local demoralization caused by a political struggle. The situation is disastrous. And something must be done to halt this deterioration, and to restore the morale and purpose of the Nationalists.

There is another factor which is impending, which might make matters worse. On the 23d of May there will be a celebration of the birthday of Buddha. All sorts of arrangements are being made for that occasion, and demonstrations by the Buddhists are anticipated. Moreover, the Saigon government has asked for a truce for that day, and possibly an indefinite extension of the truce. I am concerned about the posture from which we would negotiate if there is a deterioration in our position until that date.

Because I think this is a matter of great interest to the Members here, I have invited a certain Vietnamese whose record is impeccable. He was a very popular and effective commander in the I Corps area. He came to international prominence because he brought peace to the area at the time of the Buddhist uprising in Danang and Hue. He was later made to resign by Premier Ky. But he has always been popular with the peasants, and particularly the Buddhists. He also has the confidence of the Marines. His name is Gen. Nguyen Cahn Thi, and I have invited him to Capitol Hill tomorrow at 2:45 in the Speaker's Dining Room to talk with my colleagues about the serious situation that has developed in the I Corps area, the area that he once commanded, in the hope that he might shed some light on the question that is before us.

FARM LABOR POLICY UPHELD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, some of those who insist that American agriculture has suffered in the transition from foreign to domestic farm labor have charged that American farmers are swarming to Mexico where the going is easier.

I think it is significant that the California Farmer, a publication which takes every opportunity to attack the administration's farm labor policy, has published in its March 18 issue an article showing that Mexican agriculture is not harming American farmers and that California growers had better think twice before moving to Mexico.

The carefully researched article quickly states a simple conclusion:

If you can't make a go of farming in California, you'll never strike it rich in Mexico.

Conversations with growers, distributors, and agricultural officials in the Culiacan area of Mexico—the heart of the winter vegetable area—showed that the success of Mexican agriculture depends largely on the success of American crops. If the United States has poor crops, Mexicans come out well; if the United States has good crops, Mexican growers cannot begin to compete.

Besides being handicapped by high shipping costs to get their produce to the United States and low yield per acre, Mexican growers do not enjoy such cheap labor as some would have us believe. The writer points out that it is not unusual for hired hands working in the tomato crop—which accounts for two-thirds of the produce shipped to the United States—to receive $1.75 a day.

I think these facts have deflated yet another argument of critics of America's farm labor policy. Therefore, I would like to insert into the RECORD this article showing that American agriculture is suffering no threat from our neighbor to the south:

MEXICO—LAND OF PROMISE—IF YOU'RE LUCKY

(By Alton Pryor)

You're thinking of moving your farming operation to Mexico?

If so, you might be well-advised to hang onto your homestead until you've surveyed the situation from every angle. In a mere five days' investigation of the Culiacan area of Mexico, where the winter vegetable deal flourishes, *California Farmer* feels it uncovered sufficient information to determine that Mexico doesn't necessarily house the coveted golden egg.

When boiled down to the bare truth, the information we garnered seemed to lead to a simple conclusion: "If you can't make a go of farming in California, you'll never strike it rich in Mexico."

This is not to say that money is not being made in the vegetable industry in Mexico; some growers and distributors have managed highly successful deals, but not, we feel, at the expense of the U.S. industry.

And, for every dollar made, there is very likely one lost, for it is not uncommon for an enthusiastic grower to go south, only to come back with his "tail between his legs," so to speak. It's a risky business and the problems are great.

Certainly, our statement that growers in the U.S. aren't suffering because of Mexican imports is counter to virtually all of the news stories which have circulated in this State. But we feel we can justify the statement, and intend to do so.

This writer interviewed a host of growers, distributors and agricultural association officals, and no matter whom we talked to, our figures always seemed to add up to the same sum: "If the U.S. has a short crop, then there is money in Mexican produce; if the U.S. has a big crop, Mexican growers fall on their faces."

To illustrate this point, let us quote Walter Holm, one of the more successful distributors of Mexican produce in Nogales, Arizona, and also a financial backer of a Mexican growing operation.

"It costs from $2 to $2.25 just to get a lug of tomatoes to the border, and this doesn't include growing costs," Holm said. These costs were verified by every other person and agency we consulted.

Consequently, when growing costs are considered, a grower has to get at least $3.10 for a 3-layer lug of tomatoes to break even.

Angus MacKenzie, a buyer for Coast Marketing Company, which also has a financial arrangement with a Mexican grower, probably put this into proper perspective with this: "The cost per acre of growing in Culiacan is a lot less per acre, but not less per package."

MacKenzie should know whereof he speaks, because his firm also has a tomato operation in San Diego County. While San Diego growers can boast yields of 2000–2500 boxes per acre, he said, growers in Culiacan must

content themselves with 500–600 marketable lugs.

Culiacan growers harvest more than the 500–600 boxes mentioned, but, because of a self-imposed restriction, cannot ship any fruit which grades below 85 per cent U.S. 1.

Even if it weren't necessary to cull so heavily, Mexican growers would not reap the yields that San Diego growers experience. For one thing, as Angus MacKenzie explained, "In Mexico, we're growing in the winter. We have cold nights. The vines can be loaded with blooms and we get three cold nights in a row and they are all knocked off."

There is a reason for the heavy culling other than the restriction of the growers themselves, and this is the distance the fruit must travel to reach its ultimate destination.

There is a 2-day period from the time the fruit is picked until it reaches the border at Nogales and is sold. Fruit which could easily reach a major market in good condition from San Diego, would deteriorate considerably with this added waiting period.

The culled tomatoes aren't a complete loss, as they are sold on the Mexican domestic market, but can hardly be considered a profitable operation. The West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association at Nogales figures that only 40 percent of the tomatoes harvested meet U.S. No. 1 shipping requirements.

The other 60 per cent, classified as No. 2's and culls, are sold on the domestic market for 8.00 to 12.50 pesos (64 cents to $1.00 U.S. currency). This includes the cost of the crate which is about 32 cents in U.S. money.

Tomatoes account for about two-thirds of the produce volume shipped into the U.S. from Mexico, with cantaloups running second, but considerably lower in number than tomato shipments.

The Mexican crop comes off at the same time Florida is harvesting vegetables, and therein lies the success or failure for growers in Mexico.

If Florida has a good year, it doesn't matter what Mexican growers do. They can't compete. It's when Florida experiences a serious setback, such as a major freeze, that Mexican production comes into play.

And then, this imported production is not grabbing markets from Florida growers. They are merely shipping what Florida is unable to produce. It's a matter of supply and demand.

Labor is plentiful, and compared to American standards, is considered cheap. Even this might be disputed when you consider an operation like Horacio Campana's and his three partners.

Campana said they farm 600 hectares, or the equivalent of 1500 acres. For the 7-month growing season, it is necessary to employ 800 persons. A tractor driver earns 30 pesos a day, while a woman tying tomatoes to poles can make from 20–25 pesos per day. A peso is equivalent to eight cents American.

If you figure that each of these workers puts in 25 days a month, earning an average of $1.75 per day, it doesn't take a mathematician to see that the total labor bill comes to a sizable $245,000 a year, and this is a conservative estimate.

Mexican growers have many problems which U.S. growers don't face, such as acquiring machinery and parts (and at exorbitant prices), added freight and export duties just to get the produce into the U.S., and difficulty in acquiring packing materials.

All of these things will be explored in future installments.

At the same time, we do not want to underrate the tremendous potential of the west coast of Mexico as a supplier of vegetables.

Certainly the potential is there and should, we feel, be explored. As Carlos Brennen, who operates a packing house and works with a Mexican growing operation, said, "Mexico has the potential to feed the entire North American continent." But certainly this is not an overnight development.

While the importing of fruits and vegetables from Mexico might appear to be a one-way street, nothing could be further from the truth.

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, in 1964, Mexico bought $1,023,000,000 worth of goods from the United States. During the same year, Mexican sales to the U.S. were $600,000,000.

In our next installment, we will take a closer look at a Mexican growing operation, detailing some of the problems we mentioned previously. In future installments, we will concentrate on some of the costs involved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MAILLIARD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the period April 24 through April 27, on account of official business.

Mr. ROYBAL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), from April 20, 1967, through April 28, 1967, inclusive, on account of official business (attendance at the second session of the Latin-American Interparliamentary Conference in Montevideo, Uruguay).

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. SCHADEBERG, for 15 minutes, on Wednesday, April 26; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. BUTTON), for 30 minutes, on April 25; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. BUTTON), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WOLFF, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BUTTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. EILBERG in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 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:

680. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations for the fiscal year 1968 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 111); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

681. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances to members of the uniformed services authorized leave from isolated posts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

682. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period July 1 to December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 79–520; to the Committee on Armed Services.

683. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of March 1967, pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1967 and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

684. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of procurement of critically needed missile fuel under adverse conditions from a sole-source supplier, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

685. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of air transportation provided dependent children of Department of Defense personnel between the continental United States and overseas areas, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

686. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

687. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the determinations relating to the rearrangement and equalization of the construction repayment due the United States from the various irrigation contractors for their respective shares of the costs of the water storage works on the Milk River project in northern Montana, pursuant to the provisions of 73 Stat 584; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

688. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit tacking citizen ownership of vessels for trade-in purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

689. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 510(a)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

690. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 6, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Soquel Creek, Santa Cruz,

Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved July 3, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 20, 1967, the following bill was reported on April 21, 1967:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington; Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 9029. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted April 24, 1967*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on manpower utilization at military installations in Far Eastern and Western European countries (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: committee of conference. S. 303. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 208). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6133. A bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. 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 plated streets, alleys, and strips of land (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 20, 1967, the following bill was introduced on April 21, 1967:

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 9029. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

[*Submitted April 24, 1967*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 9030. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 9032. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9033. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9034. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9035. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Diplomatic Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 9036. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent across-the-board benefit increase, with subsequent cost-of-living increases, and to increase the amount an individual is permitted to earn without loss of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 9037. A bill to provide an improved charter for Economic Opportunity Act programs, to authorize funds for their continued operation, to expand summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 9038. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 9039. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 9040. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 9041. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 9042. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9043. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 9044. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expended job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 9045. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and institutions and to hospitals and other private, nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 9046. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9047. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9048. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 9049. A bill to amend section 3 of title 4 of the United States Code to prohibit the mutilation of the flag anywhere in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9050. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 9051. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9052. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the leasing by local governmental units of certain industrial and commercial facilities for private profitmaking purposes at rentals below their fair rental value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 9053. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 9055. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9056. A bill to provide for financing the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9057. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to construct, operate, and maintain a parking facility in Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 9058. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9059. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 9060. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9061. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 9062. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require certain agencies of the United States to obtain authorization from the Secretary of the Inte-

rior before undertaking geological and geophysical explorations in the Outer Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY (by request):

H.R. 9063. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 9064. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9065. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9066. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to increase the amount of the annual appropriations authorized thereunder for grants for basic water and sewer facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9067. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportion of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional deduction with respect to a student for whom a personal exemption is allowed the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 9069. A bill to amend section 140a of title 10, United States Code, relating to adjustments of retired pay and retainer pay of members and former members of the Armed Forces to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 9070. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9071. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITENER (by request):

H.R. 9072. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease airspace above and below freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 9073. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 528. Joint resolution requesting the Department of Defense to use butter in its rations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POOL:

H.J. Res. 529. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a National Letter Carriers Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H. Con. Res. 322. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Res. 448. Resolution extending the commendation of the House of Representatives to Keep America Beautiful, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 449. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

152. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

153. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, relative to the reading of the Holy Bible and public prayer in our public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

154. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring Walt Disney; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

155. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to the status of Guam as a true part of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

156. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to amending the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

157. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to preventing the interstate Pecatonica River from flooding annually in the plains of southwestern Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 9074. A bill for the relief of Kaneaki Kamei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9075. A bill for the relief of Mr. Sassanvash Haghighi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9076. A bill for the relief of Gertrudes Cabagungan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9077. A bill for the relief of Joan Caponong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9078. A bill for the relief of Eufrosina Garrido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9079. A bill for the relief of Conchita Tan Orgiles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9080. A bill for the relief of Federico de la Cruz-Monz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9081. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josefina Esther Kouri-Barreto de Pelleya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 9082. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl C. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 9083. A bill for the relief of Mr. Ioannis Koumbis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9084. A bill for the relief of Pablo Gregorich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 9085. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9086. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9087. A bill for the relief of Matyas Hunyadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 9088. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Fuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 9089. A bill for the relief of E. Christian Des Marets, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9090. A bill for the relief of Yoichiro Matsumura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 9091. A bill for the relief of Earl J. Weckman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9092. A bill for the relief of Maria Adelaide Soares Aguiar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9093. A bill for the relief of Julio Low; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9094. A bill for the relief of Georgios Andreas Minakakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

69. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to a change of format in printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1967

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

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Father of us all, we begin another day, another week in this Chamber of high office, seeking Thy guidance.

We are grateful for the faithfulness and sincere work of these Members of the Senate of the United States who seek to be good leaders of the people. The many tasks, the sacrificial time, the important small acts of office consistently conducted do not reach the headlines. But, they serve mankind and Thee. Bless these leaders in all of their work.

We continue to pray for the peace which seems not to be part of our understanding at this moment of history. Give to our President, his advisers, and all leaders the insight to find the way for peace in Vietnam. Be with those who suffer and die in this conflict even today.

Enlighten with Thy spirit this day all people of responsibility. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 21, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR TYDINGS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Wednesday, April 19, 1967, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me briefly?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am delighted to yield.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Legislative Calendar be waived, under rule VIII.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to routine morning business, which will be transacted at the conclusion of the address by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be limited to 3 minutes.

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

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR SYMINGTON AND SENATOR ALLOTT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning business, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that following the address of the Senator from Missouri, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] be recognized for 1 hour.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

A TRIBUTE TO ASSOCIATE JUSTICE TOM C. CLARK, UPON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on February 28, an announcement was released to the press by Mr. Justice Tom C. Clark, announcing his pending retirement, upon the news that his son, William Ramsey Clark, had been designated Attorney General of the United States.

The career of Tom C. Clark as Associate Justice of the United States is closing on a note of high principle, consistent with the spirit and the life record of the man himself. The designation of William Ramsey Clark, the son of Justice Clark, to serve as U.S. Attorney General presented the prospect of cases brought by a son before a court of which his father was member.

This would not be an unprecedented situation, and a judge of high principle might be able to decide a case on its merits regardless of who presents the arguments for one side or the other. The picture of a Supreme Court Justice ruling on cases in which his son is counsel for the Federal authorities might, however, grate upon the public conscience, and the image of justice must be unsullied by even the possibility of bias.

The decision of Justice Clark to retire is, therefore, beneficial to the spirit of impartiality that should invariably be associated with the actions of the Supreme Court and, indeed, the actions of any court of justice.

By stepping down at this juncture, Justice Clark is once again responding to that sense of principle which has motivated his action from the beginning of his career to the present day. In all he has done, he has demonstrated an adherence to principle that has won for him the respect of this Nation, not only as a public figure and as a justice, but also as a man.

Tom Clark entered the world as the member of a family thoroughly identified with public affairs. His grandfather and father were well-known lawyers, active in community matters and in Democratic party politics. Following his formative years, he attended Virginia Military Institute, from which he transferred to the Army, serving as a sergeant during World War I.

Following the war, Tom Clark attended the University of Texas, obtaining his B.A. in 3 years and his law degree in 1 more year, graduating in 1922. Admitted that same year to the Texas bar, he joined his father's law firm and quickly established himself as one of the leading legal experts in the State.

In 1927, Tom Clark left private practice to enter the office of the district attorney of Dallas County. In 5 years at this position he tried many cases and never lost a case before a jury. In 1932, he returned to private practice, but in 1937 was appointed to the Department of Justice, as Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. In this capacity he was first assigned to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and in 1938 he was transferred to the revitalized Antitrust Division, where he specialized in cases concerning violations of the marketing and wage-hour laws. A year later he was sent to New Orleans to take charge of the field office there, and a few months after that he was named Chief of the Antitrust Division's west coast offices. There, he launched a completely successful campaign to end price fixing in the lumber and oil industries.

Thereafter, Mr. Clark became First Assistant to the Assistant Attorney General in the Antitrust Division, and in May 1942 was placed in charge of the War Frauds Unit of the Department of Justice. In this position, he worked closely with the Special Senate Committee Investigating the war program, better known as the Truman Committee, handling many prosecutions based on facts unearthed by then Senator Harry S. Truman and his committeemen.

In March 1943, Tom Clark became Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division. During the 5 months in which he held the post, the Antitrust Division was exceedingly active, as was the War Frauds Unit. In August 1943, when Clark became head of the Criminal Division, he took the War Frauds Unit along with him; and as of June 1944, Clark's staff had reportedly won 92 percent of its war frauds trials. On occasion, Assistant Attorney General Clark appeared personally before the Supreme Court, taking a special interest in civil rights and peonage cases. After 8 consecutive years in the Justice Department, Mr. Clark was appointed U.S. Attorney General in May 1945, by President Harry Truman, to succeed Francis Biddle. World War II was still in progress when Clark assumed office, and many war-time matters were waiting to be solved. Black markets, repatriation of enemy aliens, and wartime tax evasion all received considerable attention, with Clark in command.

When the war ended, the Justice Department turned to the questions of demobilization, the termination of war-derived authority by the Government, and the protection of veterans' rights. In all these areas the Department performed brilliantly under Clark's direction.

Under the guidance of Attorney General Clark, the chief concern of the Justice Department at the close of the war was to guarantee that during the reconversion period there was no promotion of monopoly while new enterprises were being formed and the Government was disposing of surpluses. At all times, Tom Clark worked against monopoly, taking with him, into the Attorney General's office, all the fire he had for years displayed as an attorney on the Department staff.

In August 1949, Tom Clark was appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court, and

his performance soon demonstrated the wisdom of that appointment. His calm demeanor and moderating influences were obviously beneficial to the functions of the Court.

In 18 years on the Court, Justice Clark has been generally regarded as a member of the conservative element on many controversial issues. Not so, however, in numerous cases involving individual liberty, to which he is sincerely dedicated as a man of the law. Of all his opinions as a Supreme Court Justice, Tom Clark will be best remembered, perhaps, for those concerning civil rights, in which he was a champion of equal rights for all citizens.

Though the responsibilities of the Supreme Court place heavy demands on the time and attention of its members. Tom Clark has found opportunities to make additional valuable contributions to the law by encouraging the improvement of judicial administration. Even before his chairmanship of the American Bar Association Section on Judicial Administration in 1957–58, Justice Clark had been working to provide in-service training for judges to help the courts cope with the rising tide of litigation in the Federal courts and in the States.

It was primarily as the result of Tom Clark's work that in 1961 the Joint Committee for Effective Administration of Justice was formed to spearhead a 3-year effort to foster important programs for judges and courts. Probably the proudest achievement of Justice Clark's work in this area was the birth of the National College of State Trial Judges located in Reno, Nev., which has, for the past several years, presented seminars and workshops for trial judges from coast to coast. Providing the judiciary with resident study courses as well, the National College will stand as a landmark on the road to improved judicial administration.

Mr. President, during recent years many of the decisions of the Supreme Court have been unpopular with some sectors of our political thinking. During this same period of time, Mr. Justice Clark has done much to preserve untarnished the image of the Supreme Court. His constant efforts to improve the quality of justice dispersed in our courts, his appearances before bar associations across the land, his wholehearted devotion to improved judicial administration, and his continuing encouragement of the appointment of better-qualified judges—all have earned him a place among those who have contributed most to our system of justice.

I can recall so well that years ago, when I was president of the Junior Bar Section of the Bar Association of Baltimore City, the section sponsored a Law Day banquet. Our U.S. Senators, the mayor, and the Governor had tried unsuccessfully to get important members of the judiciary to speak. When we approached Mr. Justice Clark and told him how important our Law Day banquet was to us, and that it was being sponsored by all the lawyers of the association to dramatize the importance of government under law, Mr. Justice Clark accepted our invitation.

This willingness to travel and speak on behalf of justice under law has manifested itself time and time again, across the United States. When a junior bar association, a senior bar association, or a civic group interested in improved justice, needed encouragement, needed a shot in the arm, needed leadership or advice, it was always Mr. Justice Clark who was not too tired after a long day to board a plane and fly halfway across the United States to promote the cause of better courts or better judicial administration.

Today we are facing crises all over the United States by reason of the backlog of litigation. Mr. Justice Clark, busy as he is, can still find the time to telephone the heads of our great charitable foundations to encourage their support of studies, workshops, and programs aimed at better judicial administration. Busy as he is, he can still find time to appear personally to encourage the bar associations and the courts to work toward improving the judicial machinery which must handle the ever-increasing caseloads.

We sincerely hope, Mr. President, that the retirement of Justice Clark from the bench will not mark his withdrawal from this important field of endeavor. At this time especially it is necessary that such leadership as he has furnished in the past be continued for the encouragement of progress in the field of judicial administration.

As a lawyer, as a Justice Department official, Cabinet member, and jurist on the highest Court in the land, Tom Clark has proven himself a crusader. And as a contributor to the forward motion of the democratic process, he stands among the forefront of Americans today.

Mr. President, I have a letter and a statement from the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], who could not be here this morning. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and statement of the Senator from Missouri may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE,
April 21, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: Regret I will be away from Washington on Monday morning when you pay tribute to Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark.

Would appreciate it, however, if you would insert the enclosed statement which I have prepared at the conclusion of your statement.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

EDWARD V. LONG,
U.S. Senator.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LONG OF MISSOURI

It is a real honor to join with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and my other colleagues in paying tribute to the outstanding public service of Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark.

As a Justice Department attorney, Assistant Attorney General, Attorney General and a Supreme Court Justice, he has achieved a 30-year record of dedicated public service which is unsurpassed. He has given freely of his time to help the American people understand and appreciate the role of the judiciary and particularly the Supreme Court in our constitutional system. He has consistently contributed to the improvement of our courts and the legal profession. He has been instrumental in advancing and preserving freedom and equality in our nation. America has grown stronger through his service.

It is a privilege and an honor to know Tom Clark and he is going to be missed on our nation's highest court. However, knowing Tom Clark, his retirement will only mean a changing of hats. He will undoubtedly continue to serve the American people and the cause of justice. I wish him the very best.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland this morning in regard to the outstanding services of Justice Tom Clark.

Although I am not an attorney in my own right, I have had an opportunity on many occasions to become closely associated with Mr. Justice Clark in many fields of enedavor outside of the legal profession. He is a man with a great heart and a man of deep integrity who is interested in the welfare of the citizens of this Nation. He has been most generous with his time and his talents wherever problems of the less fortunate were affected.

I know personally, as has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, of the continued efforts of Mr. Justice Clark in behalf of people who are handicapped and this particularly true with handicapped children. For instance, it has been my privilege to serve with him for years as a member of the board of the Institute of Logopedics at Wichita, Kans. I know of the time and effort he has given in behalf of this institution which deals with the problems of retarded children. Our State and our Nation are greatly indebted to Mr. Justice Clark in his efforts in this field, and in many other fields.

I have always had the highest regard for Tom Clark as a Justice of the Supreme Court of our Nation. It has always seemed to me that he was a balance wheel on this, the highest Court in our land.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Maryland and want to associate myself with his remarks about this distinguished jurist, outstanding citizen, and great humanitarian.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I wish to second the complimentary remarks of my distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] with respect to the remarks which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. The Senator from Maryland is to be complimented for taking the initiative to bring to this body and to the country renewed emphasis if, indeed, and I think

it is important that such an emphasis should be made on the great contribution which Justice Clark has made to the legal processes in this country. I think it is particularly appropriate that my friend, the Senator from Maryland, should speak in this role inasmuch as he is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. As chairman of the subcommittee on which he serves so diligently—in which all of us owe him a debt—he has been in the forefront of the crusade to modernize judicial procedure. It is in this capacity that he brings a particular degree of expertise to the analysis of the record and accomplishments of Justice Clark.

Mr. President, it is with great honor and personal pleasure that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to Tom Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In announcing recently his intention to retire from the bench, Mr. Justice Clark demonstrated once again his inherent sense of fairness and his deep devotion to judicial ethics, for the reason Tom Clark is leaving the bench of the highest court in the land was to avoid any suggestion of conflicting interests when his son, Ramsey, became Attorney General of the United States.

When President Johnson announced that he was nominating Ramsey Clark to become Attorney General, and when Tom Clark announced at the same time that he would leave the Supreme Court, most of us, I think, greeted the news with understandably mixed emotions.

On the one hand, we were delighted that an outstanding and brilliant legal advocate would be joining the President's Cabinet. On the other hand, we felt deeply the impending loss to the Nation of a Justice who has demonstrated both wisdom and understanding over the years.

Mr. President, 18 years ago when Lyndon Johnson was a member of this body, he supported the nomination of Mr. Justice Clark with words that ring with prophecy today. This is what Senator Lyndon B. Johnson said in 1949 before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary:

For a number of years I have known Mr. Clark and his family personally. The close friendship has afforded me an opportunity to understand and appreciate Mr. Clark's personal traits and characteristics, which, I believe, embrace the distinctions of intellectual integrity, consistency, rare courage, and complete honesty so essential to the character of a Supreme Court Justice. Some other men may equal Tom Clark in these components of character, but no other man within my acquaintance excels Tom Clark.

Mr. Clark's consistency his ability to divorce the cause of justice from the ties of sentiment, his warm compassion for and understanding of the problems of our present-day society are indicative of a true judicial temperament. For most of his public-service career, Mr. Clark has been an advocate, not a judge, but his advocacy has been wise and reasonable, not bigoted and ruthless; this further commends him as a man qualified for the bench. Advocacy has been his duty and responsibility and he has discharged that obligation well; the experience gained in this service will enhance his value as a jurist.

Insofar as his capacity is concerned, Mr. Clark's public record is a remarkable testament to his stature. He has advanced steadily as his colleagues and superiors have recognized that his intellectual capacity exceeded the challenge of the office assigned to him. Because of this, I believe no happier union of challenge and capacity could be made than confirmation of Tom Clark for the position as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. President, Mr. Justice Clark was assigned as Circuit Justice to the Seventh Judicial Circuit in which my State of Indiana is included. I have been frequently questioned by the lawyers of Indiana on my opinion regarding the necessity of his resignation in light of his son's promotion to the position of Attorney General.

Many of my constituents, and members of the bar, in Indiana saw fit individually to petition the Justice to reconsider and to retain his position on the bench. This, it seems to me, is testimony to the high regard in legal circles which Mr. Justice Clark is held by jurists, lawyers, and legal scholars in my State.

Mr. President, I must say that I share the same feelings and the same concern. Knowing Justice Clark as I have had the privilege of knowing him, and also the younger Ramsey, now Attorney General, I can think of no two individuals in the same family who could separate their family's ties when arguing, perhaps, different positions in the chamber of the Supreme Court, as well as these two men could have—had this relationship continued and had Justice Clark not taken it upon himself to resign.

With respect to Justice Clark's serving in his capacity in the seventh circuit, I have noticed about Justice Clark what my colleague from Maryland pointed out in connection with the Maryland bar. Justice Clark has taken unto himself the seventh circuit and has guided, directed, and counseled its members. He has particularly felt it is an important obligation of the members of the Nation's highest judicial tribunal to develop and maintain inspiration within the younger members of the legal profession.

Thus, he has journeyed throughout the seventh circuit, speaking on law days, at law commencement activities, or wherever his services were requested.

I might also add my personal experience on the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, where I have had the opportunity to read and read and reread many important decisions. I find a great deal of agreement with the philosophy expressed by Justice Clark, and even in those areas where I might not agree with him, certainly his logic is clear and penetrating.

Thus, I should like to reiterate the remarks which have been made by my friend, the Senator from Maryland, and to say on behalf of myself and the citizens of my State of Indiana, that I express our thanks to Mr. Justice Clark for his long and devoted service to the United States. No doubt he will miss the Supreme Court and its historic and momentous work; but if it be any comfort to him, we will miss him much more.

I thank the Senator from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Indiana for his comments. Continuing along the lines suggested by the Senator from Indiana, I might reiterate that as our Nation has grown in population, the problems of court administration have been compounded and the rate of litigation has increased tremendously. Justic Clark has seen this problem looming on the horizon and has been doing something about it. He realizes well that justice delayed is frequently justice denied. Too often delay in trial favors the rich, the prosperous, the giant corporations, and frustrates the efforts of less fortunate litigants to secure their rights.

Mr. President, some 144 years ago, the 5- to 10-year delays in litigation before the courts of England almost brought about the toppling of a British Government. Commenting upon these scandalous delays in 1823, the Edinborough "Review" reminded British subjects that, in a democratic system, kings, ministers, the army, and the Royal Navy—all existed to insure the citizen, any citizen, his right to present his case and his cause to the judges who sat at Westminster.

These comments about the need for prompt and speedy justice apply today, and because they do, Mr. President, I also would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that Mr. Justice Clark has, on his own, inspired two of our leading charitable foundations to finance the National College of Trial Judges. This is a college set up to train county-level trial judges from across the United States, and to give them the benefit of the techniques, the knowledge, and the experience of the leading trial judges.

Such a college cannot fail to have an important impact upon the availability of speedy justice, even at the local level. The college is certainly highly valued in my own home county, Harford County, where our circuit court judge, Hon. Harry Dyer, has told me that the National College of Trial Judges has done more to promote justice than any other institution he knows of.

Again, this college is but one example of the many contributions to the bar and to the public that Mr. Justice Clark has made outside the realm of ordinary service as a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues who have preceded me this morning in paying tribute to Associate Justice Tom Clark of our Supreme Court who is, we are advised, soon to retire because of the elevation of his son to the position of Attorney General of the United States.

I think it is unique and certainly a great tribute to both father and son that the son, the Honorable Ramsey Clark, has followed his father in filling this highly important Cabinet position.

When the Associate Justice was Attorney General, he distinguished himself as an able administrator of the criminal laws of our land. Since he has been a member of the Supreme Court, he has participated in many decisions that have made their contributions to, and have had their influence upon, the sustaining of law and order in this country.

The distinguished Supreme Court Justice, in some of the 5-to-4 decisions

which are today almost universally criticized and have had the effect of shackling law enforcement officials in the discharge of their duties because they favor the criminal element of this Nation to the disadvantage of society—we find him generally to be on the side of law and order. He strongly defends the rights of society which are today under vicious attack by those elements that are apparently dedicated to the pursuit of crime as a way of life.

I certainly commend Associate Justice Clark for the stand he has taken on the side of right and against the crime menace that is spreading across our land.

I say without any reservations or equivocation that, in my judgment, it is tragic that more of the Justices did not share his view and join with him in the dissenting opinions he has written in some of these important 5-to-4 decision opinions. Had they done so, the dissenting opinions would have become majority opinions and the majority opinions, as so expressed, would be the law of the land today instead of some of the crippling decisions that are now having an adverse effect upon law enforcement and are, in my judgment, markedly contributing to the increase in crime in this country.

I say this notwithstanding and without apology to our former Attorney General who said, in effect, that the turning of criminals loose without any punishment has no impact upon the increase in crime. In my judgment, it is not "unutterable nonsense" to say that the turning loose of self-confessed criminals contributes to the increase in crime and thus further endanger the security of society.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Arkansas for the magnificent job he has done in trying to restore the strength of our Republic.

The Senator is, in my judgment, 1,000 percent right when he says that as a result of the Supreme Court rulings, it is virtually impossible to punish a culprit for his crimes. To say that it does not have anything to do with the increase in crime is patently ridiculous.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If punishment for a crime is not a deterrent, the whole theory of punishment for crime is wrong. Punishment should be abolished if it is not a deterrent and does not serve to prevent crime.

It is ridiculous and absurd to say that the turning loose of self-confessed criminals such as those who have committed murder, rape, robbery, and assault—has no psychological influence on those who are criminally inclined.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The old saying is: "Spare the rod and spoil the child."

Mr. McCLELLAN. We are not only sparing the rod, but by means of the Supreme Court decisions, we are also sparing the right and the duty to interrogate persons about crimes. The Supreme Court has proclaimed that a suspect cannot even be asked about a crime without first providing him with a lawyer if the suspect wants a lawyer.

The Constitution of the United States makes no such provision. It merely provides that a man shall not be compelled to give evidence against himself in a criminal case. There is no criminal case pending, even though a crime may have been committed, until a charge is made.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The impression that I have gained is that, whether it is a matter of teaching a child or an animal, the psychology is the same. When they do something wrong, we explain to them that they have done something wrong and must pay a price for it, however mild the censure may be. It cannot be merely conversation. It may be just a simple matter of saying that they cannot go to the picture show that afternoon, but at least there must be some action to chastise a person for wrongdoing so that we will encourage him to do the right thing thereafter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am criticizing the decisions of the Court, because they are directed against law enforcement officials who are trying to enforce the law, to ferret out crime, to ascertain who committed the crime, to apprehend the criminal, and to interrogate him with respect to his conduct.

We cannot, of course, compel a man to be a witness against himself. However, the opportunity should be given to any man suspected of crime, or suspected of having any knowledge of how a crime was committed or who committed it, to cooperate as a witness and tell the law enforcement officials what he may know and give them any information he may have that would aid the law enforcement officials in the performance of their duties.

When this vacancy occurs, when the distinguished Associate Justice Clark has actually retired—and I believe I voice the sentiments of millions and millions of Americans who are concerned today—let us hope that the President of the United States, in his wisdom and under his authority, will nominate someone to the Supreme Court who has a deep conviction about the fundamental principles of our land. Let us hope it is someone who will adhere to and interpret the Constitution and its fundamentals as written and as intended by the Founding Fathers. The nominee should not be someone who will seek, by some mechanism of rhetoric, to read into the Constitution words that are not there and meanings that were never intended in order to accomplish the unfortunate results we are today experiencing. The downgrading of our dedicated law enforcement officials who are trying, under most difficult conditions, to perform their duties—to bring about safe streets and crime control as sought by the President in legislation he has proposed—should not have occurred.

Mr. President, we will never have safe streets and crime control, no matter how many laws are enacted, unless the police of this country—unless the arresting officials—are given an opportunity to interrogate those who may have some knowledge that a crime has been committed. To say that those having knowledge of a crime cannot be interrogated until the State furnishes them a lawyer, is carrying concern for the alleged rights of the accused to the extreme and to the detriment of law enforcement in this country.

I hope the President will take these considerations into account when he sends to the Senate a nomination of someone to fill the vacancy that will regretfully occur by reason of the retirement of the distinguished Associate Justice Tom Clark.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Tom Clark has announced that he will retire from the U.S. Supreme Court by no later than the end of the present term in June. His place on the bench of our highest Court will be difficult to fill. The country can be solaced in that it has not lost a father, but instead gained a son. Ramsey Clark's appointment as Attorney General filled the father with pride. Tom Clark's career has made his Nation proud.

In his 18 years with the Supreme Court, Justice Clark has emerged with the reputation as a moderate, in the finest sense of the word. Moderation embodies the rule of reason. This is the approach of Tom Clark.

He has been called the traveling salesman of justice because of his extensive travels each year in efforts to improve the Federal and State judiciary. It is good that Justice Clark will continue this work. It has been announced that he will chair a special committee of the American Bar Association to survey the ethics of lawyers.

Justice Clark has recognized that there is no erosion of the separation of powers when Congress acts to change a decision of the Supreme Court. Indeed, this is the duty of Congress. Tom Clark in dissent has at times called upon the legislative branch to undo what he regarded as an improper ruling.

I hold Justice Clark in the highest regard. I am deeply sorry that he has decided to retire, but understand his reason. The President is faced with an awesome task in nominating a worthy successor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I certainly share the high opinion of Justice Tom Clark that has been expressed by the junior Senator from Maryland. Justice Clark's service has been distinguished both by his superb performance of his official duties and his continuing work for the betterment of the judicial process. If Justice Clark cannot be swayed from his announced intention, and does retire from the Bench this year, I shall wish to call to the attention of the Senate a much fuller account of the notable career of Justice Tom Clark at the appropriate time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to Mr. Justice Tom C. Clark, of Texas, upon the occasion of his coming retirement from the Bench of the U.S. Supreme Court. As an observer of the American judiciary, over the past few years, I have come to admire and respect Tom Clark for his calm, considered judgment and his basic concern for justice, at the expense of partisan advantage. He will certainly be missed.

For many years a lawyer with the Justice Department, Tom Clark rose to

prominence, originally, as chief of the west coast branch of the Antitrust Division. In this capacity he ended price fixing in the west coast lumber industry. As coordinator of all the Federal agencies concerned in the lamentable evacuation of the Japanese from the west coast, in 1942, he won distinction for humane behavior under inhumane circumstances. Promoted first assistant to the Assistant Attorney General in the Antitrust Division, he served in the exposure of numerous frauds against the Government arising out of contracts for war materials. Promoted once again to head the Criminal Division, he enforced, with fairness and determination, priority orders, price control, rationing, and food allocation laws.

Following 8 years in the Justice Department and several in the capacity of president of the Federal Bar Association, Tom Clark became U.S. Attorney General, in May 1945. Black markets and monopolies were the chief targets of Justice Department activity throughout his tenure as Attorney General. In August 1949 he was appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court, and the decision was indeed a proper one.

In 18 years on the Court, Tom Clark has been regarded as one of the conservative element, insofar as many controversial issues are concerned. Even in the matter of congressional reapportionment, he came out against full acceptance of the one-man, one-vote dogma, declaring that if one house of a State legislature met the population standards, the other might "include some departure from it—on some rational basis."

As an independent thinker, Justice Clark established himself early in his career on the Supreme Bench. When called upon to vote in the 1952 steel seizure case, he was confronted by the choice of siding with the President who had appointed him, or of following his conscience. True to his traditions, he had no choice but to vote his conscience.

And as a final note, closing out his career, he chose to retire the moment that his son became U.S. Attorney General, to prevent the impression that the Court and the Justice Department had any kind of family tie.

The action was typical of Mr. Justice Tom C. Clark, of Texas—a man of principle and a tribute to his State.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, Daniel Webster once wrote that "Justice is the great interest of man on earth." To Justice Tom Clark, these words embodied a way of life and throughout his long and distinguished governmental career—a career which all of us hope has not yet reached its culmination—his every action was directed at the fulfillment of this principle.

In his more than 18 years on the Supreme Court, Justice Clark has written over 200 majority opinions. Many of them have had an enormous impact on the course of American life; but to me, three of his most monumental opinions were written during the time that I was Attorney General of the United States.

For it was during those years that the Supreme Court excluded illegally seized evidence from State trials, barred racial discrimination on any property leased from a State agency, and more carefully defined the first amendment's guarantees of religious freedom. That Tom Clark wrote the majority opinions in these cases should surprise no one. For each of these decisions fit well with his conception of a just constitutional government guaranteeing individual liberty and fundamental freedom against state interference.

And it was during these same years that the Supreme Court handed down some of its most important and far-reaching opinions in the struggle to combat unjust mergers, price fixing, and unfair corporate dealings. In the forefront of that struggle was Tom Clark whose efforts to prevent illegal business operations dated back to 1938 when he first joined the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, a Department he was later to head. To Tom Clark the preservation of legitimate business competition was a fundamental necessity if individual entrepreneurs were to survive and America were to remain a land of equal opportunity for all.

February 28, 1967, must certainly have been a proud, yet sad day for Justice Tom Clark. On that day, his son, William Ramsey Clark, was appointed U.S. Attorney General—a position which Justice Clark had held 22 years earlier. Simultaneously, Justice Clark announced his intention to retire from the Supreme Court. He knew that personal considerations would never affect or alter his decisions as a judge. But he worried about what the American public might think and whether his position might make his fellow Justices uncomfortable. His decision to retire from the Supreme Court was the choice of a man of conscience and humility—a man who has always prized honor and principle far more than fame. Such men are hard to find and I therefore add my sentiments to those of my Senate colleagues in urging Justice Tom Clark to remain active in the Government he has served so well for these decades and to continue his leadership on behalf of a better and more just America.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there can be no joy in the antitrust camp in seeing Associate Justice Clark leaving the Supreme Court, where he has served so well.

As anyone familiar with his background with the Department of Justice might have suspected back in 1949, when he ascended the Bench, antitrust enforcement has had an understanding friend in the highest Court of the land this past 18 years.

This does not mean that he always upheld the Government's position. One need only remember the Times-Picayune case to counteract that implication. However, fairness requires acknowledging Justice Clark's fairness. This was apparent in the newspaper case. And we who feel that antitrust is simply the rules of fairplay for the game of competition must feel that his insistence in the Times-Picayune case that restraint of trade be demonstrated—and in the Tampa Electric case that a real probability of a lessening of competition be shown—did help to maintain the fairness of antitrust.

If those two cases might be cited as examples of Justice Clark taking the muscle out of the antitrust laws, there is a long list of other opinions which put more muscle in.

In fact, a recent survey of the 84 antitrust decisions since 1953 showed that two-thirds of them were written by four Judges—including Justice Tom Clark.

It might be well to mention a few of his opinions:

In National Dairy, he wrote the opinion sustaining the validity of the criminal provisions of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act against the charge that it was unconstitutionally vague.

In the Dean Foods case, he sustained the power of the FTC to seek and gain injunctive relief in merger cases.

In International Boxing Club, he wrote an opinion sustaining the violation and defending the decree calling for strong relief to break up monopolization of boxing.

In Bowman Dairy, he wrote the majority opinion which explored the cost justification defense in section 2(b) of the Robinson-Patman Act.

There is no question that the man who started in 1937 as a trial attorney in the antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has left his construction mark on the antitrust law for the past 30 years. The clearest impressions, of course, were left during the 18 years on the Supreme Court.

He is being deservedly praised today for his many accomplishments. He should be—it seems to me—thanked by every businessman in the United States. For in a land where the constant cry is "Antitrust law is too vague," Justice Clark has done his effective best to erase some of the vagueness and pencil in certainty—and fairness.

Justice Clark will be remembered gratefully by students of constitutional government for so long as our system continues. And the probability that our system will succeed, not just survive, is the greater because of the loyalty and learning of Justice Tom Clark.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me today to join in the tributes being offered to Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark.

In his 18 years on the Court, Justice Clark has handed down a distinguished series of opinions marking fully his belief in the right of all Americans to equal opportunities in life. No issue of the day is of greater moment for the future of America—for the strength of her institutions, for the continued well-being of her people, and for her stature as a world leader.

Justice Clark, in his opinions and statements from the Bench, has left no doubt on where he stands on the issues presented to the Court. This singleness of purpose could come only from a man who has a firm vision of American society, a vision grounded in nearly 40 years of public service both as Attorney General, and in the legislative branch, culminating in service as a member of the highest Court in the land.

Justice Clark is noted in legal circles

as an outstanding leader in the cause of streamlining judicial administration. Court congestion is today perhaps the most serious problem facing our judicial system. It is responsible for long delays in giving every citizen access to the courts and benefits of justice. I am sure that when Justice Clark steps down at the end of this term, he will give the lawmakers and the judges in this country the full benefit of his experience and wisdom in helping to streamline this country's judicial machinery.

Justice Clark, presently chairman of the American Trial Lawyer's Student Advocacy Advisory Committee, has recognized our great need for increasing both the numbers and the training of our trial attorneys. We must always heed the need to bring to our law students the experiences our highest judicial officers have had in administering the system which our students are studying. Only then can our legal system continue to be responsive and modern.

We will all miss Justice Clark's presence on the Supreme Court.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded

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

ON A COLLISION COURSE WITH CATASTROPHE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, of April 23, entitled "On a Collision Course With Catastrophe."

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Apr. 23, 1967]

ON A COLLISION COURSE WITH CATASTROPHE

Time is running out for the United States postal system. As Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien warned a Senate subcommittee the other day, a catastrophic logjam such as hit Chicago last October "could happen in any post office."

Volume will total 80 billion pieces of mail this year, compared to a mere 5 billion for the entire Soviet Union. We not only account for more mail than all other nations combined, but our mere rate of annual increase, 3 billion pieces, is a third the total volume of France.

The present postal system simply isn't equipped to handle a problem of this magnitude. Its physical plant is outmoded, its staffing handicapped by a hoary tradition of political patronage, and its deficit-ridden finances a nightmare of congressional interference.

The truth is that Americans are guilty of a culture lag in their attitude toward the mails. They insist on 20th century service but complacently accept the notion that the department is a political power base, useful for dispensing local postmasterships. The public demands that only the most modern management techniques be used in the Defense Department, for example, but still clings to the theory that the Post Office can be run along Jim Farley lines.

Oddly enough, a political technician has now set out to dispute the notion that the Post Office should be operated this way. Mr. O'Brien, a shrewd manager of President Kennedy's 1960 campaign and subsequently a White House adviser to President Johnson, wants to get the department out of politics, away from congressional meddling, and even away from the White House. He is literally talking himself out of a job if his plan goes through.

The O'Brien plan, unveiled at a meeting of magazine publishers here early in April, can be summarized briefly. It would remove the Post Office Department from Cabinet status, set it up as a non-profit government corporation, and operate it with a board of directors appointed by the President and confirmed by Congress. A professional executive would manage the corporation.

As part of this package, the corporation would be given a clear set of rules on the "percentage of cost of coverage for postal services," so that future changes in rates would be made on a fixed formula basis. In other words, the corporation would have a precise idea of how much its free services for congressional franking privileges and so on would be reimbursed out of the Treasury, and how much it could charge the public for regular mail.

Such a drastic reorganization of the postal system may seem a startling and hazardous venture into an unknown area. But in fact similar proposals are under study in Britain and Canada, and the government-owned corporation is nothing new.

The most conspicuous example is the Tennessee Valley Authority. The TVA Act of 1933 created a self-supporting government corporation.

In contrast to the Post Office Department, whose current deficit totals $1.2 billion, TVA is repaying money to the Treasury for the appropriations it received in its early days for dams.

There are those who will argue that this is a false analogy, that an electric power system in seven states can't be compared with delivering the mail nation-wide. They will point out that the problems faced by the Post Office have no parallel in any other industry.

Certainly no one will dispute the magnitude of the Post Office task. But oddly enough, right alongside this creaking government service with its deficits and delays has grown a flourishing private industry in one area, the delivery of packages. Testimony last year before the Senate Post Office Committee revealed that one firm, United Parcel Service, grew from zero in 1951 to 300 million parcels in 1965. Another, Railway Express Agency, since 1960 has raised annual tonnage of shipments from 1.4 million tons to 1.8 million, a 23 percent gain, and has added 126 terminals and 18,436 vehicles.

Hopefully converting the postal system to a corporation, free of congressional interference, would give a professional manager the freedom that private industry seems to translate into profits and better service.

Much has been said about the Post Office manpower troubles, mounting work load, and low morale. But as Postmaster O'Brien sees it, the real crunch comes in lack of working space.

The system's physical plant is "inadequate, badly located, and aging," he declares. Nearly 90 percent of post office space is in buildings constructed before 1940. For years, the department has skimped on new buildings and machinery, setting aside 2.4 to 4.1 percent of its budget. (By contrast, American Telephone and Telegraph ploughs roughly 33 percent every year into capital investment.)

Mr. O'Brien thinks it will take about $5 billion spread over the next five years to modernize the department's buildings. Yet the House recently cut $10.8 million out of a $55.8 million budget request for new buildings next year.

The crisis focuses on buildings for several reasons. This is where the automation is planned to speed up mail handling and reduce costs. But many of the existing buildings cannot be converted. Their floors are too weak for heavy machinery, their layouts are not compatible with an efficient flow of work, and the plants are often in downtown sites strangled by traffic.

Mr. O'Brien's proposed corporation could issue bonds for new buildings and pay off the debt by rental income. The way things stand now, Congress dictates the final budget for buildings, just as it does for pay rates, number of employees, postal rates, and hiring of postmasters. And the system isn't working.

In recent months a number of proposals have been made in Congress to change some aspect or another of the postal department. Some of these are worthy; the Senate recently enacted a bill which would abolish patronage in hiring of postmasters.

But these are piecemeal solutions.

As Mr. O'Brien observes, "I think the effort to patch a fabric so full of holes is yielding diminishing returns." No less than a revolution will cure this ailing system.

A presidential commission is now studying proposals to overhaul the Post Office, and is expected to report within a year. In the meantime Chairman Joe Pool of a House subcommittee on postal facilities will open hearings next month on the O'Brien plan. Already there are indications that key House members are hostile to the program and the loss of congressional control it would mean. But until somebody comes up with a better idea, Congress had better take the Postmaster General seriously. The system, as he correctly warns, is in a race with catastrophe. His solution makes more sense to us than anything else that has been suggested.

POINTLESS PROTEST

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the April 23 Washington Sunday Star entitled "Pointless Protest."

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

POINTLESS PROTEST

The Committee of 100 Ministers, representing a cross-section of this city's most respected Negro clergymen, has made just the right response to Julius Hobson's harebrained campaign for a May 1 boycott of the public schools.

Instead of abandoning schools and exposing school children to use as "political pawns," the ministers said, District parents should devote themselves to the "urgent task of seeking to improve the quality of education."

The distinction is between a constructive positive course and one wholly negative. The boycott scheme was born just after the reapportionment of School Superintendent Hansen, which Hobson had noisily opposed. The ministers recognize, however, that protest must serve some useful purpose in order to be worthwhile. In this case, no purpose is served and the form of protest is thoroughly deplorable.

No administrative or teaching "reforms" of any substance are likely to be made by the school board until the Columbia Teachers College study of the local school system is finished this summer—despite the board's desire for changes. No amount of protest is apt to change that situation. As to money,

the debate this week on the city budget disclosed a substantial awakening of congressional interest on the whole question of the District's school needs. This is an interest, however, which needs to be nurtured, not discouraged. And in this as in any other context, the sorry spectacle of empty classrooms on schools days could do only harm.

COLLEGE TAX CREDIT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, of April 23, entitled "College Tax Credit."

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

COLLEGE TAX CREDIT

The proposal approved in the Senate to give a tax break to parents with children in college is a move in the right direction.

There may have been a time when a college education could be treated as a luxury, something reserved in the main for children of wealthy parents. This, of course, is no longer true, if it ever was true. Higher education today is a matter of great importance, not only for the individual but also for the nation. And this is true not only of "rich kids," but for youngsters at every level of our society, economic and otherwise, who can qualify for college.

From the parental point of view, however, the cost of a college education has been spiraling and it will go higher. Without help, the inevitable result will be no room in a great many family budgets for the higher education of children who want to go to college, who ought to go to college, and who would be more useful citizens if they did go.

The tax credit proposal is on the modest side—a maximum of $325 a year per student. Smaller credits would be allowed for those with incomes above $25,000 a year and none for those whose incomes exceed $57,000. For the vast majority of Americans the $325 figure would be applicable. This is not a great deal, but it would help.

On the other side of the coin would be an immediate revenue loss to the Treasury. This is not inconsequential. But if the projections are correct, the government in the years ahead would recapture all or even more of its interim revenue loss from higher taxes paid on higher incomes by college-trained men and women. We think the House should go along with this Senate project.

SUMMER: A CITY PROBLEM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a column, by Mary McGrory, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, of April 23, entitled "Summer: A City Problem."

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

SUMMER: A CITY PROBLEM

(By Mary McGrory)

Henry James said it was the loveliest word in the English language, but "summertime" has become a symbol for trouble in America's cities.

Last year, half-a-dozen large cities were swept by the fires of racial violence. This year, it is glumly agreed, things could be worse. Dr. Martin Luther King, the foremost Negro leader, has prophesied turbulence. Mayor John V. Lindsay has begun making plans to avert riots in New York City, which, largely due to his efforts, escaped in 1966.

Race relations, which were bad last summer, has deteriorated.

The expulsion of Adam Clayton Powell Jr. of New York from the House of Representatives has solidified anti-white sentiment. The myth that he was the idol of the janitors and the maids of his race has been exploded.

Negroes are watching with unnerving intensity for the resolution of the case of Sen. Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut, who has been accused of misuse of campaign funds. If he is let off with a pat on the wrist, Negroes say they will have new proof that there are, as Howard University President James M. Nabrit charged last March, "two laws in this country—one for white and one for black."

The most ominous development of all has been the sight of Dr. King making common cause with Stokely Carmichael against the Vietnam war. For President Johnson, King's opposition would be bad enough. But for him to be allied with the most extreme elements in the civil rights movement has caused the utmost consternation at the White House.

The Nobel Peace Prize winner has declared that the war "is destroying the soul of the nation." His associates say that King did not bring the war against the war into the slums. They aver it was already on, and that he assumed leadership lest it fall into the hands of Carmichael and other "black power" advocates who counsel resistance to the draft.

To add anti-war protest to civil rights unrest is, nonetheless, to some of Dr. King's best friends, to be putting a match to shavings.

Even before this grim prospect developed, the Federal government had been tooling up the programs which King has charged have been robbed by the concentration on Vietnam.

Vice President Humphrey is in charge of coordinating numerous projects, many of them financed by poverty program funds which were slashed in Congress. The swimming pool allowance was, for example, wiped out.

He has already written to the mayor of every city of any size, telling them what remains available by way of federal financial help and giving them information on their cities which they may not have.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has, for instance, made a survey of summer camps and found an average vacancy rate of 25 percent. The vice president is suggesting to mayors they take steps to put slum children in the empty bunks.

The President in February sent a message to Congress in which he urged a national "Share Your Summer" conference to encourage more fortunate families "to open their vacation homes to disadvantaged children for part of the summer."

The Labor Department is concentrating on hard-core unemployment cases and has set a goal of summer jobs from 20,000 to 40,000 for youths between 15 and 21.

The difficulties of reaching disadvantaged and totally disoriented youth were illuminated at a hearing of the Cities Committee at which officials of the building trades testified.

The officials held to their contention that their antidiscrimination program has been 99 percent successful. Their case was statistically shattered when Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, D-N.Y., pointed out that in Cleveland, a city with a Negro population of 17 percent, a union had found only 22 Negroes worthy of being taken into apprentice training.

One of the officials countered that a carpenters union wishing to do the decent thing, offered to train a hundred boys. They were prepared to teach the illiterate to read and write and offered to pay them $2.25 an hour.

"They wound up with eight," he reported. "They wouldn't stay. You can't force a boy to train who doesn't want to learn."

In Philadelphia, the Rev. Leon Sullivan, who runs one of the most successful poverty programs in the nation, found that it was better to induce the neighborhood to contribute to training programs, so that if a boy dropped out, he had an irate contributor to face.

Responsible government officials know there is not time or money available to reconcile the sullen and estranged Negro youth described by A. Philip Randolph, the venerable civil rights leader. But they hope that they can persuade antipathetic mayors like Locker of Cleveland and Yorty of Los Angeles that a show of concern is imperative if law and order is to be maintained in the slums this summer.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, the Senate will now transact routine morning business, under the 3-minute rule.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INSURANCE AND GUARANTEES ISSUED IN CONNECTION WITH U.S. EXPORTS TO YUGOSLAVIA

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia, for the month of March 1967, not previously reported, totaled $1,206,238; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AUTHORIZATION OF TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances to members of the uniformed services authorized leave from isolated posts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 510(a)(1) OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 510(a)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (with accom-

panying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

PERMISSION FOR TACKING OF CITIZEN OWNERSHIP OF VESSELS FOR TRADE-IN PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit tacking of citizen ownership of vessels for trade-in purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Government-wide review of the administration of certain statutory and regulatory requirements relating to architect-engineer fees, dated April 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on air transportation provided dependent children of Department of Defense personnel between the Continental United States and overseas areas, Department of Defense, dated April 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on procurement of critically needed missile fuel under adverse conditions from a sole-source supplier, Department of the Air Force, dated April 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

DETERMINATIONS RELATING TO REARRANGEMENT AND EQUALIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION REPAYMENTS DUE THE UNITED STATES FROM VARIOUS IRRIGATION CONTRACTORS ON THE MILK RIVER PROJECT, MONTANA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, determinations relating to rearrangement and equalization of construction repayments due to United States from various irrigation contractors for their respective shares of the costs of the water storage works on the Milk River project in northern Montana (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, dated April 1, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 34

"A resolution petitioning the Federal Government for more latitude and discretion in the state's use of monies returned by the Federal authorities

"Whereas, It is the policy of the Federal Government to appropriate large sums of money for specific programs within the states and to require the states likewise to appropriate large sums of money for the programs specified by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas, It is increasingly the policy of the Federal Government to promulgate rules, regulations and guidelines setting forth in extreme detail the requirements for administering the programs contributed to; and

"Whereas, The needs, circumstances and resources of the states differ greatly; and the attempt to provide details of program administration applicable to all the states can cause inefficient use of the state's money and does cause the use of this state's money not in accord with the priority of need;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the Eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the House of Representatives concurring, That the President of the United States of America and the Congress of the United States are most respectfully petitioned and requested to consider whether a more efficient use of monies returned to the states could not be obtained if the states were given more discretion in the application of the monies; and whether it is indeed necessary or desirable for the federal authorities to promulgate and require adherence to such great numbers of regulations and guidelines for the state administration of federally assisted programs.

"Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of the State of Tennessee shall furnish a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Federal Congress, and to each member of Congress from the State of Tennessee.

"Adopted: April 11, 1967

"_____ _____,
"Speaker of the Senate.

_____ _____,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives,

"Approved: 4-13/67.

"_____ _____,
"Governor."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE RESOLUTION EX. 39

"Whereas, Construction of the Satus Dam has been under study since 1920; and

"Whereas, Reports on this important irrigation, flood control, water supply, recreation and fisheries enhancement project have been made as recently as 1964 by the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

"Whereas, New federal water resource project standards relating to recreational benefits from such projects open up new means of providing for these functions; and

"Whereas, The Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs have placed a low priority on this development, which is important if full development of our water resources on the Yakima River system is to be obtained; and

"Whereas, The Satus Dam would provide irrigation for some 14,000 acres of lands now dry, would store 64,600 acre-feet of water and greatly augment low flows for fish and wildlife enhancement and recreational purposes; and

"Whereas, This project has widespread community support and its construction is urged by local soil and water conservation districts, farmers, sportsmen, valley chambers of commerce and the Yakima Tribal Council;

"Now, therefore be it resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior immediately complete a comprehensive re-evaluation of the irrigation, flood control, fish and wildlife enhancement, low flow augmentation and recreational benefits of the project and place it before the Congress for authorization at the earliest possible date;

"Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson, the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; Senators Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson, Congresswoman Catherine May and the other members of the Washington Congressional delegation.

"I, Ward Bowden, Secretary of the Senate, do hereby certify this is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted on April 14, 1967.

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SJR 29

"A joint resolution relating to the National Cemetery System

"Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas figures compiled by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966 show that of the 4,873 servicemen who lost lives in the fight for freedom in Vietnam during the period, 873 or 20.4 per cent were buried in national cemeteries; and

"Whereas, although one in five were actually interred in national cemeteries, many more would probably have also been buried in a national cemetery had there been available space near the home of next of kin; and

"Whereas over the past three years there has been a determined effort on the part of some federal agencies to sharply curtail or do away altogether with any further provision for national cemeteries; and

"Whereas present day burial expenses are sufficiently high without placing on the veteran's and serviceman's dependent the added cost of purchasing a burial plot; and

"Whereas the burial allowances of the Veterans Administration and that provided under Social Security are far too meager to provide for the last rites of most veterans and servicemen; and

"Whereas it is perfectly evident that the present administration is determined to end the national cemetery system just as soon as present facilities are exhausted and this procedure is a rank departure from the long-time precedent that veterans who have served their nation in time of war are entitled to burial sites provided by the United States Government;

"Be it resolved that we strongly urge the Congress of the United States to take such action as necessary to forestall the present plans of the Bureau of the Budget and the administration, and to oppose the position of the Department of Defense which supports the administration's policy of no further expansion of the national cemetery system, with the exception of the Arlington National Cemetery, as many national cemeteries have already exhausted available space and several others are scheduled for closing this year; and be it

"Further resolved that the Department of Defense be requested to establish an adequate and permanent national cemetery system to make national cemeteries available with burial spaces for all U.S. military servicemen and women who are entitled to the same, and wish to be interred there.

"Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Carl Hayden, President Pro Tempore of the Senate; the Honorable John McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of De-

fense; the Honorable Charles L. Schultz, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators and the Honorable Howard W. Pollock, U.S. Representative members of the Alaska delegation in Congress."

Two resolutions of the Legislature of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTION No. 187 (1-S)

"Relative to respectfully requesting the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to put on notice the United Nations that Guam is not a non-self-governing dependency of the United States but a true part of the United States and as such is of no concern to that world organization, the people of Guam having freely and voluntarily associated themselves with the United States, accepting with gratitude American citizenship and participating with all other Americans in the life of the nation

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas, the territory of Guam was originally acquired by the United States as part of the war spoils generated by the Spanish-American War and thus was for many years a colony of the United States wherein the people had no voice in the administration of the island and played no part in the American commonwealth; and

"Whereas, despite the lack of self-government and the colonial status of the island and its residents, the people, nevertheless, during the Second World War when the territory was occupied by forces hostile to the United States for almost three years, demonstrated a real knowledge of the ideals of American democracy and a true loyalty to the American nation, which loyalty was rewarded by the United States shortly after the end of the war by the grant of American citizenship and local self-government to the people of Guam; and

"Whereas, despite this grant of citizenship and self-government, the people of Guam have been advised that the United Nations still considers Guam a non-self-governing dependency, i.e., a colony, of the United States and as such expects the United States to account to the United Nations as to Guam's progress toward independence, and since this notion of the United Nations that the people of Guam are somehow wards of the United Nations and not part of the United States is one highly repugnant to the people of Guam who have fought, bled, and died for the United States not as colonials under duress but as patriotic Americans; now therefore be it

"Resolved, that the Ninth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam respectfully advise and request the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to put on notice the United Nations that the territory of Guam is not a colony of the United States but is part of the American commonwealth and that, accordingly, the United Nations has no jurisdiction over, nor any legitimate interest in the internal affairs of Guam or in its relations with the rest of the United States, the facts upon which such notice should be based being, among others, the following:

"1. That the grant of U.S. Citizenship to the residents of Guam was long requested by the people of Guam prior to its actual extension and that therefore this U.S. citizenship was a free choice of the people of Guam and not given against their wishes;

"2. That as citizens of the United States, the people of Guam can travel freely anywhere else within the United States as can any other citizen and can obtain passports to travel elsewhere in the world, again as freely as other American citizens; that, accordingly, a large number of locally born citizens no longer reside in Guam but elsewhere in the United States where they, like all other citizens, vote in national and federal elections and otherwise fully participate in the life of the Nation;

"3. That although the residents of Guam, while living in Guam, cannot vote in national elections, for years neither could the residents of Washington, D.C., and neither can expatriate Americans living overseas who maintain no stateside residence, and thus the lack of a vote in a national election does not mean that the people of Guam are any less U.S. citizens than the others who can vote;

"4. That although the people of Guam do not presently elect their chief executive, **neither do the people of Washington, D.C., and in any event legislation is now pending** which will undoubtedly soon give Guam the right to choose its own chief executive;

"5. That the community of Guam has per capita lost more of its men in the Vietnam Conflict than any other American community, and this fact is a source of great pride to the people of Guam, whose young men have volunteered in large numbers to join the American Armed Services, hardly the action of a colonial people, but instead the expression of patriotic Americans desiring to help defend not their colonial master but their own country; and be it further

"Resolved, that the people of Guam do further state that although for the foregoing reasons they deny any jurisdiction of the United Nations over Guam, they nevertheless are willing to clear this matter up for all time by submitting the question to a local referendum if such be the desire of the Congress or the President, although for the compelling reasons stated hereinbefore, in the opinion of the people of Guam such a referendum is not only unnecessary but to a considerable degree insulting to the memory of the countless Guamanians who have died for their country, the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, that the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, to the Honorable Hubert Humphrey, President of the Senate, to the Honorable John McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Honorable Arthur Goldberg, United States Delegate to the United Nations, to the Honorable Henry M. Jackson, Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Honorable Wayne N. Aspinall, Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the Honorable A. B. WonPat, Guam's Washington Representative, and to the Honorable Manuel F. L. Guerrero, Governor of Guam.

"Duly and regularly adopted on the 7th day of April 1967.

"F. T. RAMIREZ,
"Legislative Secretary.
"J. C. ARRIOLA,
"Speaker."

"RESOLUTION No. 189 (1-S)

"Relative to respectfully requesting the Senate of the United States to confirm the appointment of Manual F. L. Guerrero as Governor of Guam

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas, President Lyndon B. Johnson, on his recent trip to Guam to preside over the Guam conference on the progress of the Vietnam War, upon his arrival in Guam, dramatically announced that on the plane ride from Washington to Guam, he had signed the commission reappointing the Honorable Manuel F. L. Guerrero as Governor of Guam, and that appointment is now pending in the United States Senate; and

"Whereas, Manual F. L. Guerrero has become the first appointed governor under civilian administration to serve out his full four-year term, which establishes that he has served honorably and successfully as Governor of Guam and that he can continue to do so in the future, and until provision is made for Guam to elect its own governor; and

"Whereas, the present incumbent has been employed in one capacity or another by the Government of Guam for practically his entire adult life and has unique knowledge of, and experience in, the Executive Branch of the Government of Guam and therefore is an ideal choice as appointed Governor of the territory of Guam; now therefore be it

"Resolved, that the Ninth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam respectfully request and memorialize the Senate of the United States to confirm the appointment of the Honorable Manuel F. L. Guerrero to a second term as Governor of Guam; and be it further

"Resolved, that the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, to the Honorable Hubert Humphrey, President of the Senate, to the Honorable Henry M. Jackson, Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to the Honorable Manual F. L. Guerrero, Governor of Guam.

"Duly and regularly adopted on the 7th day of April 1967.

"F. T. RAMIREZ,
"Legislative Secretary.
"J. C. ARRIOLA,
"Speaker."

A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

"Pertaining to banning of Bible reading and public prayer in our public schools

"Whereas, recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court have banned the reading of the Bible and public prayers in our public schools; and

"Whereas, other public officials in high places have given support and endorsement to the decisions of the Supreme Court; and

"Whereas, the decisions of the Supreme Court and the statements of a number of public officials have tended to confuse the public and have supported the philosophy that this Nation should ban in its public life the existence of and faith in God Almighty; and

"Whereas, this Nation was founded on the philosophy of freedom of religion and religious worship, and the strength of this Nation through its many troubled years has been fortified by the strong expression of belief by most of the people of this country of faith and dependence upon Almighty God, now, therefore

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, the Senate concurring therein,

"That this Resolution is adopted in protest of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, and the expressions of officials in high public positions, supporting the philosophy of banning the reading of the Holy Bible and public prayer in our public schools, it being recognized that each citizen should not be denied his freedom of worship, yet it being further recognized that the vast majority of the people should not be denied the right to refer to the Holy Scripture or commune with Almighty God in prayer in their public affairs and public life.

"Be it further resolved that upon adoption hereof a copy of this Resolution shall be furnished by the Secretary of State to the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme

Court and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the National Congress.

"MERLIN R. COCKRILL, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House.
"MARVIN BRITT,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION No. 12

"Relative to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring Walt Disney

"Whereas, Walt Disney brought laughter and joy into the lives of millions by the truly original and humorous antics of Mickey Mouse, Goofy, Donald Duck, Dumbo, Bambi, and scores of others; and

"Whereas, Born in Chicago, Illinois, in 1901, his family moved to Missouri where he spent most of his boyhood on a farm, where he began sketching animals and, by the age of 15, he concluded his formal education and began his career in the business world; and

"Whereas, From his imagination and factory of drawing boards, Walt Disney fashioned the most popular movie stars ever to come from Hollywood and created one of the most fantastic entertainment empires in history; and

"Whereas, From the first seven-minute cartoons, Walt Disney became the first man to use Technicolor and to mix animation with live action and pioneered in making feature-length cartoons; and

"Whereas, A pioneer in feature length color cartoons, Walt Disney popularized nature films and later expanded into adventure, comedy, and musical productions; and

"Whereas, Honored with over 900 awards from organizations and governments around the world, he was awarded the United States' highest civilian decoration, the presidential Medal of Freedom, and was proposed for the 1964 Nobel Peace Prize; and

"Whereas, Walt Disney's creative talents have earned him 31 Academy Awards and 5 Emmy Awards during his illustrious, 43-year career; and

"Whereas, Disney's restless mind created one of the nation's greatest tourist attractions, Disneyland, a 160-acre tract of amusement rides, fantasy spectacles, and recreated Americana, which was described by Walt Disney simply as "the world's happiest place" and which will survive as an enduring monument to the genius of its creator; and

"Whereas, Walt Disney was involved in plans for what he called his biggest, most ambitious project yet, Disney World, a multi-million-dollar park in Florida similar to Disneyland, and also being planned was a year-round recreation facility in the Sequoia National Forest; and

"Whereas, Although he leaves many reminders of his presence, Walt Disney will be missed by the millions of children and adults who were entertained by this great man; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Postmaster General of the United States to issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring Walt Disney; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, and to the members of the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee of the United States Post Office Department."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Whereas, the Legislature of the State of Hawaii enacted Act 3, Session Laws of Hawaii 1965, which provided that public buildings and facilities insofar as feasible will be constructed in such a way as to be accessible to and usable by the physically handicapped; and

"Whereas, Senator E. L. Bartlett of Alaska has introduced in the Senate of the United States a bill (S. 222) to insure that public buildings financed with federal funds shall be designed and constructed so as to be accessible to the physically handicapped; and

"Whereas, Congressman Charles Bennett of Florida has introduced a similar bill (H.R. 6589) in the Congress of the United States; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1967, with the Senate concurring, that it give its full support to the measures presently pending in the Senate and Congress of the United States relating to construction of federal buildings so as to be accessible to the physically handicapped; and

"Be it further resolved that Hawaii's congressional delegation be urged to support said measures to the best of their ability; and

"Be it further resolved that duly authenticated copies of this Concurrent Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of Hawaii's congressional delegation, Senator Hiram L. Fong, Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Congressman Spark M. Matsunaga and Congresswoman Patsy T. Mink."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 21

"Memorializing Congress to reconsider and amend the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–285) for the purpose of making it more flexible and workable

"The legislature of the state of Wisconsin enthusiastically approves and is desirous of co-operating in carrying out the general plan for roadside beautification under the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965, the objectives of which are primarily the same as Wisconsin's long established and continuing program to construct and maintain highways that serve and attract our resident population and many tourist guests. Nevertheless after careful study it appears that the means and methods prescribed by the act for achieving its goals, including the proposed rules and standards for its administration, not only completely change or nullify historic Wisconsin methods of controlling roadside outdoor advertising, but pose an economic and financial impact so adverse to highway construction and roadside control in Wisconsin as to make compliance therewith untenable; and, on the other hand, noncompliance therewith will result in a severe retardation of the Wisconsin highway construction and improvement program. The reasons for this are patent.

"Heretofore and for many years in Wisconsin, billboards, junk yards and unsightly structures along the interstate highway system have been controlled by legislative zoning under the police power. The Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 requires that states conforming to the act must control the same along both the interstate and federal primary systems, and fails to permit an exemption for local control within incorporated areas, thereby increasing the number of miles which would have to be controlled in Wisconsin from about 460 to 6,000 miles, affecting approximately 44,000 billboards and 451 junk yards. It further requires that such controls must be exercised not later than January 1, 1968, by removing about 40,000 of these billboards, which would be rendered illegal under the federal act, upon payment of just compensation to the owners thereof and also to the owners of the land on which they are maintained, and by screening and landscaping the junk yards or, in the alternative when that cannot be done successfully, removing them after just compensation has been paid to the owners.

"This in itself would be an insurmountable undertaking by the state, but the real dilemma is that the cost of such control program will approximate $20,000,000 of which Wisconsin will have to pay one fourth, and that the entire $5,000,000 plus an undeterminable amount for future cost of such controls will be diverted from construction of Wisconsin highways to the beautification program. Not included in these figures are the undetermined amounts necessary to control areas where no signs presently exist or for signs installed after the passage of this act on October 22, 1965.

"Another unpalatable phase of the federal act is that if a state conforming thereto fails to meet the deadline or elects not to conform in effecting such controls it will forfeit 10% of its otherwise allotted federal highway construction aids annually until it complies.

"Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That for the purpose of seeking to improve the workability of the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 to make the act sufficiently flexible to better recognize the variations in conditions between states, to minimize so far as practicable the wholesale nullification or revision of historic state legislation governing control of roadside billboards and junk yards, to give the right to exempt control within incorporated areas, to give states further time in which to meet deadlines for accomplishing effective control of roadside billboards and junk yards, and to enable states to exercise control over roadside billboards and junk yards by legislative zoning under the police power as an alternative to condemnation or payment of damages, the legislature of the state of Wisconsin memorializes the Congress of the United States to reconsider and amend the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 accordingly; and, be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each house of the Congress and to each Wisconsin member thereof."

REPORT ENTITLED "CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 191)

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "Constitutional Amendments," pursuant to Senate Resolution 193, 89th Congress, and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). The report will be received, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

REPORT ENTITLED "LABOR RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES OF JACK McCARTHY AND NATIONAL CONSULTANTS ASSOCIATED, LTD."—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 192)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit a report of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, entitled "Labor Racketeering Activities of Jack McCarthy and National Consultants Associated, Ltd."

This report concerns a series of hearings which was held during 1966 relating to the role of labor relations consultants in the important field of collective bargaining between management and labor. The subcommittee examined the activities of a labor consultant named Jack McCarthy, his associates in the firm of National Consultants Associated, Ltd., and a number of other persons who were involved with him in labor-management matters. These included labor union officials who were dominated or strongly influenced by McCarthy.

Testimony and documented evidence disclosed a number of dubious practices and outright abuses engaged in by McCarthy and his associates. This report describes a series of schemes through which McCarthy and those close to him acquired substantial personal profits, while at the same time the legitimate objectives of trade unionism were undermined and union members were deprived of rights and privileges which should have been safeguarded by existing laws.

The investigation showed that Jack McCarthy and his associates engaged in a number of corrupt and dishonest practices which are summarized as follows:

First. "Sweetheart contracts" were negotiated between employers, who were represented by McCarthy and his consulting firm, and seven local labor unions which McCarthy dominated or controlled.

Second. "Labor peace" was purchased for clients of National Consultants Associated, Ltd., through the procurement of various services which were operated by relatives, associates, or friends of McCarthy.

Third. Loans to union officials on questionable terms were arranged by McCarthy and a union official named Daniel Kapilow, who was McCarthy's partner in a firm called Linsan Trading Co.

Fourth. Union welfare funds were misused by McCarthy and Kapilow, who loaned assets of the funds to their own company while they were trustees of the funds.

Fifth. McCarthy and Kapilow, while they were trustees of a welfare fund, purchased a house in the name of McCarthy's mother which subsequently served as headquarters for the union and its benefit plans. The transaction ultimately will provide McCarthy's mother with a windfall profit of about $45,000.

Sixth. Dental and optical benefit plans for union members furnished high profits to McCarthy and others, but provided few if any benefits to the union members whose funds were used to pay for the operation of the plans.

Mr. President, it should be noted that, on March 20, 1967, by action of a Federal grand jury in this Southern District of New York, Jack McCarthy and Louis Basis, his partner in the consulting firm, were indicted on 38 counts of violations of section 302 of the Labor Relations Act of 1947 and section 504 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. The announcement of the indictment by Robert M. Morgenthau, U.S. attorney, stressed that the Government's case against McCarthy and Basis evolved from information disclosed in the subcommittee's hearings, and that the indictment was the first such action to be brought under section 504 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

Testimony in our hearings showed that McCarthy, while he was still business agent for Local 1430 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, received monthly payments from Louis Basis. The money came from business firms represented by Louis Basis and National Consultants Associated, Ltd., in the negotiation through Jack McCarthy of collective bargaining agreements with Local 1430. McCarthy was at that time a partner in National Consultants Associated, Ltd., even though he was still an official of Local 1430. McCarthy was also indicted for failing to file reports of his activities as a labor-relations consultant under the provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act and was further charged with failing to report the payments made to him by the business firms through his partner, Louis Basis.

The exposure of the activities of these persons through the subcommittee's investigation and their subsequent indictment should ultimately prove to be beneficial to the rank-and-file members of the unions and to the business firms involved. I consider the result of this inquiry, Mr. President, an excellent example of the subcommittee's accomplishments in the labor-management field during the past dozen years.

The members of the subcommittee, however, express in this report certain recommendations that we hope will produce other important and long-lasting results, particularly in the enactment by the Congress of the legislative proposals that we believe are appropriate and necessary.

The first of these measures seeks to strengthen and clarify the regulations of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act relating to the role of labor-relations consultants. The subcommittee recommends the enactment of legislation which would amend the existing statute by:

First, requiring all union officials to report annually to the Department of Labor any and all income from and transactions with labor relations consultants;

Second, requiring all labor relations consultants to report fully about their receipts and disbursements; and

Third, providing criminal penalties for violations in conflict-of-interest situations between labor consultants and union officials.

The foregoing proposals have been included in S. 1250, a bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act which I introduced in the 90th Congress and which was cosponsored by Senators ERVIN, MUSKIE, MUNDT, and CURTIS.

The subcommittee also recommends that the Congress give careful consideration to measures which have been introduced to revise and strengthen the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act by providing additional safeguards for the participants and beneficiaries of employee-benefit plans. I introduced S. 1255 in the 90th Congress for this purpose, and a similar bill, S. 1024, has been introduced on behalf of the administration. Senator JAVITS also has introduced a bill, S. 1103, which proposes requirements for protecting employee benefit trust funds.

Mr. President, the principal provisions of the legislative proposals I have referred to are needed to deter and eliminate the kinds of corruption and dishonesty which have been demonstrated in our hearings and summarized in this report. It is my hope that Congress, after due examination of these measures, will recognize their worthy objectives and enact them into law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1604. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, with respect to the definition of the term "discharge"; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1605. A bill for the relief of James L. Wheeler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1606. A bill for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1607. A bill to provide local grant-in-aid credit for urban renewal project in Garden City, Mich.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1608. A bill to amend the joint resolution of March 24, 1937, to provide for the termination of the interest of the United States in certain real property in Allen Park, Mich.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1609. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1610. A bill for the relief of Donna Sue Mendieta Gensemer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MILLER, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S. 1611. A bill to require annual approval by the Congress of aggregate amounts of expenditure authorizations contained in general appropriation acts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 1612. A bill to authorize the Secretary

of the Interior to carry out a program of restoration and development of migratory waterfowl habitat in the Middle Rio Grande Valley, New Mexico, in furtherance of the purposes of the Migratory Bird Treaties with Canada and Mexico; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, and Mr. MURPHY:

S. 1613. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Finance.

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

TO AMEND THE OIL POLLUTION ACT OF 1924

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment to the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, as it was amended by Congress last year.

The purpose of my amendment is to delete a single word slipped into the act by a House-Senate conference committee in the dying days of the 89th Congress, and to restore language approved by the Senate.

This one word has made the law's provision prohibiting the spillage of oil in inland or territorial waters virtually unenforceable. The crippling effect was accomplished by changing the definition of oil discharge as spelled out in the 1966 Senate amendment to the act. Under the new law the Government must prove that a vessel was "grossly" negligent in any case involving a discharge of oil.

This, I am told authoritatively, has placed an almost impossibly onerous burden of proof on the Federal Government. As a result, the Justice Department recently disclosed, according to the April 16 New York Times, that it has not filed a single oil pollution case in the inland and territorial water category since the law was amended last November 3. Previously, Justice says, it prosecuted about 100 or more cases a year.

The crippling of the Oil Pollution Act leaves our shores virtually defenseless against the tanker which dumps oil at sea.

Within recent days, stretches of the New Jersey coastline and the beaches of Cape Cod were fouled by oil. Off the shores of New Jersey alone, hundreds of helpless sea birds have been killed by the massive oil slicks. Apparently only a lucky tide, which seems to have carried the oil out to sea, has spared New Jersey the same fate that befell the English and French coasts from the sunken tanker *Torrey-Canyon*.

Amending the Oil Pollution Act, as my bill would do, is only one step that must be taken to protect our shores from oil pollution.

For one thing, I believe the Coast Guard must institute systematic oil pollution patrols in territorial waters.

The Coast Guard has advised me that it does not conduct such patrols at present, relying for its information on happenstance sightings made and reported by military or civilian ships and planes moving about on other business.

I am bringing this situation to the attention of the Coast Guard and am asking that patrols be undertaken as quickly as possible.

For another thing, I agree with Theodore R. Rogowski, an assistant solicitor for water pollution control in the Department of the Interior, that the Corps of Engineers should take a broader view of its enforcement authority under the Refuse Act, another means for controlling water pollution, and "be vigorous in recommending prosecution under that act."

If either the Corps of Engineers or the Coast Guard find themselves unable to carry out their responsibilities for effective enforcement of these antipollution acts because of lack of funds, theirs is also the responsibility to ask Congress for the necessary appropriations. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I stand ready to assist in providing additional funding.

We want no *Torrey Canyon* incidents off the New Jersey or Massachusetts coasts, or any other coastal portion of the United States.

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

The bill (S. 1604) to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, with respect to the definition of the term "discharge," introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, to provide that projects may be qualified for loans which would now supply water mainly for irrigation but which might, during the course of their 50-year loan repayment period, be used primarily to supply water to residential or industrial customers. A similar bill has already been introduced by the Representative from California [Mr. TUNNEY], in the House of Representatives.

During the 10 years the small reclamation loan program has been in operation, numerous projects have been qualified for assistance on the basis they are needed today to provide water primarily for irrigation, although it was possible that someday they might be used primarily to supply residential and industrial water.

However, in the last few months it has become evident that the Department of the Interior is developing a new interpretation of this provision of the law, and is holding that projects would not qualify if, during the course of the loan repayment period, these projects might be used primarily for other than irrigation purposes. This interpretation is killing the loan applications of some very worthy projects, and holding up the applications of others.

Just recently, for example, I was informed that the loan application of the Roy Water Conservancy Subdistrict, in my own State of Utah, has been returned unapproved because of this problem. I also understand that the application of the West San Bernardino County Water District was held for the same reason for months before that approval was given. I have heard further that the Colorado River Water Conservation District proposed to develop a much-needed project on the White River in western Colorado but were informed that it could not qualify for a small reclamation projects loan because more water would be used to support important industrial development than was required for irrigation, both of which are essential in developing the economy of the area. Numerous other irrigation projects which involve municipal or residential water supply are under consideration, and may never be developed, or may be turned down, on the basis of the new philosophy which is developing in the Department of the Interior.

These projects are now subject in the Department to what I will call the great guessing game. They will be approved or disapproved on the basis of someone's guess as to what type of development will take place in the future in the area in which the projects are located.

I am aware that population projections for regions, States, counties, and cities are accepted tools of our planners. However, I defy anyone to make a completely reliable projection of the conditions which will exist in a given 1,000-acre area, or even in a 10,000-acre agricultural area, 50 years from now. Yet that is what the Department of the Interior is trying to do.

The projects which basically are affected by this new philosophy are those which would be located near to centers of population. The areas in which they would be built are now still primarily agricultural, and more water is needed now for agricultural pursuits. However, it is entirely possible that some of the service areas they cover will be converted into residential areas in time. Yet because this is the case, these projects are denied loan funds now.

Why is it not good business to plan a system for agricultural use now which can be gradually converted to municipal and industrial use if urbanization of the area makes this desirable? Why should we not do the comprehensive planning necessary now to supply today's needs, and be ready for tomorrow's when they come?

If we do not make some provision of this type of development in the Small Reclamation Act, many small projects which we need now will not be built, since there is no other place such a project can go for financing. It is difficult to obtain sufficient financing from private sources because undeveloped or partially developed areas have little or no bonding capacity. And there are no other Federal programs for which they can qualify.

Let me make it clear, of course, that I am not talking about grants or subsidies for these projects, but about loans which will be fully repaid, with interest.

Mr. President, I was the sponsor of the bill the Congress enacted last session which improved and extended the

Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, and allowed this very successful program to continue.

At the time my bill was under consideration, the problems I have discussed today had not arisen. We in the Congress were not aware of the change of policy about to take place in the Department of the Interior.

So it now becomes necessary to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act again. We must not let technicalities hold up or hobble this vastly important program. We should take the Department of the Interior out of its great guessing game. We should move ahead on all fronts and in all ways to develop our water resources—it is foolish and shortsighted to do otherwise.

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

The bill (S. 1609) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

IMPOSITION OF IMPORT LIMITATIONS ON PREPARED OR PRESERVED STRAWBERRIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators HATFIELD, JACKSON, MAGNUSON, HOLLAND, SMATHERS, JORDAN of North Carolina, and MURPHY, I wish to introduce a bill designed to establish a strawberry import quota. This measure would impose limitations on the amount of prepared or preserved strawberries which could be imported annually into this country. The limitation would be set at 20 percent of our annual strawberry consumption.

This bill is important to Oregon in particular because Oregon is second only to California in the quantity of strawberries produced yearly in the United States for domestic consumption. It is identical to a bill introduced on the House side by Congressman AL ULLMAN, of Oregon.

Oregon produces approximately one-fifth of the total U.S. fresh and processed strawberry crop. In figures this is 97,150,000 pounds worth $16,936,000 yearly. The U.S. strawberry crop total for 1966 was approximately 469 million pounds worth about $105 million.

American strawberry growers, however, are faced with an enormously expanding Mexican strawberry crop as well as increased imports from Canada and Poland.

Imports of fresh Mexican strawberries have jumped from a negligible total in 1955 to 11,747,000 pounds in 1966. Frozen strawberry imports have gone from about 11,600,000 pounds to 82,825,000 pounds in the 11-year period.

Markedly lower labor costs, both in the fields and in the packing plants, and lower sugar prices have helped this rapid growth of the Mexican strawberry industry.

In a speech I gave February 10 at the Seventh Annual Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference I noted the growing political pressure in the United States to impose such quotas as these.

I noted that it was suggested that the members of both delegations urge their respective Governments to consider the desirability of a voluntary agreement which, for the next few years, would limit Mexican imports of strawberries, both fresh and canned, to the 1966 level, or a small percentage above that level with the provision for subsequent participation by Mexico in the growth of the U.S. market.

This bill will work toward that goal.

Mexican strawberry imports now total about 94 million pounds or slightly more than one-fifth of total U.S. production.

Because imports would be allotted under this measure on the basis of a previous share of the market it is unlikely the Mexican strawberry import level would drop substantially. The bill is designed, however, to prevent heavy increases which would seriously jeopardize the economic situation of strawberry growers throughout the United States.

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

The bill (S. 1613) to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries, introduced by Mr. MORSE, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 173

Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1242) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CLEAN AIR ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 174 AND 175

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, late last week the President announced a vastly expanded program for research and development in control of sulfur emissions from fuels. This new program, which envisages a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1967 of $4.2 million, will require an additional authorization for fiscal year 1968 of $15 million. Added to the previously requested expansion in monetary authorization for air pollution this will bring the fiscal year 1968 funding level to $99 million.

Mr. President, ordinarily an amendment to a matter pending before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution would be introduced by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, who has directed the major congressional efforts to secure effective air and water pollution control legislation for the past 5 years. Senator MUSKIE is unavoidably absent today. He has asked that I introduce this amendment, knowing of the concern of both my constituents and the people of the United States for early development of effective methods to control the emissions of sulfur into the atmosphere.

The control of sulfur emissions from fuels combustion is today primarily a matter of spending sufficient funds to achieve a desired goal. This fact is recognized by the fuels industry, both coal and oil, by the people responsible for the Federal air pollution control program, and by scientists and others with whom I have spoken. It is not a question of hopefully developing a method of control. It is, in fact, absolutely essential that effective control devices and methods be developed at the earliest possible date. The economy of the country is integrally related to its ability to produce an abundant supply of cheap electricity. In his letter accompanying the proposed amendment, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner, stated that selection of low sulfur fuels for certain areas offers only a temporary solution. And this solution will be a painful one for the coal industry and must be used only when the public health is threatened.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter in the RECORD.

At the same time, we are charged with a continuing responsibility to assure maximum protection of the public health from air pollutants of any kind. Therefore, I repeat it is essential that we immediately engage in a crash development progrgam to provide technically and economically feasible methods of controlling sulfur emissions from fuels combustion. I welcome the President's support in this matter and I congratulate him for this demonstrable evidence of his desire to secure effective air pollution control without undue economic dislocation. If the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator MUSKIE, were here today, he would fully endorse this position.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE.

The PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Air Quality Act of 1967, transmitted to the Congress on January 30, 1967 and now being considered by the Congress, is a matter of highest priority, if we are to continue the battle for clean air. It represents our concern for the serious threat to American health caused by polluted air.

Since the transmittal of the President's Message on "Protecting Our National Heritage," several events have occurred which make it necessary to accelerate the attack on one of the major air contaminants requiring more complete control—sulfur oxide.

The recently published "Air Quality Criteria for Sulfur Oxides," the recommendations of the conferees in the New York-New Jersey abatement action, and other findings and conclusions of prominent scientists, lead us to the inescapable conclusion that we must move more rapidly and effectively in reducing the levels of sulfur now present in the atmosphere over many of our metropolitan areas.

At the same time, it has become obvious that present technology is inadequate to deal fully with all aspects of the sulfur problem.

While it is true that selection of low-sulfur fuels for use in certain critical areas will offer a temporary solution, it is clear that we must substantially accelerate our research and development activities in three major areas: 1) Removal of sulfur from fuels, 2) process removal of sulfur from burning fuels, and 3) control of sulfur gases in the stack. Several promising approaches are available, and more rapid development to full-scale application is necessary.

We have discussed this problem with representatives of the coal and oil industries and with interested Federal agencies. We are all in agreement with the vital importance of an expanded and accelerated research and development program.

I am therefore recommending that the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 be amended to increase the authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, from $84 million to $99 million; the additional $15 million would be made available for research and development in control of sulfur omissions from fuels.

Enclosed is an amendment to the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 to carry out this recommendation.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the Air Quality Act of 1967 with this amendment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Secretary.

AMENDMENT TO DRAFT BILL, THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

In section 7, strike out "84,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "99,000,000".

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to amendment No. 154 which I proposed earlier this month as an amendment to S. 780, the Air Quality Act of 1967.

The measure which I now recommend would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish Regional Air Quality Commissions in interstate regions. This measure differs from Section 108 as proposed in S. 780 in three major respects.

First, my proposal would, I believe, provide for more effective local and State participation and thus more cooperation between levels of government.

Second, the proposed amendment would invest the Commission itself with more authority by providing that the Commission rather than the Secretary would make the final determination regarding the air quality standards of the region.

Third, the proposed amendment substitutes for the cease and desist authority of the Commission which would be authorized by S. 780 the same enforcement procedure that is involved in abatement of interstate pollution in other sections of the Air Quality Act. In the absence of compelling reasons for such an extension of the Federal authority—which reason have not yet been advanced by administration witnesses in our hearings—I feel it is the prudent thing to retain a uniform procedure in all interstate pollution abatement actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The amendments—Nos. 174 and 175—will be received, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and will be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CLEAN AIR ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 174

Mr. RANDOLPH submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment No. 154, intended to be proposed by himself, to the bill (S. 780) to amend the Clean Air Act to improve and expand the authority to conduct or assist research relating to air pollutants, to assist in the establishment of regional air quality commissions, to authorize establishment of standards applicable to emissions from establishments engaged in certain types of industry, to assist in establishment and maintenance of State programs for annual inspections of automobile emission control devices, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 175

Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. COOPER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 780, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM W. SHERRILL, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on Tuesday, April 25, 1967, on the nomination of William W. Sherrill, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The hearing will commence at 9:30 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testifying or to submit statements in connection with this nomination should notify Mr. Lewis G. Odom, Jr., staff director, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL JURY SELECTION BILLS (S. 383, S. 384, S. 385, S. 386, S. 387, S. 989, S. 1319)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce a hearing for the consideration of S. 383, S. 384, S. 385, S. 386, S. 387, S. 989, and S. 1319. These bills would provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of Federal juries.

The hearing will be held at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, May 2, 1967, in the District of Columbia hearing room, room 6226, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 49) to designate April 28-29, 1967, as "Rush-Bagot Agreement Days."

WE MUST NOT FIGHT FIRE WITH FIRE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, an article by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, April 23, 1967. It is a most thoughtful and searching inquiry into the ideological approach of the United States to foreign policy and international involvement, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WE MUST NOT FIGHT FIRE WITH FIRE

(By J. W. FULBRIGHT)[1]

Underlying the controversy about the Central Intelligence Agency and its clandestine relationships with private organizations is a larger question about our basic philosophical stand as a nation. Do we, or do we not, subscribe to the great Kantian categorical imperative—of which Prof. Henry Steele Commager recently reminded the Foreign Relations Committee—"Never treat any human being as a means but always as an end," and "So conduct yourself that you might generalize your every action into a universal rule"?

These are ideal rules; few if any men can live up to them fully, but most Americans accept them as standards to which they aspire. They are implicit in our Constitution and in our traditions, both of which put limits on the use of power so as to protect certain rights of the individual. The essential purpose of our system—of federalism, checks and balances and the Bill of Rights—is not efficiency in the use of power but limitations on it, or, to put it another way, the acceptance of that degree of inefficiency in the conduct of government which is essential to protect the individual. At the core of the system is the belief that the human individual is an end, not a means; and that means, in order not to destroy the ends they serve, must be morally compatible with them. If we stand for anything in the world, it is this idea.

Within the last generation our country has been moving away from these values. More and more, we have been treating political philosophy—more exactly, the defense of our own political philosophy and hostility to Communism—as an end in itself, to which, with increasing frequency, it is deemed necessary to subordinate the freedom and dignity of individual men. More and more, in fear of having an ideology in which power is wielded arbitrarily imposed upon us, we have been imposing a degree of arbitrary power upon ourselves, passively if uneasily accepting half-true explanations of necessity, emergency and defense, while the wielders of power reassure us with a perversion of Lord Acton's maxim, something to the effect of: "Power, it is true, corrupts, but I am incorruptible and can be trusted to wield power with voluntary benevolence and restraint."

[1] J. W. Fulbright (D., Ark.) heads the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I do not believe we have been undermining traditional values capriciously or because our leaders have become seized with the lust for power. The decisions which have led us in a direction away from rather than toward the fulfillment of our national values have been made, for the most part, by good and honest men. Good faith, however, is not the same thing as good judgment, and the fact that our policy-makers have not consciously sought to unbalance traditional constitutional relationships, and the traditional values that underlie them, does not mean that they have not, inadvertently, done so. The tremendous pressures imposed upon our policy-makers by the cold war, by the worldwide commitments of the United States and by the permanent, terrifying possibility of the destruction of our country by nuclear weapons have had a corrosive, undermining effect on the very values we are trying to defend.

In an environment of danger and anxiety ends have been confused with means. As Professor Commager said in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee: "The reason we are trying to win the contest with Communism is precisely because we want the triumph of the open mind, the triumph of freedom, the triumph of the unimpeded investigation of every scientific, every moral and philosophical question, and if we corrupt that process at the very outset, we may win the contest with Communism and lose the purpose for which we are contesting."

Prior to the Second World War—despite the use of spies in the Revolution, in the Civil War and in the First World War—our Government had never engaged in large-scale, organized secret intelligence activities. Being believers in popular government, we wanted no part of that sort of thing, and being relatively secure and isolated, we did not have to engage in the kind of intrigues which we associated with the Bad Old World of Europe.

World events and the growth of American power have altered this outlook. Implicit in our rejection of isolationism, however, is something more than an acknowledgment of altered circumstances. There seems also to be an assumption, rooted in a curious contempt for the past, that outmoded practices are bad practices and that changed circumstances are improved circumstances.

In more concrete terms, at some point in the process of acknowledging the necessity for world involvement, for huge military expenditures and far-flung intelligence activities, we seem also to have become persuaded that the taking on of these activities has been a positive good rather than a regrettable necessity. The result of this subtle but extremely significant extension of our attitude toward isolationism is that, in rejecting *practices* which have become outmoded, we have also gone far, without being very conscious of it, toward rejecting the *values* in which those practices were rooted.

Trying to make a virtue of necessity, we have come close to regarding our vast military establishment, our worldwide intelligence network and our deep involvement in the affairs of foreign nations as good things in themselves. The very word "isolationism"—or the more commonly heard "neo-isolationism"—has become, like "appeasement," a pejorative, a word that is used not to describe but to condemn a point of view.

It has become almost impossible, therefore, to introduce certain salient points into the current discussion, such as that American isolationism was a very wise policy in its time, that it has now become impractical but not necessarily undesirable and, most important of all, that being largely obsolete does not mean that it is entirely obsolete. Indeed, the term "isolationism," insofar as it connotes minding one's own business, still makes a good deal of sense in a good many places. Or, to make the point still another way, the fact that we cannot help being involved in some people's affairs does not mean that we ought to be involved in everybody's affairs.

A whole new intellectual community has arisen in our country, dedicated to the development of an ever more sophisticated global strategy. These scholars have introduced new concepts such as "graduated deterrence," the "balance of terror," "acceptable levels of megadeaths," all measurable with a fine precision by the playing out of "war-game scenarios." It all sounds so fascinating, so modern, so antiseptic that it is easy to forget that what is being talked about, coldly and scientifically, is the prospect of the most hideous carnage in the history of the human race.

Implicit in much of the thinking of the strategic intellectuals is a rejection, indeed a contempt, for traditional values. Federalism, checks and balances and the primacy of domestic civilian pursuits, insofar as they are thought of at all, are thought of as quaint anachronisms. In an age of conflict, the conduct of conflict becomes an end in itself, its needs claiming primacy over the ends for which it was undertaken. Thus, $70-billion a year for weapons must have priority over a modest little "war" against poverty; the military obligation of the young must have priority over their education.

It is, I believe, this loss of interest in the traditional values of American democracy that has alienated so many of our younger generation. Still believing in Jeffersonian principles, they have sensed and are deeply offended by their elders' reversal of ends and means. Underlying their protest and dissent, even when it takes extravagant forms, is the belief in the individual as an end not a means. And as the gap between practice and traditional values widens, so does the gap between generations, generating in the young that terrible feeling of inability to make their ideas and convictions understood—a feeling which is not just an affliction of youth but of moralists in an unbelieving age.

The American people are not given to half-hearted undertakings. Whatever the undertaking, even if it is something we do not especially need, we want the biggest, the best and the most of it—and we usually succeed. So it was with industrial and agricultural development and the exuberance of our effort has made us the richest nation in the world. And so it has been with war: Starting as an "example" for the world, a nation which, in President Wilson's phrase, was "too proud to fight," we have become the foremost fighter of the 20th century, the architect of victory in two world wars, the inventor and thus far the only user of the atomic bomb, and we are now participating in our fourth major war of this century.

So also has it been with the craft of intelligence. Prior to the Second World War American intelligence was amateurish and inadequate. Now, in keeping with our tendency to throw ourselves into things with a certain extravagance, we have, with due respect to the Russians, what is probably the most powerful and extensive intelligence network in the world. So extensive have the secret operations of the C.I.A. become all over the world that in 1963 former President Truman, who had created the C.I.A. 16 years before, wrote: "For some time I have been disturbed by the way the C.I.A. has been diverted from its original assignment. It has become an operational and at times a policy-making arm of the Government. . . ."

The crucible in which this vast secret apparatus was formed was the cold war. Emerging from the greatest war in history with a total victory that we expected to be followed by a new, civilized world order under the aegis of the United Nations, we Americans were shocked and disillusioned by Stalinist Russia's betrayal of its wartime agreements, as a result of which we found ourselves plunged into a bitter new struggle characterized by penetration, subversion, ideological propaganda and externally supported civil war. We were, there is no doubt, cruelly betrayed.

We decided thereupon, as Allen Dulles once explained, to "fight fire with fire." Through the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and the NATO treaty we saved Western and Southern Europe from what may or may not have been but was plausibly feared at the time to be a Stalinist design for the conquest of Europe. (These enlightened policies might accurately be characterized as fighting fire not with fire but with *water*.)

Beyond them, however, we mastered and practiced the techniques of the enemy. To a degree that is only just becoming known to the American people, we learned how to plant spies; we learned how to penetrate, subvert and overthrow foreign governments, and, most astonishing of all, we even developed a network of secret agents within our own society. As so often in the past, we have proved ourselves to be more than a match for an enemy in fighting him with his own weapons; we have indeed fought fire with fire and the flames have spread farther than anyone could have expected. And now the question must be asked: What is the difference between one kind of fire and another, between Communist fire and American fire?

All this was done under the authorization of two unprecedented pieces of legislation, the National Security Act of 1947, which created and defined, very broadly, the intelligence and "other functions" of the C.I.A., and the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, which exempted the C.I.A. from the disclosure provisions regarding personnel which apply to other Government agencies and vested in the Director of Central Intelligence the power to spend money "without regard to the provisions of law and regulations relating to the expenditure of public funds."

So sweeping a grant of power is not in keeping with our traditions; one might even call it "un-American." The fact that it was enacted for the sole and express purpose of defending American traditions in the cold war does not alter the fact, as Thomas Jefferson noted in 1819, that "whatever power in any government is independent, is absolute also."

What matters about the recent disclosures concerning the C.I.A., and its relations with private organizations such as the National Student Association, is not the individuals involved or allegations about their "guilt" or "innocence," but the ideas and values involved and the standing of those ideas and values in present-day America.

The fair evaluation of any human act requires that due account be taken of the time and circumstances in which the act took place. I believe that if I had been a student leader in the late nineteen forties or early fifties, and if an apparently important Government official had approached me confidentially and told me that I had a unique opportunity to perform a patriotic duty by accepting funds from a secret Government source in order to have something done that I thought needed to be done anyway, I would have found it difficult indeed to turn such a proposal down.

I would have found it difficult because in those early days of the cold war, when Russia was still ruled by Stalin, Communism seemed clearly to be an extremely menacing aggressive force, one which used student meetings as one of many instruments in a centrally directed design for conquest. I would also have found it difficult to turn the proposal down because of my confidence in the democratic purposes of my Government and, in addition, being inexperienced, I would hardly have felt qualified to challenge the view of

an apparently important Government representative on a matter of national security. Only from the perspective of the mid-sixties, when Communism is no longer a centrally directed international conspiracy, and when, for good reason, we have learned to be skeptical about some of the things our Government says and does, does it seem clear that the leaders of the National Student Association would have been well-advised to refuse any association with the C.I.A.

It is more difficult to understand why succeeding leaders of the N.S.A. maintained the secret association through the fifties and into the sixties, and it is more difficult still to understand why labor unions, leading universities and supposedly philanthropic, tax-exempt foundations undertook extensive, secret functions on behalf of the C.I.A. Clearly, all of the private individuals and Government officials involved knew—or should have known—that what they were doing was inconsistent with democratic principles of free inquiry and representative government. The most plausible explanation is that those who infringed on these principles did so in the conviction that they were discharging a higher patriotic duty, that, in making *exceptions* to democratic procedure, they were helping to defend democracy.

This viewpoint is not without merit. There are times when it is necessary to violate principle for the sake of principle; it is done upon occasion in the Senate, by honest and principled men. The danger, of course, is that expediency, like alcohol and tobacco, easily becomes a habit.

That, I believe, is what happened in the case of the C.I.A. and its clandestine associates: Exceptional behavior became conventional behavior. The clear evidence of that transition's having been made is the apparent equanimity with which most Americans have accepted the recent disclosures. I have talked to a number of people in recent weeks who have said that they favor what the C.I.A. and its private affiliates have been doing, that these organizations, after all, have been fighting against Communism and that, therefore, they regret only that it has all been spoiled by public disclosure.

Conflict is a great leveler. The longer it goes on, the more undiscriminating people become in their choice of weapons; the more they find it necessary to set aside principle for the sake of principle; the more, therefore, antagonists come to resemble each other. It is for this reason that "fighting fire with fire" is not only bad morals but bad policy as well: It tends to undermine the very purpose for which it was undertaken. It has not yet, thank God, made us a police state, but it has brought us closer to it and, what is even more alarming, to greater public acceptance of certain practices associated with a police state—secret policy making, unchecked executive power, subversion of foreign Governments, bugging and spying and wiretapping against our own people—than we have ever been in our history. All this, let it be stated again, is being done for the express purpose of defending ourselves against an enemy who is our enemy precisely because he engages in all of these practices.

The problem could be easily resolved, at least in principle, if we could simply lay down a rule that the end never justifies the means, that our policy must always be open and honest and made in accordance with constitutional procedure. The trouble is that that is probably not possible; there are times of supreme emergency, involving matters which are literally matters of life and death—for example, the missile crisis of 1962—when the President must act decisively, immediately and secretly. We are compelled, therefore, to lay down a qualified rule, a rule to the effect that the end almost never justifies the means, that our policy must almost always be open and honest and made in accordance with constitutional procedures.

Such a rule leaves room for human judgment and, with it, for human error. That is unfortunate but it need not be fatal. The American constitutional system has never functioned automatically; it has always depended for its successful functioning on a degree of voluntary restraint on the part of each of the three branches of the Government in the exercise of their respective powers.

The principal significance of the C.I.A. disclosures is the indication of a lack of restraint on the part of the executive in the conduct of foreign relations and the passive acceptance of unchecked executive power by the Congress and a large portion, probably a majority, of the public. If we are to restore that restraint in the exercise of power without which our constitutional system cannot function, we must begin by a candid recognition of the extent to which we have resorted to expediency in our rivalry with the Communist countries.

The association between the C.I.A. and the National Student Association was a clear case of cold-war expediency. It was obvious by the late nineteen-forties that the Russians were using international student meetings and youth festivals as occasions for cold-war propaganda and for efforts to influence the uncommitted. It was obviously desirable, and it remains desirable, for American students to participate in such meetings in order to make a case for—but even more important, to set an example of—freedom of thought and expression.

But while American participation in international student meetings is desirable, it is not essential. I may be missing something somewhere but I have the very strong feeling that international youth congresses and festivals are not nearly as important as the N.S.A. and its C.I.A. benefactor have thought. Since it has always been unlikely that either Russian Communists or American democrats could convert the other, presumably the importance of these meetings has been the opportunity which they offered to sway the minds of the uncommitted. It seems to me that the minds of the uncommitted would have had to be fairly feeble to be permanently won over to one ideology or the other by flattery, oratory and hoopla in the course of a youth congress.

The thought presents itself that the people the young Soviet and American activists were flattering were themselves. I have the further strong feeling that the kind of student exchange that has real significance, the kind that deeply and permanently influences the minds of the young, is the kind that brings students to a foreign country for a year or more of study, the kind that takes place in classrooms and libraries and international living centers, the kind that very seldom makes the news.

Even if it be granted, however, that there is real value in the participation of young Americans in international student meetings, by no stretch of the imagination can these be regarded as the kind of life-and-death matter which might, on rare occasion, justify the circumvention of democratic procedure. And yet that is exactly what the C.I.A., with the full approval of its political superiors, did. By secretly financing the international operations of the N.S.A., it usurped the constitutional authority of the Congress to authorize and appropriate public funds—the spirit, that is, if not exactly the letter of that constitutional authority, in light of the extraordinary financial powers given to the C.I.A. by the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949.

The C.I.A. affair is only the most recent manifestation in a long-term trend toward executive predominance in foreign policy. The source of this trend is crisis. In the past 25 years American foreign policy has encountered a shattering series of crises and inevitably, or almost inevitably, the effort to cope with these has been executive effort, while the Congress, inspired by patriotism, importuned by Presidents and deterred by lack of information, has tended to fall in line behind the executive. The result has been an unhinging of traditional constitutional relationships; the Senate's constitutional powers of advice and consent have atrophied into what is widely regarded as, though never asserted to be, a duty to give prompt consent with a minimum of advice.

It is worth recalling a few of the landmarks along the road to virtually unchecked executive predominance in foreign policy:

In 1940, President Roosevelt made his destroyer deal with Great Britain by executive agreement even though it was a commitment of great consequence and a clear violation of the international law of neutrality, so much so that Sir Winston Churchill later wrote that it had given Germany the legal right to declare war on the United States. It was, however, an emergency and Congress did not protest.

In 1950, President Truman committed the United States to war in Korea without the authority of Congress. The war was said to be a United Nations police action and therefore not a war in the traditional sense. In addition, it was contended that, because the police action was limited, a declaration of war would be awkward, possibly leading to the expansion of the conflict, and finally, it was contended that the President had the power to take the country into war under his authority as Commander in Chief and under the inherent authority of the Presidency. Finding these arguments persuasive, the Congress did not protest until the war settled into a stalemate and the opposition party saw the opportunity to make an election issue of it.

In recent years, Congress has exercised no more than a ceremonial role in decisions to commit American armed forces overseas. This role has consisted in the adoption of sweeping resolutions, perfunctorily debated and hastily enacted under conditions of extreme urgency, under circumstances in which any extended debate or deliberation would have been considered a sign of domestic dissension in the face of a foreign enemy and, therefore, unpatriotic. The resolutions concerning Taiwan, the Middle East and the Gulf of Tonkin were submitted to the Congress for the purpose of avoiding internal controversy of the kind President Truman encountered over the Korean war—that is to say, for the executive's convenience and not because any of the Presidents concerned regarded himself as lacking the authority to commit American forces abroad. In adopting each of these resolutions, Congress abdicated its constitutional authority over the decision to declare war.

It is argued by certain political scientists that the authority of Congress to declare war has become obsolete in the nuclear age and has passed into the hands of the executive. But this should not alarm us unduly, they say, because the check and balance formerly provided by the Congress are now provided by diversities within the executive branch.

"This," in the words of the distinguished historian Ruhl J. Bartlett, "is an argument scarcely worthy of small boys, for the issue is not one of advice or influence. It is question of power, the authority to say that something shall or shall not be done. If the President is restrained only by those whom he appoints and who hold their positions at his pleasure, there is no check at all. What has happened to all intents and purposes, although not in form and words, is the assumption by all recent Presidents that their constitutional right to conduct foreign relations and to advise the Congress with respect to foreign policy shall be interpreted as the right to control foreign relations."

How can the constitutional imbalance be redressed? I strongly believe that the Congress should undertake to revive and strengthen the deliberative function which

it has permitted to atrophy in the course of 25 years of crisis. Acting on the premise that dissent is not disloyalty, that a true consensus is shaped by airing differences rather than by suppressing them, the Senate should again become, as it used to be, an institution in which the great issues of American politics are contested with thoroughness, energy and candor. Nor should the Senate allow itself to be too easily swayed by executive pleas for urgency and unanimity, or by allegations of "aid and comfort" to the enemies of the United States made by officials whose concern with such matters may have something to do with a distaste for criticism directed at themselves.

It is sometimes useful and occasionally necessary for Congress to express prompt and emphatic support for the President on some matter of foreign relations. It seems to me, however, that we have gone too far in this respect, to the point of confusing Presidential convenience with the national interest. It is perfectly natural for the President, pressed as he is to make decisions and take action in foreign relations, to overemphasize the desirability of promptness and unanimity. But the Senate has its own responsibilities, and however strongly feelings of patriotism may incline it to comply with the President's wishes, a higher patriotism requires it to fulfill its constitutional obligation.

As part of a broader effort to redress the constitutional imbalance in foreign policy the C.I.A. should be brought under effective Congressional oversight. The technical means by which this is accomplished is not of critical importance. What is wanted is the will and determination of Congress to place checks on the power of the intelligence establishment and to make it truly accountable.

The dilemma posed by the C.I.A. is that, while we cannot do without secret intelligence activities in a world of armed powers, these activities can never wholly be reconciled with the values of our free society. Under the pressures of the cold war we have gone far indeed toward permitting the intelligence agency, and the executive in general, to exercise unrestrained powers over our foreign relations and, to an alarming degree, over important areas of our domestic life as well. So far has this trend advanced that the values of our society are now endangered by the means invented for their defense. That is the core of our dilemma: As long as we adhere to these values—and particularly to the Kantian imperative that a man must always be treated as an end and not as a means—we cannot give ourselves over to the fighting of "fire with fire" without jeopardizing the very values we are resolved to defend.

Whatever we do to try to resolve this dilemma, whatever we do to defend our national values, we ought never to forget that the foremost safeguard of these values is the American Constitution. It can be changed, when it is found wanting, by the means designated in the Constitution itself. But, in the words of Washington's great address: "Let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

WATER AND AIR POLLUTION MUST BE ABATED WITHOUT DELAY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, one of the most pressing domestic problems confronting Americans is pollution of the air and pollution of our lakes and rivers.

The distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], former Governor of Wisconsin, has offered most meritorious and greatly needed legislative proposals to conquer pollution of water and air. His proposals include giving industry in all our States tax benefits to spur efforts of management to end air pollution by factory smoke and water pollution by industrial wastes.

Scientists have estimated that air pollution alone resulted in nearly $12 billion damage last year and will cause that much or even greater damage this year. Air pollution blights pine trees, kills orchards, is ruinous to grapevines, corrodes metals, weakens fabrics, discolors paints, etches glass, cracks rubber, and spreads its filth over everything. The injury to health and the shortening of lives of millions of Americans cannot be calculated. We have observed snow blackened by soot and housewives' wash on the line stained with filth from factories.

Instead of wasting $40 billion as our warlike generals are urging by surrounding 50 American cities with antimissile missiles it would be far better to spend $12 billion to end air and water pollution.

Ohioans surely recognize the importance of overcoming water and air pollution, perhaps even more than residents of other States. Nowhere is the tragedy of pollution and destruction more evident than in Lake Erie, a 250 mile-long and 60 mile-wide sea which is sick and dying. Within a few years, Lake Erie, already one of the world's largest cesspools, will be unable to support almost any form of marine life. Man has taken a sparkling blue lake extending from Michigan to New York State and northerly to the Canadian shore, and turned it into a primeval swamp.

In the 2,600-square-mile heart of the lake, all the oxygen is gone, all the fish and other desirable aquatic life are dead; and the only survivors are bloodworms, sludgeworms, and bloodsuckers.

If the tragedy of Lake Erie is repeated in the other Great Lakes—as it well may be—the great industrial cities of America would be the victims of the greatest natural resource disaster in modern times.

Every day the problem intensifies as relentless flows of industrial waste, inadequately treated sewage, and other obnoxious contaminants pour into the world's largest fresh water source. The economic well-being of more than 25 million people living in the eight States bordering the Great Lakes is seriously threatened.

No longer may fishing enthusiasts enjoy productive excursions to many favorite lake areas, for polluted waters have caused many species of fish to die and disappear altogether from the lake. Today only one high-quality fish, the perch, is abundant and the total number of perch has been decreasing in recent years.

The commercial fishing industry on Lake Erie has been greatly curtailed by excessive contamination. During recent years five species of fish have been eliminated from the lake. During the past decade the total catch from the U.S. waters of Lake Erie has declined 45 percent. The loss in terms of dollar return is staggering.

More than 2,600 square miles of Lake Erie's center is already dead and unable to support desirable forms of animal life. Obnoxious plant growth which cannot be seen without the aid of a microscope in healthy waters abound throughout the lake in 50-foot lengths clogging municipal water intake valves and discoloring the precious drinking water of thousands of Ohio citizens. Much of it finds its way ashore to rot on the beaches.

Mr. President, much more must be done to prevent the destruction of our great inland water system. The Federal Government must help the States clean up polluted rivers and lakes by providing the money necessary for the construction of adequate sewage treatment plants. More money is needed for research to discover ways of controlling the discharge of pollutants into our rivers and lakes and to find ways of reclaiming pollution-burdened waters. Industry discharges twice the amount of waste into our water as do all of our cities combined. Industrialists must be encouraged or directed to construct abatement facilities. Also, we must be firm in the enforcement of established water quality standards.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] deserves the utmost praise for proposing stiffer laws and this investment for a cleaner America and healthier Americans. It is unconscionable to continue to allow our air and our water to be contaminated and polluted beyond redemption. Now is the time for concerted, coordinated efforts to overcome once and for all these enormous problems.

THE VAGUE "UNCONSTITUTIONAL" CHARGES AGAINST HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS MUST BE REFUTED—LVIII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise today to continue my daily efforts to win Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

Three of these conventions have been in the Committee on Foreign Relations for 4 years, and the Convention on Genocide has been there for 18 years.

I address myself again today to refuting the vague charges of "unconstitutional" which have been raised in some quarters against these conventions. Nothing more is mentioned, simply the nebulous and nefarious charge "unconstitutional."

There has been no testimony presented before the Foreign Relations Subcommittee responsible for three of these conventions questioning their constitutionality.

There has been no substantive case presented citing areas of conflict between these conventions and our Constitution.

The only general charge against these conventions which I have been able to uncover is the word "incitement" in the Genocide Convention. There seems to be a challenge that direct and public incitement to commit genocide is a suppression of our constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech. The term "incitement" has a well-defined meaning in

American legal history. Incitement to mutiny, incitement to riot are clearly understood, so why should incitement to commit genocide present an insurmountable problem? No answer has been forthcoming.

I agree that there are certain topics and issues which are, by nature, domestic and consequently not proper subject for treaties. However, human rights are not simply a domestic problem. Human rights and world peace are manifestly interdependent.

If human rights were solely a domestic matter, then why have 70 countries demonstrated their concern by ratifying the Convention on Genocide including virtually every major country in the world, and, indeed, all but three of the 51 countries that chartered the United Nations?

There is another argument that runs along these lines: these conventions are not traditional subject matter for treaties. There is no reference to "traditional" in the Constitution. Our understanding of "traditional" must be necessarily flexible. Otherwise, how could the Senate be about to consider shortly a treaty on outer space?

A more appropriate understanding of the proper subject matter for treaties would be those subjects which are of international concern.

I believe human rights clearly fall under that definition. I believe further that the Senate should ratify the Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery without further delay. Ratification is consistent with our Constitution and demanded by our national tradition.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, what I intend to say does have reference to the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I think it would be well if the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] were notified. It would not be necessary to notify the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] because I have discussed the matter at length with him and I have explained what I am going to say here. On that basis I would feel that his presence would not be necessary, although it may be that the other two Senators might feel they should be notified when I discuss this subject. Before I proceed with the matter I am going to put another matter or two in the RECORD in order that these Senators may be present when I speak on the subject, if they care to do so.

THIS SIDE OF TREASON

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a very thoughtful editorial appeared in the Shreveport Times of April 12, 1967, entitled "This Side of Treason." The editorial was extremely critical of Martin Luther King, Stokely Carmichael, Floyd McKissick, and those other so-called Negro leaders who have taken a position which makes it very difficult for this Nation to stand its ground before the world and fight the battle against Communist tyranny.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THIS SIDE OF TREASON

As perhaps the top leader of the civil rights movement in this country, Martin Luther King long ago was given a status of virtual sainthood by the "liberal establishment." National network news broadcasters have held him literally above reproach and so have vote-conscious national office-holders.

But this situation may be changing. The immaculately liberal New York Times, for example, recently found that King was mortal after all and had made, said this newspaper, "an error." This is not exactly a ringing accusation, but in left-wing circles any criticism of King is the equivalent of a Marine finding fault with the American flag. Other "liberals" have voiced similar criticism.

What did King do to merit a word of criticism from the very temple of liberalism? What he did was make a speech that placed him at the far, far left end of that element which opposes the Vietnam war to a point just this side of treason.

In this speech, one that had all the sick, sick phraseology of the fever Left, King likened U.S. military efforts to those of Hitlerite Germany testing "new medicine and new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe"; damned America as "the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today"; and in the whole course of his remarks found not one word of criticism for the aggressor regime in Hanoi. It was a speech that no Hanoi script-writer could have surpassed.

In the past, those who worried about radicalism in the civil rights movement have been told, time and again, that they were lucky to have a "moderate" like Martin Luther King in the forefront of this drive. King's claim to "reason" and moderation was extremely doubtful then—his "non-violence" too often became violent—but now the head of the Christian Leadership Conference, the largest rights movement, is marching with the Carmichaels and the McKissicks, all in lockstep with those shadowy elements battling any and all resistance to Communist aggression.

King, of course, bases his opposition to the war on the theory that it is depriving the Negro of his welfarist due; that it is taking away financial resources that would otherwise be spent on his advancement in various programs. The American people won't buy this excuse; in fact, welfarism is growing in spite of the war effort.

What Dr. King may well have done, with this savagely anti-American speech, is set in motion his own ultimate decline. For the American people eventually reject extremism in all its forms, right or left, and cleave to courses somewhere around the middle.

But there is something much more important to consider here than the fate of Martin Luther King; this is the effect his anti-war stand will have on the mood of Hanoi. Since King represents the nation's largest civil rights group—indeed he has been held up as the leader, or idol, of the whole movement—the Communists are more likely than not to take his violently anti-war view as that of the whole Negro population of the U.S.

This, of course, would be a mistaken assumption on the part of Hanoi. But it is on such false assumption that Hanoi has built its resolve to maintain aggression. Statements such as the one delivered by Martin Luther King have convinced the leadership of North Vietnam that most Americans either oppose the war or want it ended at any price; that in time the American people will force their government to abandon a winning struggle. These myths, it is believed by most objective experts, sustain Hanoi in war.

So it is that Martin Luther King and others like him are perhaps responsible for something far more tragic than the radicalization of the civil rights movement.

THE DESEGREGATION ORDER

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Shreveport Times of April 7, 1967, published a very well-considered editorial expressing the point of view which I believe to be the prevailing point of view of at least 70 percent, and perhaps 90 percent or 100 percent, of the people in the northwest Louisiana area with regard to the desegregation order of the Circuit Court of Appeals

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE DESEGREGATION ORDER

The federal Circuit Court of Appeals Order that public schools must be completely desegregated in every phase of their employment and their activities—whether involving classroom instruction or extra-curricular functions—by the time school opens next fall is preposterous.

It stems, of course, from the original 1954 decision and 1955 Rule of the United States Supreme Court holding compulsory segregation unconstitutional. *The Times* steadfastly has held that the original Supreme Court decision was itself unconstitutional and, thus, that all subsequent federal court rulings under it are unconstitutional.

However, District Judge Ben C. Dawkins Jr. had no other course to follow but to issue his Order putting the Circuit Court's Order into effect.

The Caddo Parish School Board and its administrative staff have no course to follow except adhering to the Order to the maximum of their ability to do so. Parents of children entering school next fall have no alternative, either, as of now.

Of course, the Circuit Court's ruling is being appealed to the United States Supreme Court. No one can forecast with certainty what that Court will do about anything, except that it nearly always upholds any lower court ruling hastening and increasing desegregation of public schools.

The Supreme Court could refuse to hear the appeal, thus letting the Circuit Courts ruling stand as issued. Or, it could hear the appeal and uphold the Order in full or in part, or knock it down. The latter certainly is not likely. It may be, however, that the Court will want to hear the case and then will specifically make the Circuit Court's ruling final and applicable to all schools and school districts anywhere in the nation where desegregation is involved.

It is not likely that the Court will delay very long on whatever action it decides to take—it rarely does where desegregation is an issue.

Thus, the only course that school boards and parents involved can plan, as of now, is full compliance with the Court Order.

For the School Board, the task of carrying

out the letter of the Order by next fall may become an absolute impossibility. For example, in Caddo parish, Negroes have so many fine and new and magnificent schools for their children that these parents have shown a definite and direct inclination to keep their children in the fine new schools rather than integrate into old schools not so well equipped for either classroom instruction or extra-curricular activities.

Further, when it comes to desegregation of faculties, it is possible that the School Board literally may be unable to find white teachers willing to teach in certain integrated schools that are predominately Negro.

The federal Court of appeals Order demands integration not only of every grade—including kindergarten—but among all employees from janitors to principals in the entire school system.

There is just one thing for both white and Negro leadership and white and Negro citizenry to remember—as we pointed out in connection with the equally preposterous decision of Attorney General Ramsey Clarke to send federal registrars here, while admitting there was no discrimination in voting registration in Caddo; the "law", which in this case means federal court Orders, must be obeyed to the best of our ability, no matter how much we may dislike it.

VOTE IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Vote in Vietnam," which appeared in the Shreveport Times of April 8, 1967.

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

VOTE IN VIETNAM

In spite of Communist terror and kidnappings, the South Vietnamese people went defiantly to the polls, voting in heavy numbers to fill local offices. A drop of rain, or less, often is sufficient to keep Americans away from the ballotbox. In Vietnam, the exercise of democracy requires raw courage.

More such elections are scheduled in the near future. South Vietnam will vote for a president, vice-president, and the upper house of the national Legislature on September 1. The lower house of the Legislature will be elected on Oct. 1.

Provisions for all these elective offices were made in the new South Vietnamese Constitution, which was promulgated only recently. Authored by a 117-member Constituent Assembly, which was elected in nation-wide voting last September, the Constitution calls for what is a more or less presidential form of government, balanced off with a strong, two-house legislature and an independent judiciary.

Contrary to all those gloomy predictions, South Vietnam now has a constitution, freely-elected local officials, and the prospect of a representative government modeled on the American system. Within the past year, the country has experienced the first two free elections in its history.

But the really incredible aspect of these gains is that they have come in the middle of a violent guerrilla war in which Communist forces have opposed every move, no matter how small, with all the considerable terror at their command.

American cynics have declared all along that it could not be done; that the Constituent Assembly could never agree on a constitution and, even if it did, the military government would veto it. Well, the assembly did come up with the document and the government has promulgated it and scheduled elections under its provisions.

There is a long way to go yet, but much has been accomplished in South Vietnam—politically as well as militarily.

A PERSONAL STATEMENT OF SENATOR LONG OF LOUISIANA

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I would like to address myself to a point of personal privilege involving the kind of thing that occurs when people fail to understand one another, which sometimes leads people to think that someone is taking advantage of them. So far as I am concerned, my view has always been that on any vote, I would be willing to pair any absent Senator, if it is within my power to provide a pair, giving it myself, or finding someone, to make it possible to record the vote of one who is necessarily absent, provided the other side would be willing to do the same thing. But, I am not willing to fight by the Marquis of Queensberry rules while the other side is fighting by the London prize ring rules. I believe that advocates of the sport of boxing recall the difference between the two. Under the London prize ring rules, men fought with their bare fists. Under the Marquis of Queensberry rules, they fight with gloves.

A man can be hurt a lot more and cut far worse from bare fists than from gloves. It is hard on the man using bare fists, but it is harder on the man receiving the blows.

Furthermore, under the Marquis of Queensberry rules, one hits the man above the belt—it is a foul to hit below the belt—but under the London prize ring rules, as I understand them, there is practically no such thing as a foul, and a man could be hit anywhere.

Well, Mr. President, I am willing to play by either set of rules, but I want to be sure that we are both playing by the same set. On that basis, I would be willing to abide by them.

Mr. President, the Senate has been voting on amendments to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. On one occasion, I lost by about six votes and on another occasion I won by about four votes. As a practical matter, my count on both occasions showed that if every Senator had been in his seat, I would have prevailed by a vote of 50 to 50, with the Vice President breaking the tie in my favor.

On the first occasion, we entered into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote. On that occasion, I gained the impression that those on the other side of the aisle knew where the Democratic absentees were. I did not know where the Republican absentees were. We got only one pair from our absentees. My impression is that the Republicans had practically all their absentees paired. I would have merely to debate a motion to reconsider for a few moments, but a number of Republican Senators had commitments which required them to leave town. The absentee situation would have been about even. I would have won by simply delaying for another 15 minutes voting on a motion to reconsider.

On the second vote, it was my turn to win on absentees. I had been working hard to get absentees into town. This time, I think I did a better job than the other fellow to get my absentees here. But, once again, I did not know who their absentees were; but they apparently had some idea who mine were.

I am willing, on any rollcall vote, any time the other fellow is willing to tell me in advance that he will pair my absentees if I will pair his, to let every Senator be recorded as present and voting; but I am not going to play by rules where the other fellow gets five votes on me by absentees when he knows where my absentees are, but I do not know where his are.

Therefore, I am willing to play by any set of rules that they suggest.

Let me refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1967, beginning on page 10303, in which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] asked unanimous consent that the Senate vote at 3 o'clock.

Mr. President, I had been doing my best to get Democrats back from all parts of the world, to get the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] back from Ireland; to get the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] back from the Bahamas where he was enjoying a much needed rest for his health; to get the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] back from Wyoming; and to find various other Senators and get them into the Chamber.

In particular, I wanted to get the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] back to Washington from New York, where he was making a speech in favor of more investments in his State of Mississippi, which was a very fine service the Senator was rendering.

In my judgment, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] could not possibly get here before 10 minutes after 4 o'clock of that day, when it was suggested by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that we vote at 3:30 o'clock.

Let me say that on the previous day I had agreed to the yeas and nays, when a unanimous-consent agreement was entered at that time from the other side, and I was told that they were no longer interested in a unanimous-consent agreement, that they had other Senators to clear it with. I said that I had no objection. I said that was all right with me. But as a practical matter, that left me in the position where I had made a standing offer of a unanimous-consent agreement, otherwise I would not have agreed to it. I was not in a position to tell Democratic Senators to return to town, knowing for some time that there would be a vote the following day, and when it would be. I did not oppose it. I have no complaint about that. They were within their rights. So it was suggested that we vote at 3:30 o'clock. I made it clear that 4 o'clock would be an ideal time for the vote, that I had a particular Senator in mind—the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]—and that, therefore, if we began the vote at 4 o'clock it would run until about 4:15 or 4:20, and he would be here. But I suggested that if the opposition had people who had to leave town, we could start the rollcall at 3:30 o'clock and if we took our time about it those who had to catch airplanes could be on them and be gone.

We would try to hold that rollcall long enough so that those who were returning here could get their votes recorded. I would try to accommodate those who were here and who had to leave, if they would accommodate Sen-

ators on my side who were trying to get here. That was what, in effect, was said.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Louisiana may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Senators know that one way we try to hold a rollcall open while an absent Senator is trying to get to the Chamber is for Senators to stand up and ask the Chair if they have been recorded and, if so, how were their votes recorded, and so forth. When that happens, it is, of course within the rules for the Senator to stand up and demand the regular order and stop that kind of procedure, so that the vote will then be announced immediately.

On page 10303 of the RECORD of April 20, Mr. GORE of Tennessee stated as follows:

> Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no question about the rate at which the clerk will call the roll, but I would certainly want to reserve the right to call for the regular order after the rollcall has been completed.

So that one of the tactics available to me, to continue the rollcall, to continue making it a gentleman's agreement, had thereby been taken away from me by the Senator from Tennessee before agreement was ever entered into.

I said:

> I do not quarrel about that.

Keep in mind that I thought we still had that gentleman's agreement, that we would call the roll slowly.

In the next paragraph Mr. DIRKSEN states:

> I make the suggestions to the clerk that it be a deliberate rollcall. There is such a thing as stretching it out to five o'clock.

I had agreed to accommodate their Senators. At this point, the minority leader began to squeeze me for accommodating my Senators to get them in here to vote.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] said:

> No; no, we will not do that.

Meaning that we would not go until 5 o'clock.

I said:

> No; we will not go until 5 o'clock. It will not go that long. It might last as long as ten minutes after four.

Mr. DIRKSEN said:

> I trust not.

Then Mr. WILLIAMS said:

> No, no, we will not do that.

Thus, Mr. President, having explained what my problem was and offering to enter a unanimous-consent agreement, thinking that we had a gentleman's understanding, the gentleman's agreement was taken away from me, as will be noted by reading the bottom page on 10303.

To continue, Mr. MANSFIELD said:

> No; that is on the final result.

I said:

> I thought we had an understanding to make it possible for those who are making every effort to be here in time to have an opportunity to vote.
>
> We are talking about a slow rollcall, and that would be all right with me. I think we understand each other. I hope that we do.
>
> Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us say, with all deliberate speed.
>
> Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; we will move ahead with all deliberate speed.

I talked to the Vice President. He said, "Why don't you suggest the absence of a quorum?"

I discussed it with the Parliamentarian. He told me I clearly had the right, when I had 1 minute remaining, to suggest the absence of a quorum. That is what I did.

While I was discussing the merits of what we were going to vote on; with the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Delaware, without my hearing it—I do not say he played a trick on me—asked that the quorum call be called off.

The Vice President said, "Without objection, it is so ordered," and I had to make an effort to get the quorum call underway.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States says one can have a call for a quorum any time any Member of this body says there is not a quorum in this Chamber. There was no quorum. It took some time to ascertain that there was a quorum here. The Constitution of the United States gives any Senator that right. If I had wanted to be deceitful, I could have asked another Senator to insist on there being a quorum, without anyone being able to impugn my motives.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent to have 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So I asserted the right that every Senator has under the Constitution of the United States to insist that there be a quorum present. To suggest otherwise would lead to a situation where the Senate could agree to vote at a given hour, with only two Senators present, perhaps, or even one. So the Senate had no right to act. I insisted that there be a quorum.

The minority leader implied at that time that I had not kept faith. May I say I was doing what was my right under the rules. Let me say that the other side did not keep faith when they did what they were doing. They were hedging. When we are in a situation where, if every Senator votes, the result will be 50–50, a Senator is not in a position at that time to let them vote their way. He has to make sure that they vote his way, too.

Mr. President, I have made my proposition. I repeat it. I made the proposition that any time those on the other side want to lay all their weapons on the table, then we will go by the same rule book. We will pair every absentee if they give me notice. I will do the same way. But it has to be reciprocal. It has to be fair. Both sides have to agree not to take advantage of the other man and that we will play by the same rule book. When we do that, there will be no trouble.

I have seen misunderstandings between Senators. May I say there is no Senator with whom I have had difficulty on this side. I regret I had difficulty with one on the other side. But I would be willing, now, or at any time in the future, to pick any reasonable man on either side to arbitrate the differences between me and another Senator, to arbitrate whether he had taken advantage over me or I over him. I would not take unfair advantage of anyone. So I would hope no one would take unfair advantage of me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, under the rules any Member of the Senate has a right to ask for a quorum call after all time has expired. However, under the manner in which we have operated, heretofore, under unanimous-consent agreements, either the time is used or yielded back before the quorum call. I am not now questioning the ruling of the Chair as rendered last Thursday. The Vice President made the ruling. It stands. I am not challenging it, but I point out what the situation is under this new ruling. We often give consent to vote after 10 minutes to each side. Under this new procedure I could take my 10 minutes, use 9½ minutes, suggest the absence of a quorum, and thereby use the other Senator's 10 minutes.

If we are to operate under that procedure we are going to destroy the possibility of any future unanimous-consent agreement arrangements; it does have its advantages. I am not quarreling with it; in fact, I may like this new ruling. I pointed out that at that time we had 3 minutes left that we wanted to use. The quorum call should have been withheld until all time had been used or yielded back. At that time it would have been in order to have a quorum call. The Senator from Louisiana should know the rules of the game.

But last Thursday the Vice President rendered a different interpretation of the old ruling, and his new ruling stands until reversed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been involved in conversation with the Parliamentarian on the point of the Senator from Delaware. If the Senator from Louisiana wants to speak on the point, he may proceed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this RECORD will show that after a quorum was demanded, I myself asked, as shown on page 10309, that 3 minutes be accorded to those in opposition to my amendment. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said, "I surrender the time."

There was no effort to deny any Senator his rights. I did not want to be denied my rights. I was denied mine. But I do not want to be accused of being in bad faith, when I am trying to explain my problem, thinking that we have a gentleman's agreement. Next thing, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] suggests that we not have a very slow call. Then I suggested how much time it should take. Having said that, in the same column, on page 10303 of the RECORD, the Senator from Delaware [Mr.

WILLIAMS] said, "No, no, we will not do that."

I did the best I could to protect myself under the rules. The Senator is not complaining about their right to protect their rights. I had a right to suggest the absence of a quorum under the rules. I do not want to deny anybody his rights, but I do not want to be denied my rights, either, and I want to play by the same rule book that they are using.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, all time on the amendment had not been used or yielded back. Furthermore, the suggestion was that the rollcall run to 5 o'clock. I never heard of an hour and a half rollcall. It was suggested we should let it run until 15 minutes after 4. Again I repeat that I am not quarreling about the new ruling of the Chair. It has its advantages and will work the same way for both sides. Under this new ruling regarding quorum calls when there is a unanimous consent, one side can use up his time and then call for a quorum and use up the other side's time, and put that side at a disadvantage. But we are all on an equal footing.

Frankly, I may even like the ruling of the Chair. In any event, the Chair has made the ruling. It works equally and with equal fairness to both sides. Let us keep it as a part of the rules of the Senate. But I point out it is a different method from that under which we have operated before, and that should be understood.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wanted a 4 o'clock vote, the opposition wanted a 3 o'clock vote. I said I would be willing to settle for 3:30, provided the rollcall ran past 4 o'clock. I stated 10 minutes after 4 as the time at which I would be willing to have the Chair announce the result of that vote. It is right there in the RECORD. When I stated that, I was not asking for a vote at 5 o'clock. I was asking for a rollcall lasting 40 minutes, so those Republicans who wanted to leave could be away by 3:30, and so I could have a Senator who was in New York City, looking after the interests of his State, back here in time. I could not get him back in time, but I got him a pair. He was a very distinguished Senator. He was doing good work for his State.

I do not want to be accused of being in bad faith when I am trying to protect my rights. They want to be protected in their rights, and I want to be protected in my rights, but they should not play by a different rule book. If the other fellow wants to hedge on me, I will want to be able to hedge on him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I merely wish to emphasize that no one has questioned the motives of the Senator from Louisiana or suggested that he acted in bad faith. I know of no one who has made such a suggestion. I observe, like Shakespeare's queen, that the Senator "doth protest too much, methinks."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator was saying I had broken faith. I had not. I did what I thought I had to do under the circumstances, but I do not think I took any greater advantage of the other fellow than he took of me. That is all I have in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

MAYOR NICOSIA FIGHTS AIR POLLUTION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as the American public is alerted to the dangers of pollution, which threatens to destroy the quality of our environment, individual citizens and industrial corporations have begun to display encouraging signs of concern for the air we breathe and the water we drink. American technological know-how and inventiveness are now being directed toward a solution of these problems. The public interest demands effective pollution control programs—Federal, State, and local.

One such dramatic effort by local officials is now being made in East Chicago, Ind., under the leadership of a unique public servant—Mayor John Nicosia, M.D. The role of vigilant guardian of the public health is not a new role for Dr. Nicosia, who had a distinguished medical career before turning to public service.

Recently an article entitled "MD-Mayor Fights Air Pollution," published in the American Medical Association News, described the effective work which this Indiana mayor is doing to help to reduce air pollution in his area. I ask unanimous consent that this brief but interesting story be printed in the RECORD.

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

M.D.-MAYOR FIGHTS AIR POLLUTION

The mayor of East Chicago, Ind., John B. Nicosia, MD, says the town's citizens thought he was joking when he said he was going to do something about air pollution.

During his first three years in office, Dr. Nicosia proved he was not joking. Today East Chicago is setting an example for the rest of the country.

Politics is a bit distant from the practice of medicine in the usual sense, but the mayor is also proving another responsibility of the medical profession in politics, and he believes the idea is beginning to spread.

Steel Center: East Chicago is the home of Inland Steel Co. and Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co., which operate a total of 48 open hearths. Faced with the growing air pollution problem, Dr. Nicosia negotiated agreements with each of the steel producers to eliminate the pollutants by 1973.

The pact with Youngstown calls for a completion date in 1971, and the Inland plant is to be converted by 1973, according to the 1965 agreement.

"We have been given indications they will be finished much sooner than that," Dr. Nicosia said. "They are changing over as soon as equipment is made available to them."

30 Years in Practice: The physician, who entered politics after 30 years of practice, stressed that this is by no means a problem confined to the Chicagoland area.

"One must understand this is a worldwide problem," he said. "We don't intend for them (industry) to do the job overnight. There is equipment to be built. But as long as they show they are doing their job, we feel like they are doing a good job."

However, it was not always so easy to see results, he said.

"They weren't too receptive to the idea in the beginning, but then we were able to resolve it," he said. The two steel companies are spending some $60 million in the conversion program.

Studies Under Way: Dr. Nicosia said East Chicago is now making studies on oils and chemicals to determine exactly what pollutants are found in the atmosphere, and working with other industries in pollution control.

The city of East Chicago is now in the process of revising its air pollution department, and Dr. Nicosia said this is going to comprise all areas of pollution in one program which is being duplicated in other nearby cities.

"We are working in close contact with Gary, and the city of Chicago," he said. "We now have 27 sampling stations around the area here which before we did not have."

The program now includes a laboratory with technical equipment, qualified operators, a sanitary engineer, and is operated with local and federal funds.

"They thought at the beginning when I said I was going to do something about it, I was kidding," Dr. Nicosia said. "I have never been more serious about anything in my life. If I do anything, I am going to conquer this thing.

"I cannot be buffaloed out of this thing because I happen to know just what the conditions are. I know just how detrimental the conditions are and it is not going to stop now because of politics."

How It Began: What got the mayor started in this drive?

"I had been eating this stuff for over 30 years," he said of the dirty air. "But unfortunately, I was in no position to do anything because of the political influences.

"When I decided to take the challenge, I felt with God willing, if I had an opportunity to win, I certainly was going to do something about it."

DEATH OF MALCOLM H. BRYAN, FORMER PRESIDENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF ATLANTA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Georgia was saddened last week by the passing of Malcolm H. Bryan, former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

Georgia has indeed lost one of its most outstanding citizens and most brilliant economists. He was my friend, and I join his many other friends, associates, and loved ones in mourning his death.

The April 20 edition of the Atlanta Constitution contains a very fine editorial tribute to Malcolm Bryan, written by Jack Tarver, president of the Atlanta newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tarver's column be printed in the RECORD.

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

HIS GENIUS WAS UNIQUE

"Unique."

That's the word William McChesney Martin Jr., chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, had for Malcolm Bryan, former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, who was buried here yesterday.

"Many men have made many contributions to the System over the years," Martin said at the time of Bryan's retirement a little over a year ago. "But Malcolm's role as a member of the Conference of Presidents and more particularly as a member of the Open

Market Committee was absolutely unique. There's just no other word for it."

Such praise from the taciturn Martin, a man little given to overstatement of anything—including the state of the economy—for most men would be tribute enough. But for Malcolm Bryan, I prefer also to recall a conversation with a brilliantly perceptive mutual acquaintance, Pedro Beltran, former head of the Central Bank and subsequent premier of Peru.

"You know my friend, Mac Bryan?" he asked when first we met. "Do the people of Atlanta and the South realize what a veritable economic genius you have living in your midst?

"They sent an economic mission from your country to help mine," he went on. "I had only to meet with them a couple of times to realize most of them were pedantic hacks. But Bryan . . . what a mind. He knew more by instinct than most of them by study. I would say to him, 'Why don't we do so-and-so?' and he would say 'No-o-o, wouldn't work.' I would ask 'why?' and he would say, 'I can't explain it now. I just know it wouldn't work. Let me sleep on it and I'll explain it in the morning.' Next morning, sure enough, he could tell you—A, B, C—why it wouldn't.

"Listen," Beltran explained. "You ever sail a boat? In sailing, there come certain situations of wind and current when there is not time to think or reason. The true sailor handles the boat instinctively. Malcolm is that way about economics."

It was a simile—and a compliment—I liked. When I repeated it to Malcolm, he grunted.

Bryan could take a compliment—or a critique—without a break in stride. I found out about the latter shortly after appointment to the board of HIS bank when, thinking to make a contribution in the one area for which experience had equipped me, I dared to venture a less than obsequious analysis of some of the bank's publications.

"That Farm Credit Bulletin, for instance," I ventured. "Some months I have the feeling the bank gets it out merely because the time has come around for it again."

"I don't mean to offend you, Mr. Tarver," came the prompt reply. "But as a subscriber, I am emboldened to say that many days I have exactly the same feeling about your newspapers."

Unique. Bill Martin had the right word for Malcolm Bryan.—JACK TARVER.

MARTINSBURG MONSTER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, my home State of West Virginia has gained some substantial benefits from the computer age. One computerized activity of much national value and a high degree of sensitivity is located within the State. It is discussed in an editorial entitled "National Publicity," published in the Martinsburg, W. Va., Journal of April 20, 1967, and it concerns the national computer center of the Internal Revenue Service, in Martinsburg, which annually receives publicity for its important part in our Federal income tax operations.

West Virginians are proud of the "Martinsburg Monster" and hope that its nickname is affixed in a comradely spirit.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL PUBLICITY

As the deadline for the annual payment of federal income taxes has come and gone, the city of Martinsburg this year has again received more than its share of publicity.

This is because of what is now nationally known as the "Martinsburg Monster", the Internal Revenue Service's national computer center located in our community.

An example of this publicity was a story Sunday in the New York Times which opened with the comment that "Martinsburg is just a small city in Berkeley County, W. Va., unless you happen to be a taxpayer. If you belong to this not-very-exclusive group of citizens, Martinsburg should take on a great deal of added importance at this time of year, for it is the home of the Internal Revenue Service's National Computing Center." The lengthy feature story, with picture, then goes on to mention Martinsburg several other times in telling how computers are now scanning everyone's tax returns and how, suddenly, people are starting to make more complete returns than heretofore.

Probably no other small governmental agency, only some 300 persons being employed, could have brought so much national publicity to our community.

Whether everybody will agree the publicity is particularly favorable, is a matter of personal opinion but we should all take some pride in the fact that this "small city" is at least helping to keep the American people honest because honesty has long been considered one of our national virtues.

Even those who might feel some slight dislike to having the term "monster" tacked onto our community's name can at least take some solace in the old adage that we don't care what they write about us as long as they spell our name correctly. Thus far we haven't seen it written "Martinsburgh," even though this was a common practice some 100 years ago even on some of our own maps.

Maybe the Chamber of Commerce could come up with some slogan such as, "Martinsburg, The City That Made America Honest."

FHA INSURANCE OF SEASONAL HOMES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, earlier this year I reintroduced a bill, S. 842, to authorize FHA insurance of seasonal or "summer" homes.

The Wall Street Journal of April 20, 1967, contains a brief article entitled "Summer Home Building May Help Spur Housing-Start Totals Nationally."

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which underscores the economic potential of this market, be printed in the RECORD. It is my hope that the Subcommittee on Housing, of which the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is the chairman, will consider my bill when he schedules consideration of other housing bills.

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

SUMMER HOME BUILDING MAY HELP SPUR HOUSING-START TOTALS NATIONALLY

Overall private housing starts in the first quarter were down 22% from last year, but some resort area builders were optimistic. "We should be up 30–40% from last year," says an official of Cedar Timber Buildings in Marengo, Ill. He says more people are occupying "summer" homes year-round because of better roads in his area. "A year ago we had no business; now we have 40 orders," says Virgil Kirby, sales manager of Anchor Homes, which builds homes in Northern California.

Other builders are more subdued. James Hobbs, president of the House of Cedar in Walworth, Wis., says his inquiries are double last year's but "people are waiting to see how interest rates move." Realtors in the Atlanta area likewise say they've noted a pick-up in summer home interest, "but savings and loans here are reluctant to finance second homes until money loosens up more," says one.

Summer new-home prices are running ahead of last year as material and labor costs climb. Rental prices rise, too. One Cape Cod realtor reports rental boost of about 10% in his area.

CRISIS IN THE MAILS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a recent article in U.S. News & World Report emphasized the coming "Crisis in the Mails." The article was followed by an interview with the Postmaster General, Lawrence F. O'Brien.

The article describing the current situation is a graphic description of what has happened, and what can happen in the near future. I have made no secret of my own belief that a monumental logjam will develop soon, unless steps are taken to improve the situation.

The interview with Mr. O'Brien goes into some detail on the Postmaster General's proposal to abolish his own job, although I have no doubt that Larry O'Brien's many talents will be used in some other high position if his present job is abolished.

Not all Senators agree with the Postmaster General's proposal. But it is a fresh and challenging idea in a Department which has been notably slow to adjust to reality. It certainly deserves the careful attention of all Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

CRISIS COMING IN THE MAILS: POSTAL SERVICE AT BREAKING POINT

The word "catastrophe" is being used by Lawrence F. O'Brien, Postmaster General, to describe what lies ahead for the mails unless drastic change occurs.

Postal service is pictured as being at the breaking point in a number of key cities right now. Let another pile-up occur, such as the one in Chicago in October, 1966, and the blow is expected to fall.

The Post Office is a 6-billion-dollar operation. Its employes total more than 700,000. Each day, 200 million pieces of mail go through the post offices, creating what has been called the biggest logistical problem in the world.

Mail volume is up to 80 billion pieces annually and is rising at the rate of 3 billion more pieces a year.

This whole vast system operates under rigid rules and restrictions laid down by Congress—subject to few independent decisions.

Management, surrounded by limitations upon its freedom of action and decision making, lacks both the authority and the executive personnel to handle the task imposed upon it.

Broaching a new plan. It is this situation that has led Postmaster General O'Brien to suggest that the Post Office Department be taken out of the Cabinet, established as a nonprofit Government corporation and operated as a business.

The idea is discussed in an interview with Mr. O'Brien on page 59. A subcommittee of the House will open exploratory hearings on May 23.

Sought in a corporate structure are flexibility, more and better management, a construction program financed by private capital, more research and development.

The alternative is thought by experts to be continued deterioration in a mail service that is vital not only to communication between people, but to large parts of private business.

William M. McMillan, Assistant Postmaster General in charge of operations, reports:

"We have 300 to 400 large post offices that are overloaded now. New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, St. Louis, Kansas City, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Washington, Cleveland and Brooklyn are among them.

"We have severe problems in Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, Indianapolis. Des Moines is a real problem. Memphis, Tenn., is extremely critical. It's a strategic point where we have woefully inadequate space.

"Los Angeles and San Francisco are subjected to extremely heavy north-south traffic. We're also watching Omaha and Oklahoma City carefully.

"Birmingham, Ala., is another danger spot. Down there, they're even using former rest rooms in the railroad station to handle mail."

On April 14, Mr. O'Brien told a Senate Appropriations subcommittee that 2,530 post offices were built before 1940. Over all, he said, the Post Office plant is "appallingly inadequate."

Finding good workers is said to be a chronic problem. At the end of 1965, when the Government was offering federal employees bonuses to retire, the Post Office lost 20,000 top supervisors.

On any day of the year, the Department is breaking in between 70,000 and 80,000 new employes. And when labor-saving devices are introduced, there is almost always trouble with the unions.

Financing is described as a perpetual headache. "We are always operating on the thin edge," said Frederick C. Belen, Deputy Postmaster General. "In 1961, we had to apportion our money so closely that if each post office had worked 16 seconds longer we would have been over our appropriation allowance."

Sword of Damocles. Hanging over the heads of postal officials is the daily threat of a breakdown.

"What happened in Chicago last year is a perfect example of what we can run into," said Mr. McMillan.

"There is no guarantee that we can't get hit the same way in any big post office in the country at any time. And if we get hit in two or three offices at the same time, we're in serious trouble.

"If Dallas and Atlanta went down together, for instance, the whole Eastern part of the country would be paralyzed. When mail is delayed at strategic points, you get a tremendous chain reaction."

Chicago is not the only place where the Post Office has had trouble.

Postal clerks got a scare in San Francisco during the Christmas rush of 1965, when outward-bound military mail began to pile up at an alarming rate. There was no real tie-up, but it called for emergency measures. The local postmaster had to scour the town for manpower to move the mail.

Dallas and Fort Worth got caught in a jam in 1963. Believing the holiday rush to be over, these post offices had laid off most of their temporary help just before Christmas.

But the mail that poured in the week after Christmas turned out to be heavier than that of the week before. Hundreds of temporary employes had to be recalled to cope with the emergency.

New York City, where the daily mail volume equals that of all of Great Britain, is said to be a continual problem.

"It's the unforeseen that creates a mail crisis," Mr. McMillan said, "like the time when two things happened at once in New York—a printers' strike and a new city tax on mailers.

"Suddenly, normal New York mail showed up originating in Chicago—millions of pieces. Chicago normally handles 16 to 18 million pieces a day.

"Overnight, it was called on to work upward of 21 million pieces. That's what gets you into trouble."

Trouble shooting. When trouble begins, there is a scramble.

"We don't have any set emergency plan because we're planning all the time to prevent emergencies," Mr. McMillan said. "Mail priorities remain the same in any situation. That means that first-class mail, airmail and 'red tag' newspapers and news magazines are always handled first.

"When a logjam develops, I send out a team of trouble shooters from Washington—my top mail handlers. Twenty-six went to Chicago during the crisis there. Some stayed until the end of January. But if we had gotten into another jam at the same time Chicago was piled up we would have been stuck.

"The cream of the crop was out there. I didn't have anyone else to send anywhere."

In spite of everything, postal officials will tell you that the U.S. mail service has improved over the last two years. They say deliveries are faster and more consistent, and that mail is not costing as much per piece to handle.

But people still complain about the mail service. Businessmen point out they now have to do a lot of their own sorting, and that costs will go up again when the new rates go into effect.

Everyone who has anything to do with mail from the President on down, seems to agree with Postmaster General O'Brien that, unless some basic changes are made soon, the U.S. postal system is headed for disaster.

NOW A COMMISSION TO STUDY MAIL PROBLEMS

President Johnson has appointed a commission of 10 prominent Americans to make "the most searching and exhaustive review ever undertaken of the structure and organization of the Post Office Department."

Headed by Frederick R. Kappel, former chairman of the American Telephone & Telegraph company, the commission is expected to report within a year. Other members:

George Baker, *dean, Harvard Business School.*

David Bell, *vice president, Ford Foundation.*

Fred Borch, *president, General Electric Company.*

David Ginsburg, *Washington, D.C., attorney.*

Ralph Lazarus, *president, Federated Department Stores.*

George Meany, *president, AFL–CIO.*

J. Irwin Miller, *chairman, Cummins Engine Company.*

W. Beverly Murphy, *president, Campbell Soup Company.*

Rudolph A. Peterson, *president, Bank of America.*

HOW TO HEAD OFF MAIL CRISIS—INTERVIEW WITH POSTMASTER GENERAL O'BRIEN

(The way out of the postal mess, according to Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, is to turn the Post Office into a corporation with freedom to run the mails in a business-like manner. In this exclusive interview with staff members of "U.S. News & World Report," he explains how such a corporation would work.)

Q. General, why are you suddenly warning the country that there might be a catastrophic breakdown in mail service?

A. You have to go back to the basics on this. Just envision for a moment the Post Office Department's closing down for a week. If that ever occurred, it would be real catastrophe for the nation. It would take months, maybe years, for the economy to readjust.

Mail service is extremely meaningful to modern business, which is increasingly based on automated billing by mail. All Government agencies depend heavily on us. We touch every American family directly, daily.

So, getting out the mail is not a mundane, routine thing. Yet the postal service is the victim of an attitude that the Post Office Department has always muddled through, and always will. In the federal bureaucracy, the Post Office Department has been traditionally low man on the totem pole.

The time for that has passed. We find ourselves today with a mail volume that exceeds the mail volume of the rest of the world—80 billion pieces a year. But we still have basically the same facilities Postmaster General Jim Farley had in the late 1930s, when there was one third as much mail to carry. This has set the stage for catastrophe.

Q. Are you speaking literally when you talk about catastrophe?

A. Yes. We've had experiences on several occasions since I've been Postmaster General where we were put to the test of keeping our head above water in maintaining the daily flow of mail. We had a taste of what can happen in Chicago last autumn. The Chicago post office is the largest in the world. It has close to 20,000 employes under one roof. It was erected across the railroad tracks in downtown Chicago, and in the 1930s that was the appropriate location.

Very, very little has changed in that facility in the past 30 years. But nearly everything else has changed. Planes and trucks have replaced trains to a very great extent. The whole concept of a modern postal service has changed drastically.

So Chicago is a good example of this fundamental problem of inadequate facilities that have been allowed to deteriorate in the midst of daily challenges for increased mail service—which have not been met.

Q. Do you fear a recurrence of the Chicago mess?

A. Possibilities of a Chicago-type crisis at all times. We must be as alert as we can to anticipate these problems, and we have taken steps to try to do so. For example, the major mail users in Chicago are now contacted in advance on a regular basis to determine the future flow of mail into the Chicago post office.

But bear this in mind: When I was assigned to this task, I was mandated by the President of the United States to provide superlative postal service to the American people. I think we have made progress. We are inching ahead. In my judgment, considering all aspects, we are providing reasonable postal service. But we are not providing the postal service that is in the American tradition.

Q. How could a postal corporation, such as you have proposed, improve service?

A. First of all, it would provide the opportunity for massive investment in facilities and in general modernization through the sale of bonds. This would provide us with capital investment that would certainly move our program of modernization much, much more rapidly than we are able to do under the current structure.

Secondly, in a corporate setup, the income would be direct to the postal department—not only income from services rendered, but also the income from Congress on subsidized services. Part of our plan is that Congress would reimburse the postal corporation for losses on mail that Congress determined should be subsidized as a public service.

The combination of current income directly funneled into the corporation along with capital investment through the sale of bonds would obviously bring you to a position where you could operate the Post Office in a modern business sense.

NEEDED: 5 BILLION DOLLARS

Q. How much capital investment is needed to modernize the Post Office, nationwide?

A. I would anticipate an investment in facilities and mechanization at the rate of probably a billion dollars a year for five years.

Q. How does that compare with present improvement programs?

A. We now have a 100-million-dollar mechanization program that is on target in the current fiscal year [ending June 30], and we anticipate the possibility—because the House has already acted—of adding to that a 300-million-dollar modernization program during the next fiscal year [starting July 1].

So we are moving ahead, inch by inch. But for every inch of progress we have gone through a battle that has been awfully time-consuming.

We currently have the kind of co-operative effort that is needed to bring about progress, in Congress. But both the Congress and the Department are operating under the framework of a structure that is, to a great extent, archaic—and the record proves it—because this Department now has to be treated, appropriations-wise and otherwise, as any other department of Government, and yet it is unique in the magnitude and nature of its problems.

Q. With a corporation, could you be more efficient in day-to-day operations?

A. Of course. You would have stability in management, which would be on a career basis, comparable to private corporate management.

You would have opportunities for employes, in promotions and other areas, that do not exist now. Just one aspect I could cite is the present residency requirement that currently exists in many cases [a general rule that postal employes must be residents of an area before they can be appointed to certain jobs]. This could be eliminated in a corporate setup.

We would also have the chance to do long-range planning, with some certainty. We can and do make long-range plans now. But can we do it with a certainty that we can see it through?

Q. Who would run the postal corporation?

A. A board of directors, who in turn would select the management-level people to carry out the functions.

Q. Would these directors have the same authority over a local postmaster that a board of directors in a business enterprise has over a branch manager? Could they hire and fire without regard to civil-service rules?

A. I'm going to leave specifics such as that to the determination of the commission that President Johnson has appointed to study my proposal. But I say this:

As I envision it, in the postal corporation you would have management teams reaching out to the regional and local-management level, and all our postmasters are managers. Our regional directors are managers.

In our present framework, I am attempting daily to provide more management authority to these people who at the moment have management responsibility but in many situations do not have the opportunity to carry out this responsibility. So I assume that the commission appointed by the President will certainly look into this matter in detail.

Q. Would the corporation directors set pay rates for postal workers, rather than having pay determined by Congress, as at present?

A. I think the corporation would be given a great deal of leeway in this area. Let me cite a situation that exists that I think requires attention:

We have standard postal salaries across the nation without regard to regional differences in cost of living or other factors. I think the corporation could well be in a position to establish salary levels by regions, or conceivably on the basis of postal volume in certain communities. There would be considerable leeway there.

WHO WOULD SET RATES

Q. How about rates? Would the corporation set the price of stamps, and rates for second and third-class mail?

A. I envision that this corporation would establish rates on the basis of a formula that would be adopted by the Congress and presented to the corporation.

Q. Preserving the public-service concept for some classes of mail—

A. That's correct. The Congress would make the determination as to what percentage of cost should be met by postal charges, in each category of mail. There would be, therefore, clear guidelines, and the corporation would have the responsibility to maintain the rate structure within those guidelines. So you would have an ongoing, relatively permanent, rate formula.

Now, you have to keep remembering that, first of all, the Congress would have to authorize creation of this corporation. Secondly, the Congress would make the determination as to what degree of public service the corporation should maintain. And thirdly, the Congress would determine what kind of a rate structure the corporation would function under.

We must also remember that the Congress, at any time, could alter these formulas. Or, indeed, the Congress, at any time, could repeal legislation that created the corporation.

Q. In your own thinking, do you visualize the postal corporation as operating at a net profit, over all?

A. No, I do not. I specifically stated in my proposal that I conceive this corporation to be a public service.

Q. In the end, will a postal corporation cost the public more money? Would it be a more-expensive mail service for some uses?

A. I can't envision its costing the public more money in the sense of mail service being more expensive, because what I do envision is a modern postal service and postal establishment, made possible by the corporation.

I think postal employes—we have 700,000 of them—are certainly, at a minimum, entitled to the modern tools to carry on their work. They are entitled to opportunity for promotion and improved working conditions.

All of this can add up to a much more effective postal service.

I want to go back again to the point I made earlier, that we are making progress in this Department. I don't want that fact to be overlooked.

As I said, we are getting a high degree of co-operation now from the Congress. In the final analysis, the members of Congress are the members of our "board of directors." These men have had a great interest in the Department, a concern about it and an attitude of complete co-operation with the executive branch in moving ahead.

But I do think that many members of the Congress clearly see that something must take place at this time to insure the future of postal service, and that the current structure is inadequate.

Q. Do you think Congress is in a mood to give up the power and influence represented by control over postal appointments, including postmasters?

A. I think the overriding mood of the Congress is that good government is good politics. That's why the response to my corporation proposal has been largely favorable, both within the Congress and among the public. Time has passed by many of the traditional concepts of political patronage.

Q. Would corporation employes be in the civil service?

A. That will have to be determined by the presidential commission. Whether the employes, all of them, would be under civil service or a similar system, the fact is that, as I see it, they would have collective-bargaining opportunities, promotion opportunities, benefit opportunities to a greater degree than now.

In addition to that, the employes would—I repeat—have modern facilities and modern tools, so the monotony and fatigue aspects of current employment could be greatly reduced.

Q. Would employes of the postal corporation have the right to strike?

A. That is another matter that will have to be considered by the presidential commission. I just simply refer to an existing Government corporation—the Tennessee Valley Authority—where the employes do not have the right to strike but do have collective bargaining, with several AFL–CIO unions involved. And it's my understanding that the record of employe-employer relations has been outstanding in TVA.

So whether they're under civil service or not, whether they have the right to strike or not, are all matters to be considered by this commission.

Generally speaking, what I'd like to see is the evolvement of a concept that would insure that they would have promotional opportunities far beyond what exist currently, that they would have salary-improvement and fringe-benefit-improvement opportunities far beyond what exist currently, and that they would have working conditions greatly improved over the working conditions they presently have.

Q. How many unions do you now deal with?

A. We have 12 unions. Seven of these unions have national contracts with us.

Q. Would you expect fewer unions, with a corporation?

A. There again, that's a matter for this intensive study that's going to take place. These unions that exist in the postal service have been established for a long time. They are responsible unions. They have a great interest in the Department.

I have attended many union conventions. And when you say "dedicated" employees—in truth, over all, the employes of this Department are dedicated, and they have my sympathy when it comes to some attitudes that exist toward them among the public, some of the neglect of their problems that has occurred over a long, long period of time, and some of the failures to recognize the service they render.

The spokesmen for these unions are responsible people. I've negotiated with them. And I appreciate the fact that the union leadership has reacted to my proposal with an attitude of, "We will not dismiss it out of hand. We will not make comments adversely concerning it. We will await the full review of exactly what this would mean in a corporate sense."

Q. Do you think the corporation might eliminate some post offices that are too small, or no longer justified because of population shifts?

A. Well, certainly, if the corporate concept was to succeed and the superlative service that the President and I seek was to be brought about, there would have to be a great deal of authority and responsibility placed in the corporation and its board of directors.

I again remind you: This proposal could become an Administration proposal only after the presidential commission reports, and you must understand the commission is not limited just to reviewing my proposal. The commission has a mandate to review the Post Office Department in all its concepts—and all views of the unions, the Congress, mail users, and private citizen will be considered by the commission.

Q. Where does the present system seem most inefficient? Is rural free delivery, for example, a concept that needs to be reexamined?

A. I think that all functions of the Department need to be intensively examined.

Q. On the corporation's bonds: Would the Government guarantee them?

A. We would just, at this point, suggest that this corporation should have the right to go into the market and sell bonds.

Q. Can you give us any idea how many postal workers you'll need by, say, 1975?

A. That's a projection I would just have to guess at. Our experts feel that, if we hadn't made the progress we did make in recent years, we would currently need 300,000 more employes than we have.

You must remember, the postal employe in America is far more productive than in any other nation in the world. Someone has said to me, however, that if we pursue this present course of inching ahead, and do not make the giant steps that we deem essential, we could get to the year 2000 and have every American a postal employe.

PROGRESS IN AUTOMATION

Q. Are you getting automatic equipment that really works?

A. We have proven hardware that is being manufactured now at a satisfactory pace. We've put it to a pretty good test with our 100-million-dollar program this year. It was a tight schedule. And we're going to meet that schedule item by item.

I might add that includes our data-processing system we contracted for just last year. We have a target of full installation of this computer equipment in the 75 leading post offices by November of 1968. Despite the competition for this sort of equipment in the nation today, I'm pleased to tell you that, as of this moment, we're assured we will be on target.

So we have found we can go into the marketplace and bring about this type of mechanization at a rather rapid rate.

Our problem has been that we have a great deal of meaningful, proven equipment, but we are considerably restricted in the amount of investment we can make. For example, I would say that on optical scanners—they're still in the test stage, but moving along very well—instead of talking about eight or 10 optical scanners, I'd like, at this point, to be talking to you about getting 60 or 75 optical scanners. This is another instance of a basic fundamental problem. We need that capital to invest, and move far more rapidly into modernization than we are moving.

Q. Is ZIP code important?

A. I would be derelict if I did not point out to you that no matter what happens to my corporation idea, or any other proposal, the key, in the final analysis, to the future of the postal service is the use of ZIP codes.

ZIP code is here to stay.

We now have 65 per cent acceptance of ZIP code across the country. We must do better. It is not mandatory, as you know, in first-class mail—and that is in the American tradition—but we're pleased with the progress that's being made.

The Advertising Council has worked arduously with us in this area. Many groups, such as the Magazine Publishers Association and our mail-users councils, have done a tremendous job in this area. But it is essential that the American people as a whole accept and use ZIP code.

Paralleling acceptance of ZIP code, of course, we must have the mechanization to fully utilize ZIP code.

SPEEDING FIRST-CLASS MAIL

Q. If you get this mechanization, will people, sooner or later, have to accept some changes in the way they handle their own personal mail? In other words, with optical scanners, will you have to, sooner or later, require people to use ZIP code on their first-class mail?

A. Well, ZIP code is now mandatory in second and third-class mail. And the acceptance of it is moving very well in first-class mail. Eighty per cent of our mail in this country can be generally termed "business mail"—including Government and the business community generally. But I want Mr. Brown and Mrs. Smith to join us in the use of ZIP code on a voluntary basis—and they will. We are improving our situation, and it is going along extremely well.

Neither do I want Mr. Brown and Mrs. Smith a few years from now to say: "Mr. Government, I have complied with your request. I'm using ZIP code, but I don't find that I get improved mail service"—because we did not modernize our Department to fully utilize the ZIP code that people had voluntarily started using at our request.

Q. Will people have to print addresses so they can be read by scanners, and use envelopes of certain sizes?

A. The optical scanner currently is geared to read printed and typed envelopes. We find, again, that about 80 per cent of our envelopes in this country are printed or typed. We are continuing to refine the scanner so that it will read handwriting. That's our ultimate goal for the scanner.

Concerning envelope sizes: We can see in the future that there will have to be some standardization to insure maximum movement of the mail through our mechanical equipment.

But all of this will in no way fetter our fellow Americans in making use of our service. I think that this nation—which can carry on as it has in so many areas, such as education, scientific research, health—certainly can reach a point where we can validly claim we are providing to our fellow Americans superlative postal service.

I cannot for one moment believe we're not capable of doing it. But I do insist that, under the existing framework, we'll be inching ahead, not making giant strides.

What I hope the presidential commission will conclude is that I am generally correct in assuming that superlative postal service is possible, and that my corporation proposal is meaningful.

While it is not necessarily the sole answer to the future of the postal service, I am convinced it's the best answer.

BRITAIN SEEKS A POSTAL CORPORATION, TOO

LONDON.—British postal authorities, like their counterparts in the U.S., have decided that a Government bureaucracy simply cannot cope with growing mountains of mail.

Under a Labor Government plan scheduled to come before Parliament later this year—

The British Post Office will be reconstituted as a nonprofit corporation with two separate branches, one for carrying the mail and the other for operating telephone and telegraph services, which are functions of the Government in this country.

A board of directors will run the corporation like a business enterprise. The board will set rates, decide what services to offer or wipe out, appoint postmasters, fix pay rates and promotion policies.

The 400,000 employes will be removed from civil service. Their 20 associations and unions will have to reorganize and, it is hoped, will merge into a few organizations. Wages and working conditions will have to be renegotiated.

The corporation's directors will answer to a member of Parliament serving as Post Office Minister. He will control general policy, but leave operational decisions up to the directors. Parliament will have to approve the corporation's budget each year.

Many of the proposed changes were recommended by an American management-consultant firm. The basic aim is to let postal officials handle their problems, their workers, and customers with some of the freedom and flair that a private enterprise uses.

This approach now is being promoted by a Labor Government that is dedicated to the ideals of socialism—but is up against the practical problems of increasing mail volume and runaway postal costs.

HELP-A-YOUTH PROGRAM IN SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, hardly a day passes without our hearing of another federally sponsored youth training program becoming so deeply involved in the bureaucratic quagmire that it has either collapsed or has been wholly ineffective.

In the meantime, more and more we hear of youth and adult training programs sponsored solely by philanthropic groups and industries meeting with remarkable success and surpassing their original goals and at no cost to the taxpayers.

In October of 1965, I placed in the RECORD a newspaper article dealing with a help-a-youth program at Springfield, Ohio, initiated by Mr. Harry Rittoff, chairman of the board of David's Gloves, Inc., of that city. That was 1½ years ago. I have now received a letter from Mr. Carl Trautman, director of this project, in which is made a brief progress report.

Mr. President, what the people in Springfield and Clark County have done to help the youth of that area is utterly amazing. I commend them.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Trautman's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

HELP-A-YOUTH PROJECT,
Springfield, Ohio, April 17, 1967.

Mr. RAY M. WHITE,
Administrative Assistant to Senator Lausche, U.S. Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the fact that Senator Lausche was instrumental in having the work of the "Help-A-Youth Project" placed in the Congressional Record, we feel duty bound to report to you, and thru you to Senator Lausche, the results of one and one-half year's operation.

As stated in the attached press release of October 3, 1965, the Help-A-Youth Project is the culmination of a desire, on the part of Mr. Harry Rittoff, Chairman of the Board of David's Gloves, Inc., to help solve the drop-out problem of boys and girls of Springfield and Clark County schools by finding part-time jobs after school hours and to assist those who were out of school to find full-time jobs and take their place in society.

This project was established as a result of several meetings in the home of Mr. Rittoff when, following discussions, a plan of procedure was adopted, an advisory committee appointed (as shown in the column on the side of this letterhead), and a director appointed. Our project started October 4, 1965, not knowing how we would be received by employers and the public, but with a firm resolve that everything that could be done would be done to make this a success.

Fortunately the local press and radio stations, thru editorials, articles, photographs, and spot announcements, gave to the project a most enthusiastic publicity and advertising campaign which from the first day on removed all doubts as to the success of our project. The first day approximately one hundred applications for work were taken and also three orders from employers for seven job openings were called in. Our first month of operation finished with seventeen boys and girls finding jobs.

Two points were settled at the beginning by Mr. Rittoff:

1. This was his project and all financial help was assumed by Mr. Rittoff. In fact, on two occasions his friends asked to help financially, by contributing several thousand dollars. This request was refused and checks returned.

2. This project under no circumstance was to be connected with Federal or Local Government Agencies. Having been asked by Federal Agencies to unite with them, again such a request was refused.

The office cooperates with City, County and Parochial Schools thru the counsellors; we work with all the local courts—Common Pleas, Juvenile, and Municipal. Also extend service to the Ohio Youth Commission in assisting those boys and girls on parole. No effort is left untouched to help the applicants and employers in this program. We work also with the churches and other religious organizations.

Every month a report of current activities is made and placed in the hands of our Advisory Committee, the press, radio and Chamber of Commerce; to governors of several states, as well as to large law and banking firms thruout the United States.

As a result of these reports being sent thruout the United States, requests have come to our office from governors and political subdivisions of several states, for information as to the feasibility of establishing such a program in their respective community.

Our results for one and one-half year's service is as follows:

1. From October 4, 1965, to October 5, 1966, our first year in business, jobs were found for 353 of our applicants. Approximately 80% were for part-time jobs and 20% for full-time jobs. The part-time jobs were filled by students after school hours.

2. Since October 5, 1966, an additional 173 applicants have been placed on jobs. Our goal is for 400 plus in our second year. Our total so far, to April 14, is 526 placements.

3. Our applicant file now numbers between 2500 and 3000 applications. Total number of employers who have given us orders approximate 200. The office has received repeat orders from a majority of these employers.

Indeed we are truly grateful for the results attained. We are also mindful of the fact that the results are due to the help and interest of the press and radio, and also to the confidence placed in us by our applicants, by industry and business. For this confidence, we are indeed appreciative.

This is our report to you, Senator Lausche, for your confidence and interest. The Help-A-Youth Program of Springfield, Ohio proves that things can be accomplished without government aid.

We feel that this is what it means to be a True American by serving our fellow man and if in any way our program is of interest to other communities, this office will be most happy to serve.

On behalf of Mr. Rittoff, the Project and our office, please accept our humble thanks, Senator Lausche.

Respectfully,

CARL TRAUTMAN,
Director, Help-a-Youth Project.

HELP-A-YOUTH PROJECT,
Springfield, Ohio, April 3, 1967.

Our March report shows quite an improvement both in orders, number of job openings and placements. Three of our orders also indicates Spring has arrived as these orders are for approximately 50 boys to work in city parks and at Ferncliff. Other orders include country clubs, industrial plants and hospitals.

There were 66 working days in the first quarter of the year of 1967 and in that period we have found jobs for 76 of our applicants.

The office is quite optimistic that we shall show an increased amount of activity during the Spring and Summer months both in number of orders received and placements made.

Your director contacted those which we served last year for yard work and agriculture work and apparently we will again be called upon for 1967 summer work.

The activities and results for March are as follows:

Number of orders received	29
Number of openings	45
Number of Referrals Made	62
Number of new registrations	68
Number of telephone calls	65
Additional interviews	71
Calls on employers	45
New hires	32

Assurance has also been given the office that contractors will use our services for some of the big Government contracts that are in progress.

Again our sincere thanks to all who have made this project a succesful one.

Respectfully,

CARL TRAUTMAN,
Director.

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY SARA PARKER, 4-H CLUB MEMBER FROM MILLEN, GA.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this week a number of outstanding Georgia young people are in Washington as delegates to the National 4-H Conference. It is indeed a pleasure to welcome them to the Nation's Capital and to wish them a most interesting and informative visit here.

We are all very proud of the splendid work being done by members of the 4-H group, and I am particularly proud of the leadership and accomplishments of Georgia's members of this organization which has done so much to develop the minds, bodies, and character of our young people.

One of Georgia's 4-H club members, Miss Sara Parker, of Millen, Ga., has written a very fine essay, "What I Have Learned in 4-H Club Work," on her experiences. She is to be complimented for this very fine presentation.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT I HAVE LEARNED IN 4-H CLUB WORK

(By Sara Parker, Millen (Jenkins County), Ga.)

When I joined the 4-H Club in the 5th grade, I had no idea of the many joys and experiences that were to come. One of the reasons I joined is that I live on a farm, and 4-H is a good opportunity for rural boys and girls.

After my first year I knew that this club was for me. It gave me the opportunity to work with other boys and girls, to develop skills and attitudes, and to gain knowledge. Gradually I sensed a change.

When I was a 5th grade 4-H'er, my Mother was teaching school, so the responsibility of cooking fell on my sister, Jane, and me. But then Jane went to college and I was left to take her place. Because of the training received in 4-H I was able to help prepare well-balanced meals for my family.

By using correct cooking methods, I found that foods I cooked would taste and look better. I have learned to prepare food that is in season. By doing this the food was of higher quality and also more economical. Food-nutrition has been my main project for seven years. During these years I have worked hard, but it has been fun and rewarding.

I have learned that a balanced diet includes the recommended amounts of food from each of the basic four food groups every day. I learned that the total quantity in daily food should be related to an individual's needs on the basis of age, sex, size, and activity. I have begun to understand that the daily habit of eating from the four food groups helps to build muscles, supply energy, and to give a feeling of liveliness and a "glow", and helps each child to grow at his or her own best possible rate. I have learned to purchase substantial foods with attention to economic ways to provide good food in daily family living. My nutrition project has played an important part in the protection of the family's health. As a result of good nutrition practices the physical fitness of the family has improved.

Because of 4-H I have been able to tell others about the importance of a properly prepared and nutritious breakfast through pamphlets, news articles, filmstrips, exhibits, and demonstrations. This project also sparked my interest in the welfare of people around me.

Dairy foods have always been of interest to me. It was convenient for me to learn the process of milk from the cow to the table since my father owns a dairy. I have tried to tell others the importance of dairy foods to the daily diet by demonstrations, radio and TV programs, exhibits, talks, and by sending 175 letters to 4-H'ers on drinking milk. I am happy to be alternate State Dairy Foods winner. I have developed an appreciation of the values of dairy products in relation to the general diet and health. I have acquired an understanding of different ways of using dairy food products and have developed skill in their preparation.

I have learned the scientific areas in nutrition. At camp I took a Fun and Food course which told me how science plays its role in the kitchen. By performing many science experiments at school and home with foods, I have learned the properties and actions of various foods. My food tests have demonstrated the presence of nutrients in samples of foods.

Through the study of Food-Nutrition I have acquired an interest in the field of home economics, and I have considered it a profession. 4-H has played a major role in influencing me in this direction.

The wide variety of 4-H projects besides Foods and Nutrition gave me the opportunity to satisfy my diversified interests. They are Leadership, Gardening, Health, Food Preservation, Recreation, Forestry, Clothing and Landscaping. Through my 4-H projects I have learned how to make decisions. I have learned how to set goals and how to make a plan for reaching my goals. Through 4-H projects I have learned effective use of time, energy, money. 4-H projects and activities have helped me test my own interests and career possibilities.

In 4-H I have developed many valuable traits which will benefit me as a leader in our society. My 4-H projects have helped me to develop leadership abilities by planning and presenting radio programs, giving demonstrations and talks to 4-H and civic clubs, and by serving on committees. Being on radio and TV gave me poise, self-confidence, and initiative. Participating on nine 4-H Sunday Programs has made me have a greater awareness of life. Taking part on the program at the Forestry Luncheon at State 4-H Congress, which is when District winners compete for state honors, was a rewarding experience. Assisting with District rallies was a service to those present who were being trained as county officers.

As president of my local and county club for two years and District reporter, the most important rewards received were assuming responsibility, being of service to others, and

developing leadership skills. The 4-H'ers of Georgia have placed their faith in me as a state officer, to lead them through the coming year. I have a challenge placed before me and I hope to meet this challenge, putting forth all effort and courage I have.

The 4-H Club has offered to me an adventure in accepting responsibility. When I first joined the 4-H Club, I was given certain responsibilities that required me to continually use my mind. As an experienced 4-H'er, I am challenged in the field of responsibility not only in my home but in my county, District, and State. Through the responsibility of Junior Leader I have received the satisfaction that comes from seeing eager little people for the first time trying to excell in something and succeeding.

The 4-H program has given me the opportunity to learn how to be a good citizen through democratic practices. I have learned that a good citizen's responsibility is to himself, to the group, to local, state, national and international affairs. 4-H has trained me to assume these responsibilities in a free society. As a part in the Citizenship Ceremony at the State 4-H Citizenship Council, it impressed upon me the importance of one's loyalty to his country.

The IFYE program is one of the ways 4-H has tried to better the relations with other countries. By being host to an Argentinian IFYE I learned about other ways of life.

Although 4-H is the only organization that still contains the word "work" in its name, I have found that 4-H Club Work isn't all work and no play. 4-H has brought me more social contacts. I have learned new games and dances, and I have learned more social grace. Through contacts I have made all over the state through camp, District, and State Council I have made valuable friendships. I have enjoyed working with others on bake sales, fair exhibits, 4-H windows, 4-H Sunday programs and 4-H radio programs.

4-H has instilled in me the desire to reach out and grasp those things that are good and challenging. I have been encouraged to continue learning every day. I feel there is no substitute for the influence of 4-H in my life . . . It means a great deal to me.

CAPT. BROOKE SHADBURNE, OF TEXAS, DEAD IN VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, when I was last in Vietnam, I flew across a large part of the Marine Corps' area of responsibility with Gen. Lewis Walt and his helicopter pilot, Capt. Brooke Shadburne, of Texas.

I was deeply grieved to learn later of Captain Shadburne's death on April 5 while flying a medical evacuation mission. He was an outstanding young officer; a credit to his family, community, and Nation. In recognition of his sacrifice to the cause of liberty, the University of Plano, in Plano, Tex., has named a building after him, and political science scholarships have been established in his name.

This is a fitting memorial to a dedicated American who felt strongly that a firm U.S. effort against Communist tyranny is necessary, particularly in southeast Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD selected excerpts from a letter Captain Shadburne wrote home shortly before his death. I commend them to the attention of all Senators.

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

LETTER FROM CAPT. BROOKE SHADBURNE, FEB. 28, 1967

DEAR MOM AND GORDO: Hi all after another long lapse in correspondence. I have a couple days slack because I pulled a muscle in my back and I've been too stiff and sore to fly—actually it's been a pretty good break and I'm feeling pretty good too.

Tonight I am sitting on my cot with a 3' length of plank leaned up against the side of the hut for a back rest. I have a cold Korean Crown beer beside me and my tape recorder is playing some soft modern jazz like slow paced and melodic chamber music played on the snares and a sax—*gee I love music*. You truly won't be able to believe your ears when I return with the HiFi I am going to buy and the music I am going to have recorded. Also I will have the facilities for recording everyone else's best music. I've decided the name of the house I am going to build some day will be (paraphrased) *"The House With a Song in Its Heart."* Can you neatly summarize that in French, Italian or Latin?—to give it a little sex/snob appeal and also make it shorter. Either song *at* its Heart or Song *in* its Heart. Anyway—Mom your last letter got here in 6 days which is about average for my mail. Two days seems also unbelievable from here to Dallas to you.

I think you know I'm not one to jump to conclusions. In fact I didn't even make any policy criticisms until of late. I STRONGLY BELIEVE one should not go off half cocked and with only half the story! Well now I've seen both winter and summer in Viet Nam. As a UHIE pilot I have worked very closely with the Korean Marine Corps, Arvin Army, Rangers and Armor units, USMC Recon. Units and regular ground troops also US Army Special Forces. I've flown and worked from the DMZ down to and into the Army controlled II Corps area to the South and west to Laos. Security permits me saying more but I have covered the area. I have worked hand in hand with both Troop and cargo helos and all of the attack jets as well.

Nite before last S. Viet Nams second largest city DaNang had about 130 rockets fired at it from a position not more than 5 miles from our large air base there. The Russian made rockets killed 13 US and gravely wounded close to 40 more, an untold number of Viet civilians were killed when 5 rockets landed in their little tin and Thach village and completely flattened and burned it. 5 miles from the runway—with Russian rockets.

It's a little hard to believe until one goes into the hospital to help hand out the purple hearts every week and you see the legless, armless, eyeless cripples. I saw one guy who will have to have his neck in traction flat on his back the rest of his life. Big handsome guy, he could move his eyes and talk—and that is all! the rest of his life. What life? These people are sitting waiting to get hit by new Russian weapons while the General attends the New Year's Sports Festival. Traveling the ½ mile of good road by *helo*, not car. A helo that could have guns and rockets on it and be supporting the ground forces.

As I see it what we are currently trying to do is gradually expand our THOR (Tactical Area of Responsibility) so that we control the people inside that area. We then give them tin to rebuild a model vill. and a school. Gradually the idea is to push out the VC, educate the children, prove that we are good white people not bad like the French, and help them establish moderate agrarian reforms. Sounds Great but ½ mile south of our Marble Mountain Air Facility helo base at DaNang there is a tiny vill typical of so many many thousand in the area. Within the last year It has "lost" two mayors. The first was kidnapped. The second was killed along with his family. The present one had his young sons fingernails pulled out one by one—he is still Mayor. Today there was a 3 year old girl in the hospital, daughter of an ex town chief; The chief and his wife were beaten and killed in view of the child and then the little girl was beaten beyond recognition with rifle butts and left for dead. She is disfigured but still alive in our hospital—at 3 years old. How can we educate during the day? How can we expect a stable government when we only own the day and at nite the VC come in with a new Russian Submachine gun to cast their *own brand of veto* to any local election. They extract their rice tax, grab the youth for recruits and by day—who is to know, they wear black PJ's and straw hat like everyone else. Stable, Educated, Reformed—we can't win hearts! lets win a war! Basically: 1) cut off ALL of North Viet Nams sources of supply sea, air, land. 2) Bring them to their knees to stop the inflow of men and arms to S. Viet Nam. 3) Make a huge *ruthless*—in terms an Asian can understand—mighty sweep through S. Viet Nam to clean out the remaining die hard—and by then underfed and under supplied V.C. gurellas. 4) Then and only then rearm, train and supervise the Arvin. Teach the children, aid the homeless, help in agrarian reform. Only then will it do any good! And soon we truly will have an ally that could be considered the cornerstone of freedom in South East Asia.

To Expand on each point a little 1) A) Stopping all international commerce would be easily accomplished by simply putting a Cuba style blockade by Haiphong harbor. Stop their air by letting one flight of F-4's destroy the runway at Hanoi. Road supplies from China could be slowed if not stopped if we concentrated the same effort on them as we do on the Ho Chi Minh Highway (Trail) in the south. Any sane observer knows that it would be impossible for N. Viet Nam to ship supplies south without external resources. The main Sea route could be cinched off without a shot fired. B) We should stop ALL commerce with pro communist Nations aiding N. Viet Nam. and we should threaten a total Boycott of all Nato Nations trading with N. Viet Nam. How long would it take France or Britain or Canada to decide we are more valuable economically than N. Viet Nam?! The moves outlined sound harsh but so is being shot through the chest with a Chi Com AK-47 in S. Viet Nam! And the Irony of it all is that if we took a truly firm stand we would be *Respected* as a nation. Our largest criticism, for which we are so constantly attuned, would undoubtedly come from the lunatic fringe from within.

Step #2 Bring them to their knees—with No external aid this step would not take much but to hasten it and bring it down to weeks versus months we could (1) concentrate on all the MIG's *sitting* on the ground. Knock out the 100 or so MIG 17's and the 20+ MIG 21's and render the airfield unusable by jets which could all be accomplished by a few flights of our attack aircraft. Then knock out SAM sites Object to *destroy their Anti Air capability* Once accomplished run in our *BOMBERS* B-52's B-58's Some of our remaining B-47's that haven't been junked (with nothing to replace them.) Run in the Bombers and put *tons* of bombs in on every possible military target, It is *insane* to delegate to a single engine *jet fighter*, that is designed for speed Not load carrying, the task of *bombing*. That is why we have *bombers*. (those that haven't been junked by the Pentagon whiz Kids in favor of ICBM's or IRBMs—where are the missils now?) And-OR better yet—rather than risk another single aircraft over North Viet Nam's murderous anti aircraft fire—use *Naval Gunfire* as we did during and prior to most of the Pacific island invasions. Practically every military target in N. Viet Nam is within range of the batttleships 16"

guns and their 2000# projectiles. You say there are no more battleships, they were considered obsolete 15 years ago? But No, there are several in moth balls and for the price of the aircraft lost *in a single day* they could be refitted and rearmed—and Not cost a single life. Two ships working 12 hr shifts replenished at sea and given sea cover by some PT's and destroyers and air cover by a single aircraft carrier could lob 2000 pound projectiles to any target in and around Hanoi or Haiphong. How long could they take 24 hr bombardment? and we wouldn't be risking a single man!! I venture to say they would crawl to us with white flag in hand shortly after they found out our battleships could be replenished at sea and never break stride! With no supplies coming in and 24 hr heavy bombardment how many troops would be rushing off to "liberate" the south?

Step # 3 clean out the South. Once the VC were truly cut-off from a supply of manpower, food, medicine and arms Charlies would have his back to a wall—stand and fight with what little he had on hand an then die, or give up. Many thousands came over last year. How many more would come over if they knew all supply and support was cut off? Then an aggressive War No holds barred sweep through S. Vietnam would make "good" V.C. out of the remaining few die hards. I would venture to say 10% or less of the US personnel were currently doing 90% or more of the actual combat in S. Viet Nam. If an aggressirve drive were started the Saigon USO would probably have to stop language lessons for a week. The General would probably have to cancel a dinner engagement or two with the Major or the visiting firemen might get the organdy vice red carpet treatment for a few weeks. All efforts would have to be pointed to winning a military war—not friends.

Then step # 4 one secure—*rebuild* as only America can do once we have beaten someone to a pulp, bring in the Peace Corps, US Aid, State department, Education, Economics, transportation etc.—etc. to *Rebuild educate* and *stabilize* on a firm (if bare) foundation. Leave a division or two in country to watchdog the activities and assign them as a primary mission the training and academic and political education of the S. Viet Armed Forces. Once trained give them some good tools for their trade and training to use them. In 15 years they, like Korea today, will or could be a strong blocking force against the Chinese Communist hordes in the North. Truly the potential is there but what are we doing to realize it?

There I got carried away, Mom I hope I haven't rambled along too much. It all seems pretty clear in my mind but on paper I tend to get flamboyant—I truly do feel the truth in what I have written. For instance the battleships we already have could do the same job as all the expensive jets and more expensive pilots we are losing today. And blocking the Harbor—who would stop us? Its almost laughable. No one would dare stop us! All we've got to do—is to do it.

PROGRESS TOWARD ELIMINATING WATER POLLUTION IN INDIANA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am proud to report that the State of Indiana has been making excellent progress toward the eventual elimination of water pollution. The 1967 session of the Indiana General Assembly enacted three significant statutes which should do much to help achieve the goal of clean water in my State.

One of the State's most respected public servants, Mr. Blucher A. Poole, who for 36 years has been a leader in efforts to reduce water pollution, estimates that Indiana could make its lakes, reservoirs, and larger streams fit for swimming in 5 years and that Statewide "clean water" could be achieved in 10 years with an expenditure of approximately $400 million.

In a column written by Fremont Power, the Indianapolis News on April 19, reviewed State action in eliminating water pollution and reported on Mr. Poole's prediction of future progress. In view of the significance of this program and as a tribute to the excellent leadership by Blucher Poole in this field, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

CLEAN WATER: HE DOESN'T BLINK AN EYE

(By Fremont Power)

In 36 years of public service with the State Health Board, Blucher A. Poole has achieved a reputation for calm, effective frankness.

He is no bug-eyed, come-lately zealot jumping into a problem like stream pollution, let us say, with an assertion that it'll be cleaned up tomorrow or he'll run everybody out of town.

Poole knows that neither would really be possible.

And so when he says that Indiana can make its lakes, reservoirs and larger streams (large enough for water skiing) fit for swimming in five years, the observation is worth attention.

POLLUTION LIKE SIN

Stream pollution for so long was something like sin: It is standard to be against it but the hopes of totally conquering it are, shall we say, variable.

Now it appears, we are on the verge of real gains in pollution control.

Not that it won't be costly, Poole points out. He estimates that achievement of clean water will require a 10-year expenditure of $400 million by municipalties and industry, which share about equally the blame for pollution.

"And that could be a bad guess," said the state director of environmental sanitation on the expenditure estimate.

Nor will it ever, he feels, be possible to return Indiana water to a state of "pristine purity."

"Not with five million people and industry," he explained.

But the prospect for ending dangerous pollution is in sight.

While it didn't raise the amount of money spent by the health board in this area, the last Legislature did show signs of getting serious about what has become something of a scandal, both here and across the country.

STATE FACES UP

1. Poole points to three significant legislative actions: Appropriation of $8.6 million to pay a 25 per cent state share of the cost of updating municipal sewage treatment plants. The Federal government, so long as its appropriations last, is committed to a 50 per cent share, leaving local government with only the final 25 per cent to pay.

2. Authorization for the State Health Board to license both municipal and industrial waste treatment plant operators. (Indiana thus becomes the only state to certify industrial waste disposal operators.)

3. Exemption of industry from personal property tax on waste disposal plants.

"This removes," Poole said, "some of the reluctance of industry to spend money."

JUNE 30 DEADLINE

Behind these state actions is a 1965 Federal law which gives states until June 30 to adopt pollution control standards acceptable to the interior secretary and to adopt implementation plans.

The alternative is correction of pollution in interstate waters by the Interior Department.

Indiana is in line and apparently on the move.

Normally, the Indiana Stream Pollution Control Board has been issuing 15 or 16 orders a year to water polluters to correct their dereliction.

"If we could get that up to 30 a year, we'd have the wheels rolling," Poole said.

SIR THOMAS MORE—MAN OF THE RENAISSANCE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the pages of history—being as voluminous as the centuries have made them—offer many examples of an ideal for any public servant who seeks one. But anyone making up a list of possibilities would have to number near the top the name of Sir Thomas More, the man of the Renaissance.

He combined not only the requisite qualities of leadership and integrity but added a list of others of impressive length: humor, scholarship, courage, humanism, eloquence, and culture.

First the Broadway play and now the movie, "A Man for All Seasons," have reminded many who first learned of this great philosopher-statesman back in school of how applicable his thoughts can be to modern days.

The printed program for the movie contains a brief—but truly eloquent—summary of Sir Thomas More and his principles placed against the background of our time. This eloquent reminder of this historic figure was written by the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and today I invite the attention of all Senators to it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the program, entitled "The Man," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MAN

(By THOMAS J. DODD, U.S. Senator)

Thomas More, Man of the Renaissance . . . scholar and statesman . . . a man of kindness, humor and compassion . . . a man in whom the best of human qualities were fused into greatness by the fire of principle . . . a man who set his conscience against the will of a king, and lost.

But what is he to us? What relevance can the life and death of this 16th Century humanist have for 20th Century man, gifted now with knowledge far beyond the ken of Thomas More, armed at last with the means to fulfill or destroy his planet?

The times in which Thomas More lived and died were not unlike our own. It was an age of intellectual and political ferment, an age of clashing arms and ideas. The western world was divided into quarreling states, spending its strength on internal conflict while barbarism threatened to engulf it from the East. Christianity itself was fragmenting, and all the feudal institutions that had borne Europe safely through the Middle Ages were being swept away in the great tides of Renaissance and Reformation.

The scholars of the Renaissance had rediscovered the ancient world of Greek and Roman civilization at the very hour in history when the seafarers of Europe were discovering the New World of the Americas, and western society was never to be the same again. From the one came an explosion of ideas, of scientific and humanistic knowledge

of social and religious change; from the other, an explosion of political freedom that echoes around the earth to this day.

The parallel is startling. Western civilization is threatened once again by Eastern despotism, materialism and jealous nationalism have divided its inner councils, and men everywhere are re-examining the values and institutions by which they have lived for centuries. The explosion of scientific knowledge in our generation enables modern man to look back to the beginnings of life on this planet, while at the same time we reach out into space to explore the New Worlds of our universe.

The tragedy of Thomas More was that in the court of Henry VIII, he stood alone in his belief, that everything for which he gave his life was rejected by King and countrymen. He had stumbled on the crucial issues of western society, on man's desperate need to free himself from economic and political despotism, but he failed utterly to influence his time. He failed to avert the bloodshed of Henry's religious revolution, and he failed to stem the onrush of Thomas Cromwell's greedy commercialism. It was not until a century later, after a bloody era of civil war, that the threat of tyranny was finally lifted from England and More was vindicated.

But in his failures, More triumphed. The ideas and ideals he championed have stirred the minds and hearts of western man for more than four centuries; they have come down to us intact, as fresh and meaningful to our generation as they were to his.

We know a great deal about Thomas More, from his own voluminous writings and from the commentaries of contemporary writers who witnessed his epic struggle with the throne from front-row center. We even have a portrait done from life by Holbein of More in his middle years, the face grave and faintly ascetic, yet lighted by a trace of the inward-turning humor that characterized his public and private life.

Thomas More was a humanist, deeply concerned with the wretched condition of the common man in 16th Century England, and he looked forward to a great society in which poverty could not exist. A man of modest means, he kept his wife Alice in constant distress over the generosity of his private charities, and his public condemnations of those who used the power of wealth to exploit the poor have roused the consciences of social reformers from his day to ours. As clearly as any social scientist today, he saw the fatal relationship between poverty and crime and ignorance.

Again and again, he told men to stretch their imaginations, not to reconcile themselves to the inevitability of social evil, but to retain the vision of what might be.

One of the greatest Christian martyrs of all history, he remained a layman to his death—a layman who lived a life of humble piety in the riotous court of the Tudors, and who wore a hair shirt for all his adult years. Religion, faith in the goodness of God and its ultimate triumph, was the dominant force in his life. Yet, as the King's Chancellor he concerned himself with the worldly problems of population balance, foreign trade, treaties of commerce, military alliance with the Continent, and the maintenance of international peace so that all peoples might be left free to enjoy the good life. As Chancellor, his central characteristic was a combination of loyalty to his country and loyalty to western society, which he saw as a bastion against the tyranny of the East.

He was firmly wedded to the principle that power should be used only to execute right and justice, that positions of power must somehow be converted into structures of right if men are to give them enduring support. At the cost of his head, he invoked that principle even against his strong-willed monarch.

Soon after his fall from royal favor, More was called upon by Thomas Cromwell, who had replaced him as Chancellor and wanted his advice on how to deal with the tempestuous Henry.

"Master Cromwell," said More, "you are now entered into the service of a most noble, wise and liberal prince; if you follow my poor advice, you shall in your counsel-giving unto his Grace ever tell him what he *ought* to do, but never what he is *able* to do."

Thomas More was a unique combination of scholarly taste and practical experience, of humanistic accomplishment and civil service to an extent unmatched by any English leader with the sole exception of Winston Churchill, who followed him in the King's Ministry by some four centuries. He is remembered as much for his human qualities as for his saintliness, for the humorous irony that salted his eloquence, for the remarkable warmth of his family life, his zest for classical learning. Unhesitatingly he reached back into antiquity, into the writings of Socrates and Plato, of Cicero and Tacitus, for solutions to the new problems that confronted a world emerging from medievalism into the modern age. Here was the living stuff of war and tyranny and revolution, of politics and morals, of justice and power, of all the weighty issues that confronted the world of Thomas More as they confront us today.

More was a leader in the revival of learning and the broadening of popular culture brought on by the Renaissance. In spite of his preoccupation with public affairs, he remained one of the foremost scholars of his age, and his closest friends were drawn from the intellectual elite of England and the Continent. He carried that love of learning into his home, where he insisted that his three daughters receive the same classical education as their brother. Only his wife Alice, that doughty pragmatist, held out against the encroachment of science and the classics in the More menage. More himself finally gave up efforts to instruct Mistress Alice in science, complaining humorously that "she could see no difference between the world and the wheel, since both were round."

We see him then as a very human man who would be quite at home in the politics, the professions and the arts of England or America today. A man who loved his books and his family circle; a man who loved God but found in himself no vocation for the priesthood; a man trained in the law and drawn reluctantly into the King's service in full awareness of its perils; a man who was willing to be silenced by his King but who shunned a martyr's death. Above all, this was no man who courted the scaffold.

Why then did Thomas More refuse the Oath that would validate King Henry's claim to spiritual supremacy of the Church of England and thereby condemn himself to a traitor's death?

There is no rhetoric to the martyrdom of Thomas More, no dramatic gestures. One is not tempted to surmise that vanity, fanaticism or stubbornness led him to mortal defiance of the Bishops, the Parliament and the King of his realm. In the Tower of London, where he waited 15 months for his execution, we find the Renaissance Man withdrawn into his last inner citadel, where he would yield nothing of Thomas More.

He who had set the authority of the state so high throughout all the years of his service, gave his life as witness to the fact that there are things the state cannot command.

We have no need to guess at his reasons. Here is no stained-glass figure from a medieval cathedral but a flesh-and-blood man whose life is as well documented if he had died but yesterday. We have his reasons from his own mouth, as he faced his judges and delivered the great plea for man's conscience in language as relevant to our times as to his:

"Ye must understand that in things touching conscience every true and good subject is more bound to have respect to his said conscience and to his soul than to any other thing in all the world beside."

Thomas More might have died in his bed, rich in honors and blest with royal favor, had he so chosen. Never was a man better qualified by training and influence to frame an honorable compromise. All but a handful of England's nobles and churchmen had bowed to the king's will; those who had refused had been disemboweled as traitors, and More had no burning desire to meet with the torturer.

He was offered ample opportunity to strike a bargain that would satisfy his monarch and salve the conscience of a lesser man. There was no dearth of powerful friends who urged him throughout his long imprisonment to take that course. Indeed, he was under constant pressure by friend and foe alike to abandon his stand for the sake of his family and his career, for the opportunity to continue the great and good works of his life.

He chose instead to die.

The choice between conscience and expediency is not peculiar to the age of Thomas More. It is a choice that must be made by all men, of all the seasons, of all generations, by men in private as well as public life.

Ours is a difficult season, a season troubled by materialism, injustice, conflict and national rivalry, but not really so different from the season of this Renaissance Man. The fundamental choice between conscience and expediency is no more difficult for the individual and the nation than it was four centuries ago. But the death of Thomas More bears witness across the barrier of time that the choice is always difficult but always inevitable if man is to go forward.

In the early morning of July 6, 1535, Thomas More died for *his* conscience, and in the dying he quickened a fire that still burns wherever men yearn to be free.

Forbidden by his king to proclaim his cause from the scaffold, Thomas More asked simply for the prayers of the bystanders and then, in the final moment of life, delivered his own epitaph in words that resound through all the seasons of man:

"I die the King's good servant, but God's first."

THE PRESIDENT, PEACE DEMONSTRATIONS, AND AMERICA'S CLEAR RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I wish to commend the newspapers which have put into perspective the Vietnam peace demonstrations erupting around the country.

A large number of newspapers have rightly noted that these protesters share with President Johnson a fundamental desire to find a peaceful solution to this conflict.

But unlike the President, the protesters refuse to face the truth. The United States did not start this war; the Communist forces did. And we are determined to uphold our commitments to the people of South Vietnam until the Communists negotiate with us to solve this problem honorably and peacefully.

The overwhelming majority of Americans stand firmly with President Johnson.

Our people will not be misled by blatant appeals to emotions. They will not be seduced by exhortations that are totally irresponsible.

Our Nation provides the freedom to protest and be heard. But our people reserve the right to scorn wild and malicious tactics that seek to divide the Nation and belittle our leaders.

The President has made clear our responsibilities in Vietnam. And our Nation is determined to meet them honorably until peace can be won.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a sampling of editorial opinion on the demonstrations and responsible behavior during this difficult period.

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

[From Newsday, Apr. 18, 1967]

PROTEST AND RESPONSIBILITY

More than 100,000 persons were in New York this past weekend to join in a protest against the war in Vietnam, and many of them plan to travel next month to Washington to take part in a similar demonstration.

There is no question about their right to assemble peacefully to register protest. It is basic. The Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., who led the rally, described the people who joined in the protest as "by and large patriotic Americans." This, too, is hard to dispute. But there are many disturbing questions surrounding this demonstration and others like it.

The seriousness of some of those who participated can be questioned. It is hard to believe that those who daub their bodies with poster paint as part of a protest against the war in Vietnam are really serious. This fringe element surrounds many antiwar demonstrations. Although the "kooks" are a minority in the antiwar movement, their presence lends weight to the most serious question that can be directed to the demonstrators. Simply stated it is this: Are the demonstrations responsible?

The vast majority of those who marched this past weekend have the franchise. They participated in the elections that chose the government whose policies they protest. Nothing bars them from telling their representatives in Washington how they feel about the war in Vietnam.

Is taking to the streets in large numbers the best way to inform their representatives? And once these representatives are aware of the dissenting point of view, how long can taking to the streets be meaningful? In other words, how far should a minority go in pressing its point of view? This minority has gone very far, and it shows no signs of recognizing the fact that the administration's policies in Vietnam have the backing of the majority of the American people.

The worst result of this unrelenting protest is its impact on the government of North Vietnam. Commenting on the demonstration this past weekend in New York, Secretary of State Rusk said: "I'm concerned . . . that the authorities at Hanoi may misunderstand this sort of thing . . . We do not know whether Hanoi is sufficiently sophisticated to understand that this is not the way the American people come to their decisions and that these demonstrations will not affect the conduct of the war."

Rusk has reason to feel concern. In the current issue of Newsweek, Senior Editor Arnaud de Borchgrave quotes North Vietnam's top military man, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, as telling a visiting diplomat: "We are witnessing the beginning of the end." De Borchgrave explains that Giap sees the protests in the U.S. as an exact parallel to the defeatist activity on the French homefront just before the fall of Dienbienphu.

One of the most disturbing elements in this past weekend's demonstration was the leading part played by civil rights leaders and the manner in which they have been injecting racial overtones into the antiwar protests. Stokely Carmichael, leader of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, called the Vietnam war "racist," and took a stand against the draft. Even more disturbing is the role played by the Rev. Dr. King. Using his civil rights prestige, he is moving to assume a position of leadership in the antiwar movement. We agree with the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which called the Rev. Dr. King's move a "serious tactical mistake."

No one questions the right of the antiwar protestors to demonstrate. But in the light of the effect on the war in Vietnam, we question the wisdom of the demonstrations.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Apr. 19, 1967]

U.S. PEACE DEMONSTRATORS PROLONG VIET WAR

(By Kingsbury Smith)

PARIS, April 19.—The Vietnam war will probably be prolonged at least another 18 months as a result of the latest pacifist demonstrations in New York and San Francisco.

Such is the belief of European diplomats who follow closely the events in North Vietnam and Red China.

These diplomats think the turn-out of over 100,000 people in New York last Saturday in support of the anti-war demonstration will encourage Hanoi to believe the American home front is eroding just as the French home front eroded at the time of Dien Bien Phu.

It will, the diplomats believe, strengthen Hanoi's conviction that if the Communists hold out long enough, American public opinion will force the United States government to pull out of Vietnam.

Diplomatic advices from Hanoi indicate the North Vietnamese regime has been greatly encouraged by reports of the size of the pacifist demonstrations, especially in New York. News of the demonstrations was prominently displayed in the North Vietnamese newspapers, and the people were led to believe that 300,000 demonstrators participated in the New York parade, instead of the 125,000 police estimate. Communist reports also estimated the San Francisco demonstrators at over 100,000 instead of the 20,000 estimate given by police authorities.

Whether it's wishful thinking or lack of reliable information, the North Vietnamese leadership has been interpreting recent events in America as evidence that a majority of the American people are opposed to continued U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war.

These events include the publicly expressed opposition by Senators Robert F. Kennedy and J. William Fulbright to continuation of bombing of North Vietnam, as well as the polls showing a decline in President Johnson's popularity because of America's deep involvement in the war.

* * * * *

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Apr. 19, 1967]

CLIMATE FOR KILLERS

As usual, the violent anti-Vietnam, anti-United States demonstrations aimed at both President Johnson in Latin America and endured by Vice President Humphrey in his recent swing around Europe have aroused considerable indignation thruout the United States.

There have been the usual cries of "ingratitude" for the aid and billions poured into both continents. It's an old story.

But why do we Americans expect Europeans, Asians, Africans and Latin Americans (and, maybe before long, Martians) to treat our nation's leaders with any more respect than we ourselves show them?

We ought to face up to the fact that anti-U.S. demonstrators abroad take their lead from our home-grown dissidents.

If Vice President Humphrey was met thruout Europe by crowds crying "murderer" and if crowds in Montevideo yelled "Assassin" at the President, both men—when they make public appearances in the United States—are only too familiar with hostile local crowds chanting, "Hey, Hey, LBJ, how many kids have you killed today?"

Why should we expect Europeans or Latin Americans to adopt a higher standard of conduct than the Harvard students who shouted down Secretary McNamara?

How can we expect foreigners to place a higher value on our conduct than, say, Dr. Martin Luther King who describes the use of "new" American weapons on the peasants of Vietnam as a counterpart of the Nazi use of "new medicine and new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe?"

Why should we be surprised that Lord Bertrand Russell is organizing a kangaroo court of European intellectuals to try this country and its president for "war crimes" with which Dr. King, an American citizen, already charges us?

In a current magazine article Lewis S. Feuer, sociology professor at the University of Toronto (and former teacher of Philosophy at Berkeley), takes apart the American "intellectual elite."

"No president in American history has evoked the animosity of intellectuals as Lyndon Johnson has," he says, and adds:

"Today, the intellectual elite has been rendering paeans to 'MacBird,' with its crude innuendo that the President fomented the assassination of John F. Kennedy. To them it is of small moment that the play emanates from a circle which has been trying to discredit the Warren Commission report; indeed, the author's husband was an investigator in a group looking for such evidence in Dallas."

It is not freedom of speech that's in question here. It is responsibility of speech that is at issue. All these scurrilous and libelous attacks and implications—on home ground—all this is creating an atmosphere in which another assassination is possible.

The neurotic loner or psychopath who killed the 35th President of the United States is not the only psycho in the nation. There is being fostered in this country an unprecedented climate of reckless abuse and hostility—by relatively small but highly articulate groups across America—that can trigger a repetition of the awful events in Dallas.

It is we—not outsiders—who are doing this to ourselves and our country.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Apr. 20, 1967]

MARCH TO NOWHERE

The "peace marches" held during the weekend in New York and San Francisco certainly provided much encouragement in Hanoi.

North Vietnam's leaders have always considered "anti-war" sentiment in the United States to be their ace-in-the-hole, and are convinced this will one day cause the U.S. to "get out of Vietnam," as the paraders' banners demand.

The tragedy of this is that Hanoi is hypnotized by the world-wide propaganda generated through such marches, and believes they represent the wishes of the majority of the American people. This is simply untrue, unless every sampling of public opinion on the subject is inaccurate, which is unlikely.

Hano's ace-in-the-hole, therefore, is a grim joker.

Unquestionably, few of those who marched can be categorized as "disloyal" Americans in the sense they are deliberately treasonable to their country. They are convinced they are acting in their country's interest. And they have the right to such a view, even though we disagree with them vehemently.

The marchers might consider the fact, though, that "protest" marches such as are freely undertaken in the U.S. would not be permitted in Hanoi or Peking or Moscow, al-

though there are surely persons in those cities who disagree with their government's policies.

An inexcusable aspect of the marches is their total lack of objectivity. None of their banners or chants include demands that Hanoi or the Vietcong "stop-the-war." The demands are solely for a unilateral U.S. cessation of hostilities, as if only the U.S. were doing the shooting in Vietnam. Communist attacks on Vietnamese civilians are ignored.

Some of this one-sided attitude could be rationalized if the marchers consisted solely of youthful, uninformed, and unwashed beatniks. But the parades included, in New York at least, several contingents of professional people from whom more thoughtful judgment can be expected.

It is reasonable to assume, however, that the marchers' ranks do include a segment of determined, dedicated Communists who skillfully and energetically seek to manipulate such events to advantage of the USSR and, perhaps, Red China. The disloyalty of such elements is brazen and self-evident.

Perhaps the greatest tragedy of the marches, though, is in the invective they hurl at President Johnson.

The marchers ignore the fact that President Johnson has engineered the greatest program of social legislation in the nation's history. Most of the measures he has sponsored—among them Medicare, civil rights, education, and the War on Poverty—find vociferous champions among the marchers themselves.

But the marchers revile LBJ, condemning him in crude terms for a war that was begun by Hanoi and is continued by Hanoi in the face of repeated American attempts to negotiate a settlement. In doing so, the marchers display a pathetic lack of political maturity.

They should grow up.

A SALUTE TO COL. CLARE F. FARLEY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on June 16 of this year, the Corps of Engineers will be having its 192d birthday, while Alaska celebrates its centennial.

Without the corps, I doubt much that Alaskans would be in a mood to be blowing out 100 candles on their birthday cake.

The tasks assigned the Alaska district office at Anchorage following the Good Friday earthquake in 1964 were formidable. They proved, however, not to be overwhelming, because once more the corps proved its worth.

Shortly after disaster struck, I spoke in the Senate, telling the story, as of that date, June 16, of the Alaska district and its role in Alaska's recovery. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NINETEEN DECADES OF SERVICE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, several thousand miles lie between Bunker Hill and south central Alaska, and 189 years separate that first severe battle of our American Revolution from the harsh reality of this country's worst earthquake. But there is a strong bond between the two events in our history which tested man's courage and gave him confidence to conquer his enemy.

The bond linking events bridged by almost 19 decades was established when George Washington on June 16, 1775, named as this country's first engineer Col. Richard Gridley who fortified the American position at the Battle of Bunker Hill. June 16, 1964, finds Colonel Gridley's engineering heirs doing battle for Alaska's recovery.

From the days of its beginnings to the present, the Corps of Engineers as it gathered strength has reaped many honors. Not to be forgotten are the difficult tasks assigned to the Corps in World War II, such as construction of artificial harbors, temporary docks and airfields, clearing of beachheads and other actions performed under enemy fire. Surely a great contribution to victory was the Bailey Bridge created through joint efforts of American and British engineers to ease the crossing by troops and equipment of major rivers during the war. Combat found engineers fighting as infantry, especially at the Battle of the Bulge. The engineers served well in war; they serve well in peace.

We in Alaska have had many occasions to mark our gratitude to the Corps of Engineers. Here is a land, strategically located, 586,000 square miles in size including 10 million acres of inland water acres. Through this land flow mighty rivers, the Yukon and the Kushokwim, the Copper and the Sustina, and others. Alaska's shores are washed by the Pacific Ocean, the Bering Sea, the Chukchi Sea, the Arctic Ocean and the Beauford Sea. Alaska is a vast peninsula and its economy in great measure is dependent upon the fishery resources of these waters. And, in turn, our fishermen in need of safe anchorage have found refuge in small boat harbors built under the supervision of the Corps of Engineers.

The corps has had many opportunities to assist when the Alaska spring begins with the breakup of ice on our big rivers. This is the time of floods and high waters. This is the time when through the aid and cooperation of the Army, Air Force, and Navy, the corps puts to practice its authority to relieve such situations. Within the past 3 weeks, in addition to all the tasks it is performing in the wake of Alaska's earthquake, the corps fought floods and performed evacuation of flooded areas. Some 550 Alaskans were moved from flood-threatened areas to rescue centers by the Alaska district of the corps through use of Army and Air Force helicopters. Ninety of these people were moved from Stevens Village on the Yukon and 460 from villages on the Kuskokwim. Over 100 aerial reconnaissance flights were made by hydraulic engineers employed by the Alaska district during breakup. The corps under its authority in such situations to call upon locally available military personnel and equipment asked the Navy to drop 25,000 pounds of bombs to blast out ice jams. The bombing was a major factor in saving the community of Bethel from flooding and alleviating flood damage elsewhere on the Kuskokwim. The Yukon required little bombing this year except at the mouth of the south channel to ease flood threats to the village of Alakanuk and vicinity.

These are examples of how the activities of the corps touch the lives of Alaskans and assist in their problems. These are the kind of aids which Alaskans have long known and appreciated, as have other Americans in similar circumstances throughout our country.

The military construction work performed by the corps in Alaska has been considerable. Large-scale construction did not start until the early 1940's. First begun under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General, the work was transferred to the Chief of Engineers at the end of 1940. It was then that work began on Ladd Air Force Base near Fairbanks and Fort Richardson at Anchorage, on the 1,600-mile Alaska Highway and airstrips in the Aleutian Islands. At the same time under the jurisdiction of the Seattle District Engineer construction of airfields and garrisons started at Yakutat and Annette Islands in southeastern Alaska.

After January of 1941 when the district engineer at Seattle was given the responsibility for War Department construction in Alaska an area office was established at Anchorage. During the period between 1940 and 1946 Alaska military construction totaled $1 billion.

Following World War II representations made for a separate Alaska office were successful, and the Chief of Engineers on April 9, 1946, signed the general order creating the Alaska District, and on May 1 the district began active operation with headquarters at Anchorage. Its first assignment was to carry on the military construction undertaken in World War II. In 1949 civil works responsibilities were added to the initial mission, and the first project in this category was started, the survey of all water resources of Alaska. Major projects of the district's military program have included construction of Army and Air Force bases, troop and family housing, the Haines-Fairbanks pipeline, the DEW line extensions, BMEWS and aircraft and warning stations, Nike-Hercules sites, and Alaska's first nuclear powerplant at the Army base of Fort Greely.

These military construction and civil public works programs have played large roles in Alaska's economic development. Improvement and maintenance of Alaska's navigable waters have aided the fishing and lumbering industries. The potentials of Alaska's hydroelectric energy estimated at upward of 18 million kilowatts of prime power, have been studied and advanced by the Alaska district.

But the biggest task and the most meaningful the Alaska District has been called upon to undertake was assigned by nature when on March 27 at 5:36 p.m., south central Alaska time, the earth rolled and heaved and cracked for seemingly endless minutes, and the huge waves came and then receded and took with them docks and canneries and breakwaters, all vital, almost all destroyed. And the land tilted so that some areas dropped several feet and others rose. A massive reconstruction effort was ordered by President Johnson with initial and considerable assistance coming from his disaster fund administered by the Office of Emergency Planning under the direction of its extremely able and dedicated Director, Edward A. McDermott.

The Alaska district was assigned the task of rebuilding the public sector using OEP disaster funds and in some cases funds available to the corps. The work being accomplished by contract and by the corps itself includes repair of access roads, power and communication cables, water systems and sewers, demolition of buildings, clearing of massive rubble, repair of schools and harbor facilities, and many more. All of this presents a tremendous challenge to skill, to organization, to efficiency, to endurance. Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., the corps' 42d Chief of Engineers, Col. Kenneth T. Sawyer, Alaska's district engineer, and all those who work with them are meeting this challenge magnificently.

In recognition of this contribution to Alaska's reconstruction and for past services rendered and as a salute to the 189th anniversary of the Corps of Engineers, Alaska's Gov. William A. Eagan has proclaimed this day U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Day in the 49th State. I ask unanimous consent to have the Governor's proclamation printed at this point in the RECORD as I take this opportunity to add my congratulations and thanks to the Corps of Engineers as it turns toward its 20th decade of service to this country.

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

"Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will celebrate its 189th birthday on June 16, 1964; and

"Whereas for 95 years the Corps of Engineers have been active in Alaska in many fields including construction and improvement of Alaska's harbors, navigation channels, and flood control projects; and

"Whereas with the advent of World War II, the Corps of Engineers constructed under extremely adverse conditions, the Alaska Highway, linking Alaska with the first 48 States; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers also supervised construction of the Nation's northern defense system on Alaskan soil; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers responded speedily and efficiently in rendering assistance to earthquake stricken south-central Alaska; and have diligently pursued plans and activation of a reconstruction program designed to get Alaska's economy back in normal channels: now, therefore,

"I, William A. Egan, Governor of the State of Alaska, in recognition of the achievements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, hereby proclaim Tuesday, June 16, 1964, as U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Day in Alaska and urge all Alaskans to pay recognition to the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, both uniformed and civilian, for the tremendous task they have achieved in planning, construction, and maintenance programs in the State of Alaska, as well as throughout our Nation.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of Alaska to be affixed, this 3d day of June in the year of our Lord, 1964.

"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor.

"Attest:

"HUGH J. WADE,
"Secretary of State."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Alaska district, at the time of that speech, was headed by Col. Kenneth T. Sawyer, who did a superlative job. Shortly after my June 1964 speech, Colonel Sawyer was assigned as Deputy Chief of Staff, Logistics, at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Alaskans will always be grateful to him for his brilliant service in our time of crisis.

Alaskans were again fortunate in that Col. Clare F. Farley was assigned as district engineer to replace Colonel Sawyer. He came on duty in August of 1964, and now that duty is soon coming to an end. Alaskans will welcome his successor, Col. Ernest L. Hardin, Jr. However, they will say goodby to Colonel Farley with deep regret mixed with affection and gratitude.

Since his graduation from West Point 24 years ago, Colonel Farley has served in Iowa, New York, and Kansas; and attended the War College in Carlisle, Pa. After his commissioning in 1943, he saw service in Europe during World War II and was a platoon leader of combat engineers landing on Omaha Beach on D-day, June 6, 1944. He also saw service in the Korean war when he served with the 2d Engineer Combat Battalion of the 2d Infantry Division. On leaving Alaska this coming summer he will be assigned to Washington headquarters to serve in the Directorate of Topography and Military Engineering.

Most assuredly, Colonel Farley and those who work with him have earned the respect and appreciation of Alaskans. During the 3-year period of Colonel Farley's jurisdiction, some $175½ million worth of projects were underway, including those scheduled for award through August of this year. This includes 126 earthquake restoration projects valued at $50½ million, 30 civil works projects valued at $10,367,000, 222 military construction projects worth $103,748,000, and 14 other contracts for such agencies as the Public Health Service and the Atomic Energy Commission in the amount of $10,937,000.

Work connected with the earthquake provided restoration of schools, hospitals, water supply and other utility systems, airfields, harbors, docks, and public buildings. Major projects included the buttress in downtown Anchorage, a new waterfront in Seldovia and Cordova, the new railroad and harbor complex in Seward, and a complete new city for Valdez, as well as new harbor and dock facilities in Homer and Kodiak. Emergency school repair and utility work were accomplished for the beginning of school and the onset of cold weather in 1964, and the remainder of the emergency work was completed by 1966.

At the same time, the district carried on its major construction program for both the Army and the Air Force. At more than 50 locations, from southeastern Alaska to the Arctic Coast, to St. Lawrence Island, and to Shemya and Attu, projects were constructed. Among the more significant undertakings in this program are the Whittier-Anchorage pipeline and tunnel now under construction, new hangars for both the Air Force and the Army, the protection of the Air Force installation at Galena from the Yukon River's destructive potential, and major family housing additions at Fort Greely, Elmendorf Air Force Base, and Fort Richardson. This year, with the authorization to undertake additional work, the district will initiate 80 new military projects before the end of June.

In its role as a major construction agency available to all elements of the Federal Government, the district has undertaken and completed work for the Defense Atomic Support Agency in connection with the successful underground nuclear test on the Aleutian Island of Amchitka. At Fairbanks, on the site of the University of Alaska, the district completed in record time a water pollution laboratory for the U.S. Public Health Service, and is now completing the Arctic Health Research Center facility. Urban renewal work has also been undertaken in Valdez, Cordova, Kodiak, and Seldovia, in addition to the buttress in downtown Anchorage. At present, the district is participating in both engineering and construction supervision for the work being done by the Atomic Energy Commission in Alaska.

Of prime importance to the State of Alaska, the civil works program of the corps is now underway and gathering momentum. The small boat harbor at Sitka is completed, a major hydropower project at Snettisham in southeastern Alaska will be placed under construction this year, and lesser projects have already received initial approval. More than 20 other potential facilities for improved navigation, production of hydroelectric power, flood control, and beach erosion are under study by the district. The favorable results anticipated from some of these investigations will provide Alaska with the improvements needed to keep pace with our growing population and dynamic economy.

I imagine that Colonel Farley will never again face the challenges which have been his during his Alaska service. He met them all head on; he accomplished much. We will miss him.

INVITATION TO GO FISHING IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the April 20 issue of the Roane County Reporter, of Spencer, W. Va., contains a poetic invitation to go fishing in West Virginia, phrased by Mr. Roy Lee Harmon, poet laureate of West Virginia, which I wish to pass on to the Members of the 90th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the poem be printed in the RECORD.

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

TROUT FISHING INVITATION

(By Roy Lee Harman, poet laureate of West Virginia)

When Spring walks down the far-flung hills
With flowers in her hair,
Forsake the hurried pace which kills,
And laugh at every care.

Go fish a West Virginia stream
Where fighting trout leap high;
Go share an angler's fondest dream
And watch your troubles die.

I claim that every fishing trip
Will lengthen out life's span;
It makes the darkest problems dip
For any fishin' man.

The trout are there, so take your fill
Of blessed fishin' fun
Within this land of dale and hill
Beneath a friendly sun.

Just put those pills upon the shelf
And grab your fishing gear,
Go land a mess of trout yourself
In water crystal clear.

The trout streams sing . . . so let your soul
Echo the glad refrains;
Today peace is an easy goal,
It's fishin' time again.

BUSINESSMEN SUPPORT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., an organization having 232,338 members in the 50 States and the District of Columbia, has announced the results of a nationwide poll of its members on the question of whether the electoral college should be retained or direct popular election should be substituted as a means of choosing the President and Vice President.

The poll was conducted on the basis of Senate Joint Resolution 2, which I introduced on January 11, 1967, for myself and several other Senators. This amendment proposes doing away with the archaic system of electing our chief executive officers in favor of the democratic principle of popular choice.

It is gratifying to me to learn that the members of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., all of whom are independent business proprietors, overwhelmingly endorsed this proposal. The poll showed 75 percent in favor, 18 percent opposed, with 7 percent undecided.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this is yet another indication of the widespread support of this proposal among people from all walks of life. Other diverse groups whose members

have indicated similar support include the United Auto Workers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the American Bar Association.

Another poll, which was previously conducted by the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], showed that approximately 90 percent of the State legislators throughout the Nation favored direct election of the President and Vice President.

This evidence indicates that the people want to elect their President in the same way they now choose practically all other government leaders, whether it be township trustee, county supervisor, mayor, Governor, or Senator. It is time that Congress answered this apparent mandate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release describing the poll and its results as conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.

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

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1967.

Insofar as the nation's independent business proprietors are concerned, the electoral method of electing a President of the United States should be scrapped in favor of the election being based on a majority of the popular vote by the population as a whole.

This is reflected in the result of a nationwide poll just completed by the National Federation of Independent Business on Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, by Senator Birch Bayh, Ind., which would amend the constitution to affect this change in the method of electing.

The results show 75 per cent in favor, 18 per cent opposed, with 7 per cent undecided.

In Indiana the vote was 79 per cent in favor, 17 per cent opposed, with 4 per cent undecided.

This proposed change in the national election law is expected to create a great deal of interest. The opposition viewpoint appears to base its position on the belief that such a method would destroy the two-party system and open the door for formation of other parties.

Supporters, who contend the present system weakens the smaller states claim that 90 per cent of the respondents to a poll conducted among 8,000 state legislators want a change in the present method, and also that the American Bar Association has called the present system "archaic and dangerous."

Do you favor presidential election by majority popular vote of the people?

[State breakdown figures]

State	Percent		
	In favor	Against	Undecided
Alabama	81	14	5
Alaska	80	15	5
Arizona	76	20	4
Arkansas	77	17	6
California	75	19	6
Colorado	77	16	7
Connecticut	77	17	6
Delaware	79	16	5
Florida	80	16	4
Georgia	70	22	8
Hawaii	76	21	3
Idaho	78	17	5
Illinois	74	19	7
Indiana	79	17	4
Iowa	74	18	8
Kansas	76	18	6
Kentucky	66	25	9
Louisiana	73	21	6
Maine	82	14	4
Maryland	77	15	8

Do you favor presidential election by majority popular vote of the people?—Con.

[State breakdown figures]

State	Percent		
	In favor	Against	Undecided
Massachusetts	79	16	5
Michigan	73	20	7
Minnesota	79	13	8
Mississippi	83	11	6
Missouri	76	18	6
Montana	75	20	5
Nebraska	76	18	6
Nevada	82	12	6
New Hampshire	75	17	8
New Jersey	74	18	8
New Mexico	77	16	7
New York	75	18	7
North Carolina	75	19	6
North Dakota	80	15	5
Ohio	76	17	7
Oklahoma	82	13	5
Oregon	78	15	7
Pennsylvania	77	16	7
Rhode Island	81	15	4
South Carolina	75	18	7
South Dakota	82	14	4
Tennessee	75	17	8
Texas	78	18	4
Utah	74	20	6
Vermont	75	23	2
Virginia	71	21	8
Washington	77	17	6
Washington, D.C.	83	11	6
West Virginia	71	24	5
Wisconsin	79	14	7
Wyoming	74	20	6

COLUMBIA POINT NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH CENTER

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, some of the most significant and promising antipoverty activity in Massachusetts is underway at the Columbia Point housing project in Dorchester, just outside of Boston. The Columbia Point neighborhood health center has become a national model for similar health centers in other cities across the country, but it is only one of several closely related projects which are helping Columbia Point residents to help themselves out of poverty.

An article by Sherry Petchul in the Christian Science Monitor of March 23 describes the equally successful Patricia M. Hassett day-care center at Columbia Point, which combines the attributes of comprehensive day care services with those of a year-round Headstart program. This is a program which is proving to be of enormous benefit and importance to parents and to the entire Columbia Point community, as well as to the 65 little children who are enrolled in the center program.

Mr. President, I think Miss Petchul's article has a good deal to say about the importance of the economic opportunity programs to poor communities.

I ask unanimous consent that it be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

HEAD START: DAY CARE BOLSTERS FAMILIES

(By Sherry Petchul)

BOSTON.—"In the willows where the warm breezes blow, chee-rump," hums a naptime record for children whose world is the Columbia Point, Dorchester, housing project.

Some of the 65 three- and four-year-olds at the Patricia M. Hassett Day-Care Center at Columbia Point use their imaginations to extend this world.

"I have a cow."

"You do?"

"I keep it in the front yard."

A rule at the project forbids pets.

DAYCARE CENTER BUSY

The staff at the day-care center, delegated as one of Boston's five year-round Head Start centers, works hard to give the children real experiences beyond the limited housing-project environment.

The children visited a downtown store to see the Christmas decorations. They bought ingredients and made cranberry-orange relish for their mothers. They've had rides on the subway and, on the swan boats in the Public Garden.

One class, working on a transportation unit, has been to Logan Airport and actually boarded a plane.

Unlike many day-care centers, where supervision and baby-sitting are the only services, the full-time center at Columbia Point emphasizes education, health, and social service.

GOALS SHARED

"Day care involves, these three components in order to serve families and children well," says Sibley Higginbotham, executive director of Associated Day-Care Services, which administers the center.

He adds, "A good day-care program, a good Head Start program, and a good educational program have a lot of the same goals."

Head Start objectives include health checks; school preparation involving reading readiness, ability to work and play within the group, and acceptance of adult guidance; parent involvement in the children's education; and community participation in the project.

The four classes at Columbia Point, grouped basically by age, are handled by four professional teachers and four aids from the community.

HELPING START READERS

Reading readiness activities include everything from field trips to extend awareness to a child matching letters from a felt board with his own name printed by the teacher. In one class, it meant drawing out a child who didn't talk for two months.

The Columbia Point center has a "uniquely strong social-work component," according to Mr. Higginbotham. Two full-time social workers, a case worker and a group worker, contribute to the center's goal of "100 percent social service."

Mrs. Marilyn Kalis, the center's group worker, meets with two groups of mothers once a week. They may discuss budgeting, marital adjustments, or the problems of living in a housing project.

Mrs. Marilyn Kalis, the center's group director, has a meeting open to all of the mothers once a month. "I take my cues from what the parents want," she says. At Christmas the mothers learned to knit and made stockings for their children. A child librarian visited to talk about children's books.

DEATH OF A RUSSIAN COSMONAUT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I know I speak for all Americans when I rise to express the feeling of great sadness I have over the death this morning of Vladimir Komarov, the Russian cosmonaut.

Komarov was a dedicated space pioneer and a courageous man. The 40-year-old cosmonaut, a veteran space pilot who orbited the earth in 1964 was grounded by Soviet space doctors shortly after that flight because he had a heart murmur. But 5 months after an operation to restore his health, and despite the doubts of Soviet medical officials, Komarov was back in physical trim and,

according to Soviet news agencies, the No. 1 Russian cosmonaut.

When earth-bound man attempts such a bold undertaking as space flight, with its inherent dangers, known and unknown, there are certain to be great tragedies. We Americans know the full measure of this tragedy in the recent loss of three of our own astronauts. But it is a mark of the courage and dedication of these space pioneers that they press on in their unparalleled adventures with enthusiasm.

John Donne said it very well 350 years ago:

> No man is an island, entire unto himself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friends or of thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind.

Cosmonaut Komarov's death is a tragedy, a tragedy which I know is felt by peoples everywhere.

NATIONWIDE RAILROAD STRIKE CANNOT BE TOLERATED: LABOR AND MANAGEMENT HAVE DIRECT RESPONSIBILITY TO ACHIEVE A SETTLEMENT IN PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, despite sincere efforts of the President of the United States, the Congress, and three of the Nation's most experienced mediators, the railway unions and the carriers seem unable to reach an agreement at this time which would avert a disastrous rail strike just 8 days from now.

President Johnson has announced that, although the disputing parties are separated by only dollars and cents, no settlement has been reached.

This is a time for the national interest to be served—and under the circumstances a week is adequate time in which to serve the national interest by negotiating a settlement.

We all know the consequences of a nationwide strike. In his announcement Saturday, President Johnson declared:

> The cost is incalculable—food shortages would occur, health hazards would develop, factories would close and workers across the nation would be idled. Our prosperity would be seriously imperiled. Beyond this, the impact of a railroad stoppage on our efforts to support the 500,000 valiant servicemen in Southeast Asia make it abundantly clear that a strike at this time cannot be tolerated.

As I said in the Senate on April 11, my home State of West Virginia would be among the first to feel the catastrophic effects of a complete shutdown of the five railroad systems serving our people, our industry, and our commerce. The general economy of West Virginia would be staggered from the direct results of coal and rail stoppages alone. To then add to the economic chaos the impact of a railroad strike on the chemical, steel, and glass industries would be to compound the problem into economic catastrophe and widely spread human suffering.

The President's statement of April 22, 1967, was a strong and sobering one, and the conditions which would grow out of a general rail strike in West Virginia would be intolerable. The public interest must be served and the public must be protected.

I am pleased that the President's three-man panel of competent and dedicated mediators testified before our Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare today in an open and candid discussion of the crisis the Nation faces in the threat of a railroad shutdown. It was gratifying to hear that the panel is now drawing recommendations to the President as to what additional action the members of that distinguished group believe will be necessary to prevent a strike and to achieve a fair and just settlement in this case.

But I sincerely hope that further action by the President or by the Congress will be unnecessary. I hope that labor and management will go back to the conference table and settle this matter themselves. Hence, I am in complete agreement with the resolution reported by our Labor and Public Welfare Committee today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes during the morning hour.

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

THE KENNEDY ROUND—WILL THE AMERICAN FARMER BE SOLD OUT?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Kennedy round of the trade negotiations will be ending in a matter of a few weeks. It will then be up first to the administration, and later the Senate, to evaluate the results of those negotiations and decide what has been accomplished.

These decisions will have major import to many areas of trade, for two reasons none more important than those affecting agriculture.

First, U.S. agricultural exports have moved ahead more rapidly than any other export item since the early 1960's; and we must be certain that the outcome of these negotiations provide an opportunity for continued maintenance and growth in these agricultural exports. This is important to farmers, to the agribusiness complex, and to our total economy.

Second, in that these agricultural exports play a vital role in the continuing unfavorable balance-of-payments problem, the results of the Trade Expansion Act are important to all Americans.

Since the early 1960's, each year U.S. agriculture has set new export records year after year. Let me cite a few facts and figures.

U.S. agricultural exports today are at an alltime high of some $7 billion annually. That is slightly over one-fourth of the Nation's total exports—agricultural and industrial combined—and an increase of more than 50 percent since 1960.

This Nation now exports the output of one in every 4 harvested acres, with the total area that produces for export about 80 million acres, seven times the total harvested acreage of my own State of Missouri.

Exports bring the American farmer 17 cents of every market dollar he receives, or almost twice as much as a dozen years ago; in other words, the export contribution to domestic farm income has almost doubled during that period. In addition, these exports have naturally expanded income by a substantial amount through the strengthening of farm prices across the board.

We have three agricultural export commodities of billion-dollar size—wheat, oilseeds, and feedgrains; and soon we will have our first billion-dollar customer—Japan.

The progress in agricultural exports in the 1960's will go down in history as a great achievement, not the least of which is the healthful effect on our country's balance of payments.

From a trade balance point of view, we are doing much better in our agricultural trade than in our industrial trade. As example, in the calendar year 1966, the United States had a total favorable trade balance of $3.6 billion; and of that total the agricultural trade balance accounted for $2.4 billion, two-thirds of this favorable margin.

Since 1960, dollar exports of farm products have totaled $29.1 billion, which, along with $1.8 billion in "avoided expenditures" through the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480, gave a total of $30.9 billion in dollar earnings from agricultural exports to apply against the dollar drain. Without agricultural exports, our serious international finances would be in critical shape.

This extraordinary growth in farm exports is the result of careful planning and aggressive execution of programs incident to market development. Secretary Freeman and his associates in the Department of Agriculture had the foresight to recommend legislation first in feed grains, then wheat, and more recently in cotton which led to the development and expansion of our export markets for agricultural commodities. The Congress then approved new agricultural programs which largely eliminated surpluses and also enabled our major commodities to be priced competitively in the world markets. The programs in wheat and feed grains have proved themselves, and cotton is moving in the same direction.

Some of the success of this program has been spectacular, for instance, the building of feed grains into the largest export dollar earner this country has, exceeding even the largest industrial export item—motor vehicle and tractor parts.

Excellent work has been done in Japan on behalf of wheat, soybeans, and tallow; in Western Europe on rice, fruit, and soybeans; and in cotton all around the world. Effective farm product promotion has also been accomplished through trade fairs abroad, particularly in the case of processed food.

Nevertheless these imaginative promotional efforts are about powerless unless the doors to trade are kept open; and

that is why the success of the Kennedy round is so important.

Perhaps the most famous example of what happens when trade doors are slammed in our face is the so-called poultry war with the European Common Market; a war which began when our poultry industry, through diligent promotional work, opened up a growing and lucrative business in broiler chickens in Western Europe, principally West Germany.

After the formation of the Common Market, the German market for broilers was virtually closed to the United States. This was done through a system of levies designed to freeze out outside suppliers and build up the domestic production.

After long but fruitless protests, the United States took retaliatory action by suspending trade concessions on certain European products shipped to this country. Among them were trucks, brandy, and potato starch.

An obvious drawback to this development is that the U.S. action, although the only one available to us, did nothing to help American poultry farmers. They lost this important new market.

As it turned out, the poultry producers and consumers of the Common Market countries also lost. Overprotection brought an overproduction that has proved disastrous to poultry prices throughout the area. At the same time, poultry consumption in Europe failed to grow as expected, because nothing was done to keep retail prices low.

In other words, consumers are currently bearing the cost of the excessive market protection extended to the farmers of the European Common Market. It is vitally important to the entire U.S. economy that the Kennedy round give American farmers assurance that the doors of foreign trade will be open to them. That can only be accomplished by obtaining meaningful agricultural trade arrangements with the Common Market in the present Kennedy round negotiations.

The European Common Market is the world's largest importer of farm products. It takes over $11 billion worth a year, of which more than $1.5 billion worth has been coming from the United States. That is close to one-fourth of all the export markets of our farmers.

Today the big question is grain.

Last year, the Common Market bought $650 million worth of grain from the United States. Most of this was feed grain—corn and grain sorghum.

This trade has now been rendered more uncertain as a result of the Common Market countries expanding grain production. The market's system of high internal grain prices could, if unchecked, close that market to the grain exporters of the world. That is what the U.S. negotiators at Geneva are working to prevent—just this occurrence—so as to keep this market open to U.S. growers of wheat, corn, and grain sorghums.

We have a big stake in other product areas, as well—meat, fruits and vegetables, vegetable oils, dairy products, poultry, tobacco, and others.

As the Kennedy round negotiations move into their final days—virtually their final hours—let us all be alert to just what is at stake for both our farmers and all the people of our Nation.

Secretary Freeman has spearheaded the American farmers' fight for access to world markets. He has traveled abroad repeatedly and has spoken out publicly and privately in Europe, Asia, and Latin America in behalf of reduction of foreign trade barriers in order to attain the freest possible flow of agricultural products among the producing and consuming peoples.

The Kennedy round, conducted under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, can set the stage for true growth in world farm trade for many years to come. It will determine whether the great natural advantages of this Nation as a food producer are turned to our benefit, or sacrificed to protectionism in other lands.

Now the moment of truth is at hand.

The problem is a relatively simple one. Will our negotiators sell our farmers down the river? Will they compromise the European market outlets that our farmers have developed on a competitive basis?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the able Senator from South Dakota, one of the foremost agricultural authorities in the Senate, and hope he agrees with the comments I just made.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Missouri that I not only agree with the statement he has delivered on the Senate floor today, but I also regard it as one of the most crucial and important statements that have been made in the Senate this year.

The Senator speaks to some of the most fundamental questions affecting not only the future of American agriculture, but also the capacity of America to carry out its commitments in many areas of the world.

The Senator has spoken with great cogency about the relationship of our agricultural prosperity to the open markets in Western Europe and the importance of keeping those markets open on an expanded basis to the products we produce on our farms and ranches across the country.

Beyond that, the Senator has warned us of the close relationship that an expanded agricultural trade plays in maintaining our balance of payments.

I think the Senator from Missouri has given more careful thought and attention to this whole problem of the relationship of trade, and particularly our agricultural trade, to our balance of payments and then, in turn, the relationship of our balance-of-payments position to our capacity to carry out our commitment to the world than any other Senator.

The Senator is an expert in this very complicated field. He has demonstrated here in his statement today a capacity to reduce complex problems to simple English in a way that, I am sure, will be understood by everyone who reads the statement.

I would like to ask the Senator if, considering the fact that we are carrying a disproportionate share of the load in granting food assistance to the developing world—some of it under an outright grant basis and some on a conditional sales basis—he thinks we can continue to carry that kind of load if our commercial markets in Western Europe are cut off?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me first thank the Senator for his kind but undeserved remarks, especially because they come from one who, as I mentioned, is an authority in this field.

My answer to his question would be "No." As I understand it, our negotiators hoped to have what might be termed a "pool" of $10 million of agricultural products. That proposed figure was heavily cut to less than one-third of the original amount.

I say to the able Senator that I would much prefer to handle foreign aid with food rather than dollars. When we do it with the former we have more assurance that the aid will get to the place for which it is intended. We also improve the income of the American farmer through eliminating surpluses.

I agree with the Senator. If I may extend his thought—and let him correct me if wrong—I think the time has come when the American people have to decide whether we can continue to carry on so many unilateral financial policies without ultimately running into even deeper fiscal and monetary problems.

In connection with the Common Market negotiations we have done our best, ever since World War II, to promote the economic stability and the prosperity of those countries. Nevertheless it would appear from recent reports that they are desirous of establishing the type and character of quotas, or variable levies, which, regardless of the price at which we would be willing to sell, will make it impossible for Americans to move agricultural products into those countries in Europe.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I think the Senator is in almost a unique position as far as his committee experience in the Senate is concerned. He served for a number of years on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and served with great distinction on that committee. In recent years, he has had the opportunity to serve on the Committee on Foreign Relations where he has been able to sharpen his own insight and understanding of the close relationship between our commitments abroad and our food-producing industry here at home.

Beyond that, his service on the Armed Services Committee has given him a special insight, I think, into our security problems around the world.

I quite agree with him that we cannot discharge those obligations, we cannot continue to carry the lion's share of the development assistance programs around the globe and the security commitments we have made unless we have a strong, favorable balance-of-payments situation. Certainly, agricultural trade is absolutely crucial to that.

I commend the Senator for his very important statement. I hope it will be widely and thoughtfully read.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senator is very kind. I do thank him.

THE ROLE OF THE CONGRESS AND THE POLITICAL VITALITY OF STATE GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on April 6, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] made a very fine address at Wayne State University in Detroit.

The title of the address is: "The Role of the Congress and the Political Vitality of State Government."

The Senator from California made many very interesting observations in the address.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech of the Senator from California printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE ROLE OF THE CONGRESS AND THE POLITICAL VITALITY OF STATE GOVERNMENT

(Text of address by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, Wayne State University, Detroit, April 6, 1967)

I deem it a high honor to participate in this series of lectures in dedication of the Wayne State University Law Center. Yours is a great educational institution, rendering an ever larger service to society, meanwhile adding great luster to the State of Michigan, and the city of Detroit. I serve in the Senate with two respected and able citizens from this area. Philip A. Hart and Robert P. Griffin are my friends, and I pay to each my sincere respects as I come to their State. I am privileged to call your great Governor, George Romney, my friend. He is highly respected all across the country, and is an acknowledged leader of my political party.

"Detroit" is the catchword of modern industrial progress. Your best known product, the American automobile, has revolutionized our society. For a third of a century, my State of California has long been your best customer. Motorcar transportation is here to stay, although I recall Sir Winston's words: "I have always considered that the substitution of the internal combustion engine for the horse marked a very gloomy milestone in the progress of mankind."

We meet together representing, as we do, opposite ends of a vital chain of human activity to consider the rules of our society in this fast moving final third of the Twentieth Century. In my opinion, the great power of a representative system of government, like our own, is its sure instinct for citing public problems and meeting public needs. And it is the people who shape the instinct in their representatives, and who create the power. It is their government, and, over the long haul, it is responsive to their needs.

Any discussion of our American society, and of any of its governmental segments must keep squarely in view the full scope of human initiative as it may unfold in the public or the private components of our economic life, in government or in business and industry, in the college campus or the labor unions, in tax-exempt foundations or the church. If the Bureau of Reclamation chooses not to build a reservoir with its hydroelectric power potential, the Corps of Engineers may decide to do so, and if neither does, a privately owned utility may take up the challenge, or the most affected community may do so. Or it may be all the other way around. Government may do what private enterprise fails or refuses to do. If NASA rejects a research project, the Ford Foundation may fund it. If a county welfare organization cannot or does not add another needy family to its list, a labor union may step in to help. The total democratic society, for all its faults, is quite responsive to public needs in this modern existence, where improving techniques for communication give us constantly more information about our neighbors across the street or around the world. If human virtue has not become visibly stronger with the passing of time, there is certainly, in this present era, far more reason to apply what virtue we have in seeking to respond properly to society's needs.

There have always been those who would undersell the effectiveness of American democracy. In the Nineteenth Century, Lord Macaulay wrote that the democratic aspects of American life "will produce fatal effects if they shall last until North America has two hundred inhabitants to the square mile." Macaulay foresaw a rapid population increase resulting from unrestricted immigration; he saw the closing of the frontier and the occupation of all available land. He predicted that Americans would eventually have to choose between "civilization and liberty", because our political system provided little defense against tyranny. "Your Constitution," he wrote, "is all sail and no anchor."

Thomas Babbington Macaulay, favored of Queen Victoria, author of "Horatio at the Bridge", failed to recognize the prowess and the determination of the citizens of American democracy. He didn't take the trouble to visit America. His fashionable aristocratic Victorian prejudices against democracy were unsullied by objective study.

This was not true of Macaulay's French contemporary, Alexis de Tocqueville, who traveled extensively in the United States and who saw the effects of democracy in almost every aspect of life and who commented on many of them, including an asseveration that democracy had a benign effect on both love and virtue. De Tocqueville concluded his work with a testimonial to the superiority of American women as the main strength and prosperity of America. He found democracy a very positive force, indeed.

De Tocqueville was, on balance, an optimist. Macaulay foresaw calamity. And, perhaps, they were both right.

The population surge is with us, the frontier is closed, the land is filling up—and, yet, our American democratic system has been, and shows every prospect of continuing to be, highly effective, highly flexible, and highly responsive in meeting the nation's needs.

In the last century there began a trend, like it or not, in American business and industry towards merger and consolidation. The independent businessman has had to fight for his existence. That he still succeeds is a tribute to him and to his willingness to deal with current problems in a progressive, forward-looking way. I think the evolution of American government has followed somewhat the same pattern. Problems, long considered "local", began to run across state lines. A strong federal executive, accepting the new challenge, sped by the states—in part because of the laggards. The pendulum was swinging. Effective action began to come at the national level. In the last century this process became increasingly marked. Let us examine it from the beginning.

Our Founding Fathers wrote the American Constitution relying on the assumption that our people were largely pastoral and, therefore, to a large extent, immobile. They should not be faulted for failing to envision Messrs. Ford, Dodge, Durant et al. Thomas Jefferson saw a nation of farmers. With the vast untapped treasure of land to the west across the Alleghenies, there seemed no reason to assume for the foreseeable future there should be any significant challenge to the fulfillment of his ideal. Indeed, through most of the Nineteenth Century, while the frontier remained open, succeeding waves of western migration substantially repeated the settlement experience of earlier colonists in Virginia, New York and the Middle West.

Nothing is more remarkable than visiting a rural Iowa town founded in the late Nineteenth Century where a New England church with its white steeple stands by the side of a green common—the very landscape of Vermont or Massachusetts. In California and Oregon settlements grew in this pattern with the same inculcation of morality and education, the same architectural emphasis, almost the same landscape.

Through the Nineteenth Century this system worked well, but for one great flaw—the inequalities among men accepted in the so-called "three-fifths compromise" and in the continuation of human slavery in the southern states. A nation founded on the proposition that all men are created equal could not tolerate these contradictions. There could be no forward progress until they were expunged.

Compromise failed to remove this flaw from our Constitutional system. Thus, the one great weakness in our Federal structure was atoned by Civil War, a bloody conflict whose aftermath was to alter forever the Jeffersonian dream.

One important aftereffect was the growth of my own political party—dedicated to the principle that racist contradiction must be rooted out and to the proposition that democratic government is a cipher if it fails to meet clear public issues. Republicans of the late Nineteenth Century saw that the basic principles of the Constitution were correct, but they saw, too, that the whole context of our society had changed from agriculture to industry, and from rural to urban life. The 1860's had demonstrated how the field of action is shifted to the Federal level whenever any group of states, even a minority, refuse to join in facing major national issues.

The pattern of government following the Civil War revealed almost a fear of leaving issues to the mercy of the states. Succeeding amendments to the Constitution not only took power away from the state legislatures, such as the election of Senators, but also transferred major functions to the Federal Government. Examples were the 16th Amendment, authorizing a Federal income tax, and the 18th Amendment, prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages. By contrast, almost all other Constitutional amendments have been directly related to extending our democracy—suffrage for women, abolition of the poll tax, or perfecting our Executive system—Presidential disability, limitation on Presidential terms of office.

Today, we are neither pastoral nor immobile. The frontier is closed; there is no more available free land to support a purely agricultural economy. Less than 6.4% of our population now live on farms. The nation has become industrialized and urbanized.

The very rate of population growth will have a profound effect on our Federal system. By the year 2000, it is predicted that there will be 40 to 50 million people in my State of California. At today's rates of 450,000 people per Congressional district, our State's House delegation would be around 100. The probabilities are that the House would not wish to increase materially its present ceiling of 435 members. Perhaps, the population per district might simply double.

My sympathies and compassion pour out for my California successors in the Senate three decades hence. How will each one answer his mail? On highly controversial issues, my mail from home runs into thousands per day. Californians are extremely prolific letter writers. What a nightmare to envision the letter writing proliferation of the next generation or two. Even with a staff of 40 or 50 or 60 people, my successor at the turn of the century would be hard put mechanically, let alone intellectually, to an-

swer his mail and see even a fraction of the hundreds of constituents who, after an hour's jet travel, would descend upon his office. When would he be able to do any thinking? How would he find time to research and study and try to arrive at sound judgments?

We are reaching a point in our development when the national legislative branch must free itself from every time-consuming, unnecessary encumbrance which prevents legislators from dealing with the great issues facing our country.

Congress still continues to be city council for the District of Columbia, a chore, however important, it should have delegated to citizens of our capital city long ago.

Private immigration bills continue by the hundreds to clog Congressional calendars each session.

Rules of procedure, I speak here of rules in the Senate, need to be thoroughly overhauled to prevent the frustration of the public interest by obstructionists. Quite aside from eliminating the filibuster, we need to require a little greater relevance in debate, and to write in a little greater assurance against one or two men tying the whole Senate up in knots—which takes place more frequently when the Congress tries to come to grips with the major issues of our society.

Earlier this year, the Senate passed a bill providing for appointment of Postmasters by the Executive Branch, a worthy step, which I hope the House may approve. You would be surprised at how much time can be consumed today, in both the House and Senate, over a Postmaster controversy.

I think Congress must give consideration to delegating its less vital prerogatives to executive agencies so that it may turn its attention, fully and unhurriedly, to the issues of life or death which will continue to plague mankind until the millennium arrives.

Today, while the Congress continues to deal with a broad spectrum of minor matters, practically any issue can be said to be within the proper and legal sphere of action of the Federal Government. The Supreme Court in *United States vs. Darby* interpreted the Interstate Commerce Clause to include any economic activity "affecting commerce." In the famous *Wickard vs. Filburn* decision, the scope of regulation was extended to include agricultural produce raised and consumed on the same farm. The Court reasoned that "the conflicts of interest between the regulated (sic) and those who advantage by it are wisely left under this system to resolution by the Congress under its more flexible and responsible legislative process." Even by a strict interpretation of the Constitution, those who disagree with some of the Court's rulings would have to concede to the Federal Government great power today, because virtually every item of domestic concern in some way flows over state borders.

We are today vitally concerned with problems, such as the purification of air and water, quantities not circumscribed by fixed boundaries. In the past we have left such matters to nature, but we do so now at our peril. The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, a distinguished Californian, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, recently told a Senate Committee that Man must give up the belief that he is "conquering" Nature. Rather, he must now settle for "co-existence." In these new battles to avoid suffocation and desiccation, to enjoy the bounty which every man thought was free until a few years ago, the boundaries of the states have increasingly less relevance.

More important, men are on the move. In California an average family moves every four years, or less. As men move across state lines, there is an increasing need for national standards to regulate conditions of work on a uniform basis. If one state allows for cheap labor while another has fair standards, then labor will move from one state to the other or business in the latter state will be faced with unfair competition. The work of the Congress in providing nationally uniform laws to remove this inequity may actually reduce the mobility of manpower—a factor which in the long run all states might be thankful for.

Whenever the states refuse to take action, the venue for resolution of the issue moves to Washington. If one state has inadequate laws to protect the working man, if its educational system is years behind the times, if its public health establishment has neither modern standards or equipment nor trained technicians, the citizens of that state will be encouraged to emigrate. No state has more experience with that problem than my own. As if following Lord Macaulay's warning, my State of California has increased in population density so that all but 4 million people of the total 19 live within major urban areas. In 1900 there were 67 acres per man in California; today there are 5 or less. The State budget is over $5 billion per year.

When I inquire about a proposed bill, whether on wages and hours, or on health or education, the staff members of the Senate committees frequently respond that the national standards which the new law would provide are patterned after those of my own State. I can think of many reasons for moving to California, but one of them that is rarely mentioned is that, by and large, we have good State government. This asset in addition to its other charms has brought our State a bounty of population—and at substantial cost.

Mobility has created inequality among the states. It is paradoxical that the inactive states have benefitted by losing their population, simply because their costs go down. I am not in favor of so-called equalization provisions in grant-in-aid measures to encourage expenditures by these states, unless they are balanced by a so-called "maintenance of effort" clause requiring recipient states to make full and ample use of the money for the intended public benefit.

The crucial task before our people today is to make our Federal system, including governments at both the national and state levels, effective and complementary. Ours is now a system of "shared responsibility". In this relationship, the Federal Government has grown strong. Many, but not all, of the states have prospered, and built good state government systems. But there is indeed a problem of equity in bringing laggards forward.

Our system of dual sovereignty does not envision two levels of government working at cross purposes. It rests on the novel theory of the division of responsibilities. That is still its working principle. The task of our age is to maintain the vital distinctions—recognizing that with increased mobility and communication, the practice of government, like all other forms of human activity, cannot be confined to the neat divisions of the past.

Both national and state administrations have a common interest in good and effective government. Today's challenge is to specify this common interest while maintaining the necessary distinctions, which continue to play a vital role in the checks and balances of our democratic system.

I would agree with those who feel that the tendency toward concentration of power at the center can be overdone, but I do not believe that there is any substitute for a strong uniting force in Washington. President Eisenhower's Commission on the National Goals put this problem fairly: "Those who value the virtues of decentralization, which writ large are virtues of freedom, need not scruple at recognizing the defects of those virtues. The defects are principally the danger that parochial and private interests may not coincide with, or give way to, the nation's interest. The necessary cure is effective national leadership."

There are steps that Congress and the White House can take to improve the effectiveness of the Federal-State relationship and to encourage the vitality of state governments to make them more responsive to public needs.

First, I would urge a greater use of elected representatives in Washington as channels to make known the needs of State administrations. In the early days of our Constitution, Senators were regarded as "ambassadors" from their states. This theory was changed with the system of direct elections of Senators by the people. The Senator is now responsible directly to his constituents, but he has a duty to consult with the leaders of his State on matters affecting the interests of their common constituency. I have long accepted this as a basic responsibility, to be discharged without reference to partisan cause.

It is far more important in the priorities of a Senator's duties to represent accurately the needs of his state than to deal with the thousands of petty matters, such as I have described above, which have come down over the years as vestiges of a less complicated era.

Second, I would suggest the establishment of an intergovernmental personnel system recognizing that career government service, at any level, stands on a par with other professional activities. This could be a joint state-federal activity. The principal object should be to train government administrators so that they may move from one government agency to another. This would encourage flexibility. It would also provide a means of terminating bureaus which become themselves political constituencies long after their utility to the public has passed. The elimination of aged bureaus is a major problem. The failure to deal forthrightly with it is one of the causes of unnecessary growth at all levels of government.

A cadre of trained administrators capable of accepting assignments either at the state or Federal level would also help to increase understanding and a common knowledge of joint problems. Today, many officials in state government have the same general areas of interest and responsibility as their colleagues in Washington. The neat divisions of the earlier Federal system are blurring. The problem of air pollution or water supply, for example, cannot be ignored by a state official any more than by a member of Congress.

Third, I would leave a broad revenue base for the states. As a former State Controller of California, I have long believed that the best revenue system is a sharing of the tax base rather than of the revenues themselves. Traditional state revenue sources, such as inheritance taxes, were invaded by the Federal Government during World War II on what was then called a "temporary" basis. The ground so seized has not been returned. I believe it would be far wiser to look first to this and other sources from which the states may generate their own income.

The revenue sharing proposals now before the Congress would dangerously enshrine a high level of the progressive income tax and limit the feasibility of reducing that tax both as a spur to the economy and as an initiative in the private sector. A blanket return of revenues to the states would not necessarily encourage state action or initiative—particularly if one of our goals is to reduce the number of Federal controls placed on monies put at states' disposal.

Furthermore, I do not believe that states should be made dependent on shared Federal revenue. This would distort the traditional system of responsibility of state governments and make them less responsive to the public will, rather than more, which is, after all, our goal.

There will always remain ample need for grant-in-aid programs, particularly where grants-in-aid are needed to support Federal activities. A clear example is the impacted

school aid program, which relates directly to the number of children attending public school whose parents are employed at national defense establishments.

There must be, however, a thorough review of grant-in-aid programs both to establish a tight system of priorities and to place limits on the suasion Washington can exert on the states through them. Some Federal encouragement of state action is undoubtedly necessary, particularly where states are falling behind in important areas, such as health and education. I am devoted to the principle of local control, which, incidentally is clearly written into every Federal education statute in what is known in the legislative trade as the "Taft Catechism". But Federal money should not be the precursor of Federal management. If that were to happen, we would have to abandon our Federal system altogether. In the 90th Congress I have joined a number of my Republican colleagues in introducing legislation to initiate a review of grant-in-aid programs and to provide that no program be authorized for more than five years.

In the same vein I would oppose short circuiting state governments by direct Federal grants to local agencies. The states ought not to be circumvented.

The emphasis in improving our Federal system must be a positive one. Little is to be gained by the kind of "revolution of the states" now discussed in terms of calling a Constitutional Convention made up of special state delegations, other than those in the Congress. I have favored some of the proposals suggested for such a convention, but I do not believe that the merits of any of them justify re-opening the basic issues of the national compact, as we have interpreted them since 1789.

What is needed is a strengthening of the Federal partnership. We have come a long way from the Articles of Confederation. Forward progress has been made in Washington and in the capitols of many of the states. The task is to continue that effort by finding ways of working together, and by bringing all states forward so that they may discharge their responsibilities in the modern world. In 1789, at Philadelphia, the Founding Fathers asked the fundamental questions of democracy. They wrote the answers into the Constitution. The overwhelming majority of Americans adhere to its precepts. Our Federal system is no longer a precise division between national and state government, but a complex partnership, joined to respond to issues of the Twentieth Century. Its vitality is not only a matter of fundamental American philosophy but of practical American politics.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour is concluded. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is to be recognized at this moment, to speak for 1 hour. In his absence, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall yield to the Senator when he arrives, if he desires to deliver his speech.

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT INVESTIGATION OF TRADE MATTERS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on March 3, I announced that the Committee on Finance soon would begin hearings in the nature of a legislative oversight investigation into all matters relating to the administration of our trade laws and of the policies underlying these laws. To my knowledge, this sort of investigation have never been conducted by a congressional committee since the trade agreements program was initiated in 1934.

Import interests are disadvantaged in many areas of our trade laws. Similarly, there are many areas where domestic interests are disadvantaged. It is the hope of the committee that all these areas be explored, so that when the time comes for new trade legislation to be taken up, we will be forearmed with data pinpointed directly at the issues.

The April 1967 issue of the "United States-Japan Trade" features an appraisal of the proposed Finance Committee hearing. This appraisal, entitled "Attack on Liberal Trade Due in Senate Probe," suggests the hearing is wholly protectionist motivated.

In order to set the record straight, let me state that the hearing grows out of December 1966 request by the majority leader that Senate committees spend more time this year reviewing the operation of laws already on the books and making oversight investigations into their operations. This is the real reason for the hearing.

My position on trade matters, and, indeed, the position of many members of the Committee on Finance, was ably expressed by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who presided at a recent hearing of the committee, during which our trade policies and the Kennedy round were discussed. Senator SMATHERS closed that hearing by admonishing Special Trade Representative William M. Roth to insist on a fair reduction in foreign tariff and nontariff barriers in return for opening our markets to further international competition. Senator SMATHERS stated to Ambassador Roth:

> You should stoutly defend our market, the greatest market on earth, from those who are unwilling to strike a fair bargain with us.

The forthcoming Finance Committee hearings are not going to be conducted in an atmosphere of protectionism. To the contrary, they are going to be conducted with a view toward detected defects which hinder the smooth operation of our trade and tariff laws.

As we move into discussions of a new approach to trade policy to replace the expiring Trade Expansion Act, I will be guided by the principle stated by Senator SMATHERS—that the advantages of freer trade can come only if concessions on all sides are truly reciprocal.

I ask unanimous consent that the article I have referred to and the statement by Senator SMATHERS be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ATTACK ON LIBERAL TRADE DUE IN SENATE PROBE

In what might be considered a portent of rising protectionist feeling in Congress, the Senate Finance Committee announced early in March that it would soon begin a review of U.S. trade policy. The Committee announcement said that the review would cover such matters as possible shortcomings in trade legislation, methods of reporting trade statistics, valuation and dumping practices, procedures for aiding workers and industries harmed by excessive imports, methods of expanding U.S. exports and the role of the Tariff Commission.

One of the reasons for suspecting a protectionist tinge to the forthcoming review is that the Committee announcement was apparently based on a memorandum circulated within the Senate by Senator Dirksen which was highly critical of many aspects of U.S. trade policy. The Dirksen memorandum argued that the U.S. has not received reciprocity in its trade agreements negotiations; that the Executive branch has misled the Congress with respect to the U.S. balance of trade; and that there has been a one-sidedness in applying existing legislation which has reduced its protective benefits to U.S. producers.

The memorandum goes on to criticize the abolition of peril point provisions in the Trade Expansion Act and to characterize the escape clause and adjustment assistance provision of the Act as totally inoperative. The Office of Emergency Planning is criticized for converting the national security provisions of the Act into a dead letter; the Tariff Commission is accused of failing to keep Congress fully informed of developments in the trade field; and the Treasury Department is accused of non-administration of the Antidumping Act, underevaluation of imports and failure to impose countervailing duties on subsidized trade coming into the U.S.

Later in March, the Republican leadership of Congress issued a statement endorsing the Finance Committee's proposal for a review of the trade agreements program. After noting that U.S. balance of trade has been declining in recent years and that a number of domestic industries have suffered under liberalized trade policy, the statement added that the current Trade Expansion Act must be amended to correct these difficulties. The protectionist mood of both the Finance Committee's call for hearings on trade policy and the Republican leadership's statement would seem to be more representative of current Congressional attitudes toward trade than the strong endorsement of liberal trade contained in the recent report of the Joint Economic Committee.

Senator SMATHERS (presiding). Mr. Ambassador, I want to close this hearing with this statement: With the Kennedy Round approaching its climax, many people fear American negotiators may thrust forward for an agreement at any price. Such a "panic" approach to trade negotiation would lead to lopsided U.S. concessions. While it is difficult to argue that advantages do flow from freer trade, I believe you must agree that they can come only if concessions on all sides ar truly reciprocal. The U.S. objectives in the postwar period were largely to restore devastated economies of Europe, either through trade or aid. Trade policy became closely alined with aid policy and, perhaps, we gave up more than we got.

Today the European nations and the free Asian nations have recovered. Their economies are bustling and their manufacturers

and producers can compete with any in the world. But now the United States is in trouble. Our balance of payments has been unfavorable every year since 1958.

The American share of world exports is diminishing while our imports are increasing. Our trade balance is kept favorable only because our statistics fail to tell the whole story, and improperly attribute foreign aid sales of agricultural commodities as competitive international transactions.

In these changing times you, Ambassador Roth, as our chief trade negotiator, should insist on a fair reduction in foreign tariff and non-tariff barriers in return for opening our markets to further international competition. You should stoutly defend our market, the greatest market on earth, from those who are unwilling to strike a fair bargain with us.

Look at the bargain closely and coldly, and agree to it only if we get as much as we give. Don't trade off a horse and accept a rabbit. Don't trade off a barrel of wheat for a biscuit.

If agriculture does not get a fair shake there should be no agreement.

One final word. U.S. agriculture, which accounts for $6.8 billion of our total exports of $29.9 billion last year, would suffer a serious setback of you agree to industrial commodities without tying the arrangements to an adequate commitment on agricultural products.

The committee wishes you good luck and particularly good judgment from this point on.

We will stand in recess.

Mr. ROTH. Thank you, Mr. Senator. I will take the statement to heart. It was a good one.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the committee recessed, subject to call of the Chair.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] would permit me to do so, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time, but if the Senator desires to proceed immediately, I shall yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield at this time, with the understanding that I will be recognized following the quorum call.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that after ascertaining the presence of a quorum, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] be recognized.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 91 Leg.]

Aiken	Hatfield	Morse
Allott	Hickenlooper	Morton
Bartlett	Hill	Moss
Bayh	Holland	Pell
Bennett	Hollings	Randolph
Boggs	Hruska	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Church	Long, La.	Sparkman
Curtis	Magnuson	Stennis
Dominick	Mansfield	Talmadge
Ellender	McCarthy	Tydings
Gruening	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Hansen	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Harris	Montoya	Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] are necessarily absent.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senators from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Anderson	Hart	Nelson
Bible	Hayden	Pastore
Brewster	Inouye	Prouty
Cannon	Jackson	Proxmire
Carlson	Javits	Smathers
Case	Kennedy, Mass.	Spong
Cooper	Kennedy, N.Y.	Symington
Dodd	Lausche	Thurmond
Eastland	McClellan	Tower
Fannin	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Monroney	Yarborough
Fulbright	Mundt	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

ANNUAL APPROVAL BY CONGRESS OF AGGREGATE AMOUNTS OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATIONS IN GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, at the request of the President we are hopefully about to repeal the suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit. I supported its repeal, but in light of the fact that the action to suspend the tax credit was only taken late last year, and that in October it was clothed in an aura of the greatest urgency, I believe that a review of the fiscal and monetary policies of the administration is not only in order, but perhaps overdue.

Facts are facts, and they have to be faced. The facts concerning the administration's fiscal policies—and I use the word policies advisely, because they are many and contradictory—make it difficult for a reasonable person to find direction in them, and what is worse, it makes it nearly impossible for the reasonable person to make any sort of plans based upon them. These on-again, off-again policies are wreaking havoc with the economic and financial planning of not only business, and farmers, but also the wage earner.

The effects of these "now you see it, now you don't" policies are more obvious with respect to business and farmers than they are to the wage earner, but, nevertheless, the effects on the wage earner are no less real. The slowdown of plant expansion will unquestionably have a direct effect upon the demand for labor both in construction and in operation, and while the repeal of the suspension is intended to speed up plant expansion, the uncertainty that has been endangered will have a dampening effect—at least for a while. For what some have called planned economy, it seems to be displaying a singular lack of planning.

Look at the record since 1961. According to the fiscal 1968 cash budget, since 1961 defense spending has risen $29.1 billion, but nondefense spending has risen fully $43.8 billion.

In the same period, Federal Government civilian employment has risen by 474,000 to a present grand total of 2,881,000. That is Federal employment alone.

This year, the President is asking for a $5.5 billion increase in defense spending, and a $6.1 billion increase in nondefense spending.

Finally, since 1964 alone, we have chalked up more national debt than in the entire 10-year depression period of 1931–41.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] recently noted that under this administration, President Johnson—in the years 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967—has spent a total of $40½ billion more than the Government has taken in. And, by the end of fiscal year 1968 the indications are, and I believe, that the 5-year deficit may exceed $58 billion.

This is an average deficit of $10 billion a year; an average of $800 million a month; or $40 million a day, on the basis of a 5-day workweek.

Carrying the figures a little bit further, it comes to $5 million per hour. That is not what we are spending. That is how fast we are going deeper in debt—$5 million an hour.

THE UNITED STATES—A COUNTRY IN DEBT

How did we dig ourselves into this hole? Apologists for these policies come to us and say it is because we are fighting a war. But, this does not square with the facts because, as I have mentioned, nondefense spending has gone up so much more than defense spending, and it has gone up so much more quickly.

Look at the facts. Two years ago appropriations were increased over the strong protests of Republicans in both the Senate and the House—by some $13 billion. A year later, that figure was topped by about $25 billion. And now the administration wants us to add another $21 billion to that.

It is a fact that the country is growing, and that more people are demanding more and better services. True. But we have had only six balanced budgets since 1930. The reason for that, I submit, is that neither the President nor the Congress has shown the kind of restraint that in many cases could have been exercised. It just is not possible to raise enough tax dollars to pay all the bills that 200 million people can run up, given half the chance.

So, we have been using a credit card and we have had to raise our national debt ceiling 10 times as a result.

In May 1964, our debt ceiling stood at $315 billion. Since then we have had to raise it to $324 billion, then $328 billion, then $330 billion, and in February of 1967 to $336 billion. What is worse, we will have to raise the debt ceiling again this year. Treasury officials have already hinted that they will be back in May. The word ceiling in this context has about the same meaning as it does to an astronaut.

Interest costs on the national debt represents the largest single expenditure—outside of national defense—in the entire administrative budget.

For fiscal year 1967, the Government now estimates that direct interest on the public debt—which excludes interest paid by the Federal agencies—will amount to $13.5 billion, increasing to $14.2 billion in fiscal 1968.

This $14 billion interest charge is more money that we spend for the Department of State; the Department of Labor; the Department of the Interior; the Department of Justice; the Department of Commerce; the Department of Agriculture; the Atomic Energy Commission; and the entire District of Columbia; all put together.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

I said earlier that the budget could stand a certain amount of review. Actually, we have a problem here in deciding which budget to talk about.

Should we talk about the $135 billion "administrative" budget?

Or the $144 billion "new obligational authority" budget?

Or the $169 billion "national income accounts" budget?

Or the $172 billion "cash payments to the public" budget?

Or do we want to talk about the "super-cali-fragi-listic" $210 billion "gross expenditures of Government-administered funds" budget?

That is the grand total of what the Government will spend in fiscal 1968.

In any event, the most commonly discussed budget is the $135 billion "administrative" budget. So, for the time being I will stick with that one. Briefly, the President says we will bring in about $127 billion in taxes, spend $135 billion, and end up with a deficit of precisely $8.096 billion.

Actually, I like to call this a "but that's if" budget. Let me show you what I mean.

The President said our deficit for fiscal 1968 would be $8.096 billion.

But, that is if we pass into law the President's request for higher taxes. Should we not raise taxes, we will not receive that extra $4.7 billion the President is counting on, and our deficit will be $12.796 billion.

But, that is if we increase postage rates, as the President asks. Should we not increase postage rates, we will not receive the $700 million the President is counting on, and our deficit will then be $13.496 billion.

But, that is if we further accelerate corporate tax payments, as the President asks. Should we not further increase corporate tax payments, we will not receive the $800 million the President is counting on, and our deficit will then be $14.296 billion.

But, that is if we sell off more Government assets in the form of participation certificates, as the President asks. Should we not, we will not receive the $5 billion the President is counting on, and our deficit will then be $19.296 billion.

But, that is if the general performance of the economy this year does not vary significantly from the economic assumptions underpinning the budget.

In short, we had better bring in $126.9 billion in taxes this year or else we will be further up the fiscal creek.

PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES

But, if we do not bring in $126 billion, the President will come up with a new gimmick to cover up the red ink.

Perhaps the best example of this is the "participation certificate." In 1966, the Democrat-controlled 89th Congress enacted—over united Republican opposition—the Participation Sales Act. This act authorized the Federal National Mortgage Association to sell what they call "participation certificates" in Government financial assets. But, the proceeds from these sales are not counted as Government receipts. Instead, they are counted as a reduction of expenditures.

So, every time the Government goes further into debt through the sale of these participation certificates, expenditures are reduced on paper by a corresponding amount. Because of this, administrative budget expenditures reported for the month of January 1967 will be understated by $1.1 billion simply because $1.1 billion worth of participation certificates were sold in that month. And since they are counted as a reduction in spending, the debt ceiling becomes even less meaningful.

It is pretty hard to explain to any man of commonsense how a sale of national assets constitutes a reduction in expenditures.

Worse, the interest rates the Government offers on these participation certificates are sky-high. In June 1966, the first issue of $530 million worth of participation certificates were offered at interest rates ranging up to 5.75 percent.

This additional pressure on the financial market last year pushed interest rates across the country to their highest level in 40 years. And this is what happened:

Total private borrowing, lifeblood of an expanding, dynamic economy, dropped more than $22 billion during the last half of 1966. Corporate borrowing alone dipped $5 billion.

The shriveling money market meant there were fewer houses bought, a sharp decline in the building industry, and fewer jobs. About $14.4 billion for mortgages was available up to June 30, but only $10.2 billion for the rest of the year.

Consumer credit shrank by over $1.5 billion during the second half of 1966, dropping from $7.8 billion to $6.2 billion.

During the first half of the year, bank loans totaled $11.4 billion, but during the second half fell off to $8.7 billion.

Borrowing by State and local governments also fell off during the second half—from $6.4 billion to $5.1 billion. As a result, school construction slumped, highway and street building slowed, and other improvements planned by State and local bodies stalled.

All in all, 1966 was a bad year for nearly every segment of the economy under the administration's high interest policy.

Eventually, a temporary moratorium had to be declared on the issuance of any additional certificates because they were driving up interest on all Government borrowing. Republican opposition to the Participation Sales Act was vindicated.

At this point, the administration decided something new had to be added to make the certificates more readily salable at lower interest rates. A well-timed opinion from the Attorney General, dated September 30, 1966, which concluded that these participation certificates were now backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, served this purpose.

With the Attorney General's opinion as a basis, arrangements were made to sell a second issue of $1.1 billion in January 1967. It was the obligation of the United States—not the so-called beneficial interest in a pool of assets—that was being sold. In short, the buyer could not care less what assets of the Government his certificates were now participating in.

WHAT PRICE DECEPTION?

At precisely this point, what is perhaps the ultimate of all gimmicks enters into the picture. For more than 30 years, administrations of both parties had limited the investment of social security trust funds to U.S. Treasury obligations, but no longer.

Of the last issue of $1.1 billion worth of participation certificates offered for sale on January 5, 1967, the Secretary of the Treasury purchased a total of $500 million for the social security and other trust funds.

But, fiscal manipulators asked themselves, "why stop with the social security trust fund?" As Senators know, there are numerous other trust funds readily available for such so-called investments.

The last sale of these participation certificates broke down like this: $100 million from the national service life insurance trust fund; $50 million from the Federal hospital insurance trust fund; $50 million from the railroad retirement trust fund—I am sure our railroaders in this country will be glad to hear that one—$100 million from the unemployment trust fund; $100 million from the civil service retirement and disability trust fund; and, $100 million from the Federal old-age and survivors trust fund.

As my Republican colleagues on the House Ways and Means Committee said:

These fiscal manipulations serve no useful purpose other than to conceal from the American people the magnitude of the public debt and the true budget of expenditures. What price deception! What is the price the American people will be forced to pay for this deception?

An estimated $5 billion worth of participation certificates will be sold in fiscal year 1968. As a result, some well-established programs appear to be costing less when in actuality they are costing more. Take education, for example. It is listed at $2.7 billion in the 1968 cash budget, which appears less than its amount for fiscal 1966. But then, add back the $1.8 billion in college loans slated for sale, and you get $4.5 billion. My point here is that even for a valid, needed, much desired Federal program, this kind of gimmickry tries to give the appearance that we are spending less, when actually we are spending much, much more.

In fiscal 1967, the administration will spend $161 billion and end up with a deficit of $6.2 billion, but eliminate participation certificate sales and we find we are spending $164.6 billion, with a true deficit of $9.8 billion.

CREDIBILITY

What can we believe? Whom can we believe?

In September, the President asked for a quick removal of the incentive tax credits for capital business investment, and this 15-month suspension was enacted in October. In March, 5 months later, he wants the credits given back.

The chaos created is far more hurtful to the small businessman that it is to the large. It is not just a headache for the board of directors, either. It goes far beyond that—to affect many, many jobholders and their families.

One wonders if the new economists are playing with the economy, just to see how much punishment it can take.

Any decision to spend money for expansion—and through expansion create more and better job opportunities—is not taken lightly. Such decisions involve a multitude of separate and highly complex factors, each of which must be weighed carefully. Most certainly, the tax question is one of these factors.

There must be some certainty as to just what tax rules are applicable in order to make a decision. In the present government climate, forecasting must be done not in terms of years, or months, but almost daily prophecies as to what to expect.

In January, the President's economic advisers told the Congress that all is well in this year 1967 in spite of clear evidence of an economic slowdown. In March, the President called a news conference to tell the country the economy is listing a little.

Will there be a surcharge tax this year? Who knows? And who can tell? Chairman WILBUR MILLS, of the House Ways and Means Committee, is now hinting that there cannot be a tax increase by July 1 as the President originally requested. For one thing, the President has not sent up the formal tax proposal yet. And the delay means a delay in hearings and in House action.

So then an administration spokesman hints that maybe the tax increase will be postponed until September 1. But he is not sure. And neither are we in Congress sure.

We do not know what the true economic situation is. But, in these circumstances, it is even more difficult to figure out whether there will be an upturn or another setback in the economy.

BUDGET NOT A SOUND ECONOMIC DOCUMENT

The budget is no longer a sound economic document. It is no indicator of the way things are moving.

How can a budget which is so iffy, so contradictory, be counted on by the business community?

We cannot really tell from this budget how much the Government will spend in fiscal 1968; because, in 1966 the original budget indicated $99.7 billion, but, with supplementals, we actually spent $107 billion.

Again, in 1967, the budget projected expenditures of $112.9 billion, but, actually, expenditures will be $126.8 billion.

Will we be spending $135 billion this year, as the budget projects, or will it be $145 billion—or $150 billion—or $160 billion?

THE GOLD OUTFLOW

Without definitive and effective corrective action, these problems have a way of becoming worse and more wearisome simply by the passage of time. Nowhere is this more evident than in our gold loss since the late 1950's.

In the past 8 years, world gold stocks have grown from $39 billion to over $43 billion, but what has happened in the United States?

I realize that this is no revelation to the administration, since the gold drain has been going on for a long time. Yet, nothing has been done to stem the tide or to increase our gold reserves. The drain on our gold reserves became critical in 1961. In that year, outflow of gold exceeded 22 million ounces—about $800 million worth—while imports were a mere 1.6 million ounces, or about $56 million worth. Since then, there has been some tapering off of the outflow of gold, but the problem remains unabated.

In 1949, U.S. gold reserves stood at about $24.4 billion, whereas they are now only about $13.2 billion—a drop of $11.2 billion.

What corrective measures has the administration proposed?

The only gold legislation that has enjoyed the administration's stamp of approval was the measure passed in 1965 which removed the requirement for 25 percent gold backing on Federal Reserve deposits. I take pride, Mr. President, that I voted against that measure.

This kind of "solution" is no solution at all; it merely postpones the decisions that will have to be made, and at the same time increases the danger.

Many of us on the Interior Committee, as well as other Senators who are concerned over this matter, have sponsored gold legislation designed to increase our domestic production of this vital commodity. A great variety of approaches to our deplorable gold situation have been advanced. But, what has been the result of all of this legislative effort? In a word—nothing. The Treasury Department and the administration have responded to these constructive proposals with either stony silence or the usual all-encompassing statement of opposition: that it could result in "instability of the dollar."

There are those who have suggested that we remove the gold backing from our currency in the mistaken belief that it would have little effect upon our economy and the stability of the dollar. One is prone to ask, "What stability?" In fact, about 3 weeks ago S. 1307 was introduced by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] which, if enacted, would have this direct effect.

I disagree with this thesis, but, judging by what has happened in the past 2 years—namely, the debasing of our coinage and the removal of the gold cover from Federal Reserve deposits—it would appear that this is the direction in which we are heading. If, as has been indicated by Treasury officials, the mere discussion of the gold situation has an unsettling effect upon foreign dollar holders, what will happen to the stability of the dollar when we completely remove the gold cover? I can assure you that such action will not have my support, because, in my opinion, such action would lead to complete financial chaos in this country. It would lead eventually, as we are approaching it now, to complete freedom of the printing press, and the only limitation would be the amount of paper on which to print currency.

In 1963, we repealed the Silver Purchase Act, over my strong objections, and the Treasury Department stopped issuing silver certificates. I am now informed that a proposal has been made and may soon be considered which would remove the last vestige of silver support for our currency.

In 1965, the cupronickel sandwich coin was substituted for the silver coin, again over my strong objections. Dimes and quarters became completely silverless, while the 50-cent piece, a coin which is seldom seen, had a reduced silver content—from 90 percent to 40 percent.

From this coin-clipping alone, the administration has picked up an extra $2 billion in the last 2½ years.

I recall questioning the Secretary of the Treasury about this matter 2 years ago in hearings before the Subcommittee on the Departments of Treasury and Post Office of the Committee on Appropriations. At that time he estimated the Department would pick up in seigniorage as much as $3 billion to $4 billion. When I asked him about the operation of Gresham's law, that people would put the good money in their pockets and hold onto it, he said there was no possibility of that. Yet, considerable silver has come out of circulation so that instead of coming up with $3 billion or $4 billion worth of seigniorage by the Treasury, they have come up with $2 billion. At any rate, even though authorized by Congress, I say that it is an immoral act of Government.

EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT FISCAL ACTIVITIES

None of this would be quite so disheartening if the impact of Federal fiscal activities was not so gargantuan. Today, the Federal Government owns 34

percent of the land, buys 23 percent of what is produced, contracts for 30 percent of all construction, generates one-quarter of the Nation's electrical power, and hires directly or indirectly one-fourth of the people in this country.

Uncle Sam takes 67.2 percent of all taxes collected, but, in spite of this, the Federal debt has grown to be 3.5 times larger than the total debt of all the States combined.

Today, one out of seven people working is on a Government payroll. The cost to us taxpayers: $60 billion a year. That is more than the United States was laying out for national defense until this year.

In America today, there two Government employees for every salesman; five for every farmer; 10 times as many as all doctors, dentists, and nurses put together.

My point here is that Federal Government activity today is so immense—and involves such enormous quantities of money—that every single American family is affected whenever the administration engages in some form or another of new fiscal experiment.

Government trust funds, in particular—like social security, railroad retirement, GI life insurance—have grown too huge for the public to ignore any longer. Their income and outgo is not counted as part of the $135 billion administrative budget. Yet trust funds are growing much faster than the administrative side of the budget.

From fiscal 1957 to 1966, administrative outlays rose from $69 billion to $107 billion, a 55-percent increase. But, in the same period, trust spending rose from $12.9 billion to $34.9 billion, a jump of 170 percent.

For fiscal 1968, the President has asked for an administrative budget of $135 billion and $44.5 billion for trusts. If Congress approves, trust spending will have almost doubled just since 1961—from $22.8 billion to $44.5 billion.

All told, the Government's trust funds have grown from assets of $9.5 billion in 1941 to $69 billion in 1966. Such a large, built-in market for Government securities makes it easier for the administration to borrow money from itself. About 20 percent of the national debt, as a matter of fact, has been borrowed from the trust funds.

This is one of the reasons we have been so upset with sales of participation certificates to trust funds. The market here is so big, it is almost an outright invitation to make spending appear smaller each year by borrowing from various trust funds.

In the past 4 years, the most outstanding characteristic of this country has been the never-ending and increased volume of the demands for more and more money and greater and greater Federal spending. Almost without exception, groups representing every conceivable object of the Federal bounty have demanded more, and groups heretofore unattached to the Federal Treasury have successfully made the connection. As a result of this increased demand competition for the Federal dollar has become much more intense. This competition will further intensify as the realization begins to crystallize, that the Federal dollar cannot support all.

Acquiescence to all these demands has pushed up Federal expenditures during the period 1965–68 nearly 2½ times as fast as during the period 1961–64. The administrative budget increase during the 1965–68 period has averaged nearly $13 billion per year. If it continues at this rate our annual administrative budget will just about double in 10 years. I do not think that we can continue to maintain such a rate of growth in Federal spending. If we do, we will have to find new sources of revenue—either new taxes or increases in old taxes. With $14.2 billion per year already tied up in paying interest on the national debt and the cost of other fixed commitments rising, deficit financing will continue to diminish our ability to reduce expenditures in the future. By continuing to accrue huge deficits each year, we block ourselves in so that budgets in the future will have to be very large, making future tax reductions less probable.

It would be well for the taxpaying public to remember that nearly 70 percent of the Federal income tax receipts come from personal income taxes. Consequently, reductions in the personal income tax rate will have a profound effect upon Federal revenues.

Tax increases or decreases have perhaps the greatest impact upon the middle-income family, those with incomes between $7,000 and $15,000 annually. According to 1965 figures—the latest figures available—the middle-income family filed 38 percent of the income tax returns, but paid 42 percent of the total personal income tax paid to the Treasury. A tax increase or decrease has almost an immediate effect upon consumption of consumer goods and investments, and therefore, upon the general level of the economy. Tax policies which affect this group should be most carefully weighed because of their impact upon the economy.

Despite the fact that we enacted legislation in 1964 which reduced personal income taxes and have not yet taken action to restore the earlier higher rates, the average family has suffered a sizable increase in its total tax bill. According to Department of Commerce figures, the average family had an income of $6,010 in 1956. It was up to $9,000 by 1966, an increase of just under 50 percent in 10 years. While these are impressive figures the increase in the total tax bill—Federal, State, and local—is even more impressive.

This same average family paid a total of $1,400 in taxes in 1956, but by 1966 the average family was paying $2,768 in Federal, State, and local taxes—an increase of 98 percent.

So, of the $2,990 increase income, $1,368 of it was absorbed by increased taxes.

Also, the average family's purchasing power was further diluted by increases in the cost of living. During this same period the Consumer Price Index increased by 17.3 points—from 94.7 to 112.0 with 1957–59 average equaling 100.

Taking the 1956 average family income of $6,010 and deducting from it the total tax bill of $1,400, the average family had $4,610 of spendable income in 1956 dollars. Applying the Consumer Price Index to this figure, that same average family had a spendable income of $4,860 adjusted to the 1957–59 base. Then, taking 1966 average family income of $9,000 and deducting from it the total tax bill of $2,768, the average family had $6,232 of spendable income in 1966 dollars. Again applying the Consumer Price Index to this figure, we find that the average family's income is reduced to $5,564 adjusted to the 1957–59 base. Consequently, based upon the only really comparable figures which portray the average family's financial condition, we find that the nearly $3,000 increase in income is diminished to only a $704 increase in spendable income, and this is in spite of a sizable cut in personal income taxes enacted in 1964.

With 62 percent of the personal income taxes being paid by those earning less than $15,000 per year, increases in such taxes should be considered more in the light of being a last resort to raise needed revenue. We should look first to reducing Federal expenditures.

Some may say, "Oh, that is the easy way." I beg to differ. I believe that we have been proceeding along the easy way—that is to accede to every request for the Federal dollar and make no attempt to place priorities on our spending. Fiscal restraint is not easy, because it requires someone to say no. It is easier to say, "Yes" to everyone's request for funds without regard to the merit of the proposal and let the next administration wrestle with the problem of setting the Nation's finances in order.

I am prone to remark at this point that if Congress ever adopts a song for itself, it should consider the old song, "I Just Can't Say No," which I believe came from the show "Oklahoma." I believe that this administration can be characterized as being filled with men to whom the word "yes" comes too easily—almost automatically. The applicant for Federal money seldom hears "a discouraging word."

Since the administration has failed to exercise fiscal restraint, it falls upon the Congress to do so. But Congress has not equipped itself properly. The executive branch has its Bureau of the Budget which acts as a focal point for all requests for funds by the various departments and agencies. Through the Bureau of the Budget, the President looks at the total Federal spending requirements and can place a top limit upon it, requiring the Bureau of the Budget and the departments to adjust their programs and spending accordingly. However, once the budget is received in Congress it is dissected into 13 separate appropriation bills and is never again looked upon as a whole.

These 13 separate appropriations bills wend their way through the appropriation process at varying speeds. Some become law before the end of the fiscal year while others do not emerge until fall—months after the first bill was signed. It is difficult to conceive of the whole when looking at only one of its 13 parts—and looking at each part several months apart from the other.

This is the need that the bill I introduced today attempts to satisfy. It will require that Congress adopt a joint resolution approving the aggregate amount contained in those separate bills before the money would be available for expenditure. We would then review not only the merits of individual programs, but the total amount of new funds to be provided as against expected total income for the fiscal year.

Actually, Mr. President, sizable sums which the Congress acts on would be left outside the scope of this bill, for practical reasons. Appropriations of trust funds would not be covered, nor would retirement of debt. Deficiency and supplemental bills would also be outside this bill's coverage, simply because it would not be practical to hold up the whole appropriations process until we were assured that no further funds would be required in any program. The "continuing resolution" under which the various agencies continue to function until the appropriations procedure is completed would also be excluded from the bill's coverage.

But the bill would at least cover the bulk of our appropriations, and would oblige us to consider the budget requests in relation to anticipated income for the year. Even more importantly, it would enable us to review our action on the earlier passed bills in light of what action we take on later bills. I think it would be informative both to the Congress and to the citizens of the United States.

While this procedure is somewhat similar to that followed by my State of Colorado, and several other States, because the Colorado Legislature is required to look at its total appropriation since the State constitution prohibits appropriations in excess of tax receipts, the Federal Government has no such limitation. However, such a limitation, except during extreme emergency conditions, may not only produce very desirable results with respect to our fiscal balance, but also might not be inappropriate. I am confident that a much higher degree of fiscal responsibility would result. Our constituents would soon demand it if each new demand on the Federal Treasury was equated with an increase in taxes. Under such circumstances, only the most meritorious programs would be given easy approval. Others would have to prove themselves, and rightly so.

In these times of ever-expanding demands upon the Federal dollar, I believe that every Member of Congress has not only a right, but more importantly, a duty to look at the total appropriation figure, as approved in the separate bills, and to decide whether this is the amount we really want to spend in light of expected revenues, the state of the economy, and many other relevant factors. My bill will provide that opportunity and impose that obligation.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BENNETT, CURTIS, DOMINICK, FANNIN, HATFIELD, HICKENLOOPER, HANSEN, JORDAN of Idaho, MILLER, PROUTY, SCOTT, THURMOND, and WILLIAMS of Delaware, I send to the desk a bill to require annual approval by Congress of aggregate amounts of expenditure authorizations containing general appropriations, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill—S. 1611—to require annual approval by the Congress of aggregate amounts of expenditure authorizations contained in general appropriation acts, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before making that request?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION—TREATY ON PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE ACTIVITIES OF STATES IN THE EXPLORATION AND USE OF OUTER SPACE INCLUDING THE MOON AND OTHER CELESTIAL BODIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering Executive D, 90th Congress, first session, Executive Calendar No. 15.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to the consideration of Executive D., 90th Congress, first session, a Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. which was read the second time, as follows:

TREATY ON PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE ACTIVITIES OF STATES IN THE EXPLORATION AND USE OF OUTER SPACE, INCLUDING THE MOON AND OTHER CELESTIAL BODIES

The States Parties to this Treaty,

Inspired by the great prospects opening up before mankind as a result of man's entry into outer space,

Recognizing the common interest of all mankind in the progress of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes,

Believing that the exploration and use of outer space should be carried on for the benefit of all peoples irrespective of the degree of their economic or scientific development,

Desiring to contribute to broad international co-operation in the scientific as well as the legal aspects of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes,

Believing that such co-operation will contribute to the development of mutual understanding and to the strengthening of friendly relations between States and peoples,

Recalling resolution 1962 (XVIII), entitled "Declaration of Legal Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space", which was adopted unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly on 13 December 1963,

Recalling resolution 1884 (XVIII), calling upon States to refrain from placing in orbit around the Earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction or from installing such weapons on celestial bodies, which was adopted unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly on 17 October 1963,

Taking account of United Nations General Assembly resolution 110 (II) of 3 November 1947, which condemned propaganda designed or likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression, and considering that the aforementioned resolution is applicable to outer space,

Convinced that a Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, will further the Purposes and Principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

Have agreed on the following:

ARTICLE I

The exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development, and shall be the province of all mankind.

Outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall be free for exploration and use by all States without discrimination of any kind, on a basis of equality and in accordance with international law, and there shall be free access to all areas of celestial bodies.

There shall be freedom of scientific investigation in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, and States shall facilitate and encourage international co-operation in such investigation.

ARTICLE II

Outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.

ARTICLE III

States Parties to the Treaty shall carry on activities in the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, in accordance with international law, including the Charter of the United Nations, in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international co-operation and understanding.

ARTICLE IV

States Parties to the Treaty undertake not to place in orbit around the Earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, install such weapons on celestial bodies, or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner.

The moon and other celestial bodies shall be used by all States Parties to the Treaty exclusively for peaceful purposes. The establishment of military bases, installations and fortifications, the testing of any type of weapons and the conduct of military maneuvers on celestial bodies shall be forbidden. The use of military personnel for scientific research or for any other peaceful purposes shall not be prohibited. The use of any equipment or facility necessary for peaceful exploration of the moon and other celestial bodies shall also not be prohibited.

ARTICLE V

States Parties to the Treaty shall regard astronauts as envoys of mankind in outer space and shall render to them all possible assistance in the event of accident, distress, or emergency landing on the territory of another State Party or on the high seas. When astronauts make such a landing, they shall be safely and promptly returned to the State of registry of their space vehicle.

In carrying on activities in outer space and on celestial bodies, the astronauts of one State Party shall render all possible assistance to the astronauts of other States Parties.

States Parties to the Treaty shall immediately inform the other States Parties to the Treaty or the Secretary-General of the United Nations of any phenomena they discover in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, which could constitute a danger to the life or health of astronauts.

ARTICLE VI

States Parties to the Treaty shall bear international responsibility for national activities in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, whether such activities are carried on by governmental agencies or by non-governmental entities, and for assuring that national activities are carried out in conformity with the provisions set forth in the present Treaty. The activities of nongovernmental entities in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall require authorization and continuing supervision by the appropriate State Party to the Treaty. When activities are carried on in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, by an international organization, responsibility for compliance with this Treaty shall be borne both by the international organization and by the States Parties to the Treaty participating in such organization.

ARTICLE VII

Each State Party to the Treaty that launches or procures the launching of an object into outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, and each State Party from whose territory or facility an object is launched, is internationally liable for damage to another State Party to the Treaty or to its natural or juridical persons by such object or its component parts on the Earth, in air space or in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies.

ARTICLE VIII

A State Party to the Treaty on whose registry an object launched into outer space is carried shall retain jurisdiction and control over such object, and over any personnel thereof, while in outer space or on a celestial body. Ownership of objects launched into outer space, including objects landed or constructed on a celestial body, and of their component parts, is not affected by their presence in outer space or on a celestial body or by their return to the Earth. Such objects or component parts found beyond the limits of the State Party to the Treaty on whose registry they are carried shall be returned to that State Party, which shall, upon request, furnish identifying data prior to their return.

ARTICLE IX

In the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, States Parties to the Treaty shall be guided by the principle of co-operation and mutual assistance and shall conduct all their activities in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, with due regard to the corresponding interests of all other States Parties to the Treaty. States Parties to the Treaty shall pursue studies of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, and conduct exploration of them so as to avoid their harmful contamination and also adverse changes in the environment of the Earth resulting from the introduction of extraterrestrial matter and, where necessary, shall adopt appropriate measures for this purpose. If a State Party to the Treaty has reason to believe that an activity or experiment planned by it or its nationals in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, would cause potentially harmful interference with activities of other States Parties in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, it shall undertake appropriate international consultations before proceeding with any such activity or experiment. A State Party to the Treaty which has reason to believe that an activity or experiment planned by another State Party in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, would cause potentially harmful interference with activities in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, may request consultation concerning the activity or experiment.

ARTICLE X

In order to promote international co-operation in the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, in conformity with the purposes of this Treaty, the States Parties to the Treaty shall consider on a basis of the equality any requests by other States Parties to the Treaty to be afforded an opportunity to observe the flight of space objects launched by those States.

The nature of such an opportunity for observation and the conditions under which it could be afforded shall be determined by agreement between the States concerned.

ARTICLE XI

In order to promote international co-operation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space, States Parties to the Treaty conducting activities in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, agree to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations as well as the public and the international scientific community, to the greatest extent feasible and practicable, of the mature, conduct, locations and results of such activities. On receiving the said information, the Secretary-General of the United Nations should be prepared to disseminate it immediately and effectively.

ARTICLE XII

All stations, installations, equipment and space vehicles on the moon and other celestial bodies shall be open to representatives of other States Parties to the Treaty on a basis of reciprocity. Such representatives shall give reasonable advance notice of a projected visit, in order that appropriate consultations may be held and that maximum precautions may be taken to assure safety and to avoid interference with normal operations in the facility to be visited.

ARTICLE XIII

The provisions of this Treaty shall apply to the activities of States Parties to the Treaty in the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, whether such activities are carried on by a single State Party to the Treaty or jointly with other States, including cases where they are carried on within the framework of international inter-governmental organizations.

Any practical questions arising in connection with activities carried on by international inter-governmental organizations in the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall be resolved by the States Parties to the Treaty either with the appropriate international organization or with one or more States members of that international organization, which are Parties to this Treaty.

ARTICLE XIV

1. This Treaty shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign this Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which are hereby designated the Depositary Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by five Governments including the Governments designated as Depositary Governments under this Treaty.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depositary Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of and accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force and other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XV

Any State Party to the Treaty may propose amendments to this Treaty. Amendments shall enter into force for each State Party to the Treaty accepting the amendments upon their acceptance by a majority of the States Parties to the Treaty and thereafter for each remaining State Party to the Treaty on the date of acceptance by it.

ARTICLE XVI

Any State Party to the Treaty may give notice of its withdrawal from the Treaty one year after its entry into force by written notification to the Depositary Governments. Such withdrawal shall take effect one year from the date of receipt of this notification.

ARTICLE XVII

This Treaty, of which the English, Russian, French, Spanish and Chinese texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

DONE in triplicate, at the cities of Washington, London and Moscow, this twenty-seventh day of January one thousand nine hundred sixty-seven.

For the United States of America:
DEAN RUSK
ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
PATRICK DEAN
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
A. F. DOBRYNIN
For Chile:
RADOMIRO TOMIC
For Mexico:
HUGO B. MARGÁIN
For China:
CHOW SHU-KAI
For Italy:
SERGIO FENOALTEA
For Honduras:
RICARDO MIDENCE SOTO
For Ethiopia:
TASHOMA HAILE-MARIAM
For Ghana:
ABRAHAM BENJAMIN BAH KOFI
For Cyprus:
ZENON ROSSIDES
For Canada:
A. EDGAR RITCHIE
For Bulgaria:
DR. LUBEN GUERASSIMOV
For Australia:
JOHN KEITH WALLER
For Denmark:
FLEMMING AGERUP
For Hungary:
JÁNOS RADVÁNYI
For Iceland:
PETUR THORSTEINSSON
For Czechoslovakia:
DR. KAREL DUDA
For Japan:
RYUJI TAKEUCHI
For Romania:
PETRE BALACEANU
For Poland:
ZDZISLAW SZEWCZYK
For Tunisia:
RACHID DRISS
For New Zealand:
JACK SHEPHERD
For Colombia:
HERNAN ECHAVARRÍA OLOZAGA

For Finland:
OLAVI MUNKKI
For Panama:
RICARDO M. ARIAS E.
For Laos:
KHAMKING SOUVANLASY
For Greece:
ALEXANDER A. MATSAS
For the Philippines:
JOSÉ F. IMPERIAL
For Turkey:
MELIH ESENBEL
For Yugoslavia:
VELJKO MICUNOVIC
For Afghanistan:
DR. ABDUL MAJID
For Argentina:
ALVARO C. ALSOGARAY
For the United Arab Republic:
MOSTAFA KAMEL
For Haiti:
ARTHUR BONHOMME
For Luxembourg:
MAURICE STEINMETZ
For Viet-Nam:
BUI DIEM
For Venezuela:
ENRIQUE TEJERA-PARIS
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
HEINRICH KNAPPSTEIN
For Israel:
AVRAHAM HARMAN
For El Salvador:
RAMON DE CLAIRMONT-DUEÑAS
For Thailand:
SUKICH NIMMANHEMINDA
For Sweden:
HUBERT DE BESCHE
For Ecuador:
GUSTAVO LARREA
For Togo:
ROBERT AJAVON
For the Dominican Republic:
HECTOR GARCIA-GODOY
For Switzerland:
FELIX SCHNYDER
For Burundi:
CLÉMENT SAMBRIA
For Ireland:
WILLIAM P. FAY
For Cameroon:
JOSPEH N. OWONO
For Indonesia:
SUWITO KUSUMOWIDAGDO
For Bolivia:
JULIO SANJINES-GOYTIA
For Botswana:
ZACHARIAH KEODIRELANG MATTHEWS
For Lesotho:
ALBERTO S. MOHALE
For Korea:
HYUN CHUL KIM
For the Congo (Kinshasa):
CYRILLE ADOULA
For Uruguay:
RUBIN A. ALEJANDRO CHELLE
For the Central African Republic:
MICHEL GALLIN-DOUATHE
For Rwanda:
CELESTIN KABANDA
For Nicaragua:
GUILLERMO SEVILLA-SACASA

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how long does the Senator think it will take to explain the pertinent parts of the proposed treaty?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should think that the opening statement should take approximately 30 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending treaty occur at 2:30 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at that time, the yeas and nays will be asked for.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho for yielding to me.

The unanimous-consent agreement reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That the Senate vote at 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 25, 1967, on the resolution of ratification of the Treaty on Outer Space (Ex. D, 90th Cong., first sess.).

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is my privilege to commend to the Senate for its advice and consent the Outer Space Treaty which the Committee on Foreign Relations has reported out favorably. The draft treaty before the Senate establishes the general principles which will govern the activities of states henceforth in the exploration and use of outer space.

The subject matter of the treaty is indeed awesome. We are here adopting rules to govern the activity of the United States and other nations in the infinite void of space. Man's technical ingenuity and restless curiosity have catapulted him well on the way to the moon and our sister planets. Man's law-making genius must keep pace, not only to ensure that the exploration and use of space proceeds in an orderly and productive fashion, but in order to minimize the possibility that national activities in space will add to grievances on earth. This is a major objective and a noble purpose.

We in the Senate, for our part, must weigh the adequacy of the provisions of the draft treaty in terms of the goals it sets forth. We must consider its relation to U.S. objectives. Finally, we have the grave responsibility to judge whether the arms control provisions of the treaty meet our strict standards of national security.

I

However novel this treaty may seem, its most essential aspect is not new at all, but familiar—as familiar as humanity. As man steps into space, the most important possessions he carries with him are his own nature and heritage: his civilization, his ideas of law and justice, his earthly structure of sovereign yet interdependent nations, and his powers of creation and discovery.

Today, with our infinite capacity for magnifying disasters, it would be tragic if law-making capacity fell behind scientific invention. The Outer Space Treaty before us is some reassurance that the gap can be closed. Mankind entered the space age with a unique sense of what he was starting. The slate was clean, and we knew it; we had the capability of writing the wrong history, and we knew that.

In our own Nation, this awareness was shared by leaders in both political parties, in the executive branch, and in the Congress. This Senate, this Congress, was acutely aware of the problems and potentials. In 1958, Congress enacted the National Aeronautics and Space Act in which it declared that—

It is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

It is to the great credit of our system of government that the spirit of bipartisanship has consistently prevailed in the development of our space effort, particularly in its international aspects. Close cooperation between all branches of Government concerned meant that the United States has spoken with one voice. The institution of providing congressional advisers to the U.S. Representative to the United Nations Outer Space Committee, and the careful and continuing consultations over the years has meant that the Outer Space Treaty is the product of a continuing process of cooperation between the legislative and executive branches.

The effective working of this system was well exemplified in November of 1958, when the then Democratic Majority Leader of the Senate, Lyndon B. Johnson, speaking on behalf of the Republican administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, told the United Nations that:

Today, outer space is free. It is unscarred by conflict. No nation holds a concession there. It must remain this way. We of the United States do not acknowledge that there are landlords of outer space who can presume to bargain with the nations of the Earth on the price of access to this domain.

We must not—and we need not—corrupt this great opportunity by bringing to it the very antagonism which we may, by courage, overcome and leave behind forever if we proceed with this joint venture into this new realm.

We know the gains of cooperation. We know the losses of the failure to cooperate. If we fail now to apply the lessons we have learned, or even if we delay their application, we know that the advances into space may only mean adding a new dimension to warfare. If, however, we proceed along the orderly course of full cooperation we shall, by the very fact of cooperation, make the most substantial contribution toward perfecting peace.

II

The philosophy expressed in that speech in the fall of 1958 blossomed into two major antecedents of the pending treaty. The first was a statement, delivered separately by the United States and the Soviet Union that each would not station or otherwise place weapons of mass destruction in orbit around the earth, on the moon or other celestial bodies. The United Nations welcomed these expressions of policy and urged that it be made generally applicable. Several months later, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a declaration of legal principles to govern activities in space.

There are two other sources of the space treaty which bear mention here. One was the Antarctic Treaty of 1959, which inspired the inspection and scientific cooperation provisions of the space treaty. The Antarctic Treaty in addition demonstrated one very important fact: an area could be defined, quarantined from the usual products of competition among States, and dedicated to peaceful pursuits and scientific cooperation. There is no doubt that the Antarctic Treaty—a major accomplish-

ment of the Eisenhower administration—has worked. There have been no violations. Inspections have been carried out without incident and in full compliance with the treaty.

The success of the Antarctic Treaty provided a sound basis for aiming at something bigger, when the consequences for the future might be greater and more far-reaching. But the problem remained of assuring ourselves that other parties were complying. Here, the experience of the Limited Test Ban Treaty was drawn upon. In that treaty, we decided to rely upon our own unilateral capabilities to detect compliance by others. We were able to develop our monitoring technology to provide high confidence that we knew what the other side was doing. Similarly, in the Outer Space Treaty, our capacity to monitor has kept pace with the potential threat. This is a critical point involving national security. The considered judgment of our top military men was essential. The conclusion reached by the Joint Chiefs of Staff was that we can rely on our unilateral capabilities to monitor the no-bombs-in-orbit provision. The security of the United States will be fully preserved.

III

With this as a background, President Johnson on May 7, 1966, urged that work begin on a treaty and asked our Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur J. Goldberg, to undertake the task. After preliminary and encouraging discussions in New York with the Soviet Union, the United States suggested that the Legal Subcommittee of the United Nations Outer Space Committee undertake the task of negotiation. The subcommittee met for 4 weeks last summer in Geneva and resumed discussions, public and private, in New York during the fall. I had the honor of being a member of the U.S. delegation during the 21st General Assembly. One of the high points of that Assembly, indeed, one of the high points in the history of the United Nations, was the announcement by President Johnson last December that agreement had been reached on a treaty.

In a resolution sponsored by 43 countries, the General Assembly endorsed the treaty. Signing ceremonies took place last January in Washington, London, and Moscow. At last count, 79 countries have signed and submitted the treaty to the ratification process.

IV

The resulting treaty is impressively comprehensive in defining broad areas of concern and articulating general principles to deal with them. Its preamble cites its sources and some of its goals. The treaty's intention echos the policy declared by Congress. The first sentence of article 1 stipulates that—

> The exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development, and shall be the province of all mankind.

This philosophy of openness and broad applicability permeates the treaty.

The reasons for the treaty's universal importance are worth elaboration. Basically they fall into three related groups: those concerned with international peace and security, including arms control; those concerned with rules for the future direction of the newest age of exploration; and those concerned with the responsibilities of the space powers to the nonspace nations and the world community as a whole.

In the field of international peace and security the importance of the treaty is obvious. This is the most significant arms control development since the conclusion of the Limited Test Ban Treaty in 1963.

Because they are clear and well known, I shall not dwell in detail on the peace and security measures of the treaty. They start in article I, which announces the principle of openness by stating that "there shall be free access to all areas of celestial bodies." Total openness, especially in conjunction with the other provisions of the treaty, should make clandestine warlike preparations on celestial bodies impossible.

Article III stipulates that activities in outer space, including celestial bodies, shall be carried on in the interest of maintaining peace and in accordance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Of particular relevance are the Charter's provisions regarding the uses of force and the obligation to settle disputes peacefully.

Article IV spells out restrictions in more detail. It prohibits the orbiting of weapons of mass destruction in space or their stationing in outer space in any manner. Weapons of mass destruction are forbidden on the moon and celestial bodies, which are reserved for peaceful purposes only. Certain specified military activities are prohibited, such as weapons testing and military maneuvers. Article IV makes clear that it does not restrict the use of military personnel or equipment on the moon for peaceful purposes.

Article XII carries forward the guaranty of open access and describes procedures under which representatives of one state may ensure that other states are complying with these restrictions. Such assurance is, clearly, of pivotal importance. The provisions for consultation and notice are clearly and wisely designed to assure the safety of personnel and in no way describe the right of veto.

There are no comparable inspection provisions with respect to objects in orbit. The treaty, however, places no restriction on our right to observe. It guarantees freedom of access to all parts of space. Thus we must rely on our unilateral capability to monitor compliance by other parties. Our capability in this respect has been thoroughly reviewed by our very best military authorities. We have been clearly and forthrightly assured that we prefer to rely on our own monitoring capabilities and that we can do the job. I am, therefore, satisfied that our national security is in no way jeopardized by the lack of an inspection provision for orbiting objects.

These arms control measures will, I believe, be a significant contribution to maintaining the peace. Of equal importance in the long run will be the draft treaty's general principles designed to guide the peaceful development of outer space.

Under the treaty, exploration should result neither in conquest nor in harm to the interests of others, but in international scientific advancement. Article I states this in general terms, and article IX stipulates that states shall avoid harmful infringement on the rights of other parties, and will enter into consultation as appropriate.

Space discoveries will lead not to division of spoils but to an adventure for all mankind, for the second article rules out territorial sovereignty. This means that exploration in space can never lead to extension of territorial domains. Astronauts will indeed be envoys of all mankind, as stressed in article 5. They will be assisted and promptly returned if they should land in the territory of another state.

Articles VIII states that parties are liable for damages caused by space launchings. Article VII will facilitate the long, frustrating, and expensive process which an individual citizen must ordinarily go through in pressing a claim against a foreign government.

Article V places an obligation on all parties unconditionally to assist and protect astronauts and return them to their countries if they should land in distress elsewhere than planned.

Article IX obliges parties to the treaty to refrain from harmful experiments.

All of these points, I should think, would be of interest to every country, including those with no plans for a space program. In addition, however, the treaty contains several features especially directed at those who are not, for the moment, in a position to undertake activities in space. The nonspace countries were well represented on the committee which negotiated the treaty. I should like to note briefly the points which relate to the responsibility of the space powers toward the world community as a whole.

Many such points are summarized in article I, a portion of which I have already quoted. Article I also stipulates that "Outer Space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall be free for exploration and use by all States without discrimination of any kind," adding that there shall be freedom of scientific investigation and that international cooperation shall be facilitated and encouraged. This is an important provision for a state which has no space program in 1967 but which may have one at some future time.

The treaty also has a provision which should be of immediate interest to every scientist, whether or not he comes from a country with a large space program. In article XI, parties "agree to inform the Secretary General of the United Nations as well as the public and the international scientific community, to the greatest extent feasible and practicable, of the nature, conduct, locations, and results" of activities in outer space. This provision describes the reporting practices which the United States has followed from the beginning of its space

program. Surely those of us fortunate enough to participate in the first groping explorations of space should share our scientific findings with the rest of the world.

Finally, article X, dealing with tracking facilities, was put into the treaty at the insistence of the Soviet Union. Initially, the Soviet Union appeared to be seeking a free ride from countries which have granted tracking facilities to the United States. The final version provides no such free ride. It is clear from article X and the history of the negotiations that the provision is no substitute for bilateral agreement between the Parties concerned for the establishment of a tracking facility.

V

It is clear, I believe, from a review of its text, that the draft treaty deals with the important problems of space exploration which we can perceive and define today. It is most important to the United States, with our legitimate concern for the good opinion of mankind, that we go forward in space with the approval and support of all. It is also most important that the treaty be consistent with our space program and contain clear advantages to the United States. The draft treaty meets these tests.

The treaty will inhibit a new and dangerous area of weapons deployment.

Our security is promoted because space exploration will proceed in an orderly fashion and atomic weapons will be banned from space. General Wheeler and Deputy Secretary Vance were clear and unequivocal in support of the treaty and in their confidence that the security of the United States is protected and, indeed, enhanced by the treaty.

The treaty further ensures that our astronauts will be assisted and safely and promptly returned. We will be informed of phenomena in space which may affect the safety of astronauts. Property rights in space vehicles are guaranteed and provisions made for their return.

Outer space and celestial bodies will be free and open to all. No one may tell us that we cannot traverse a particular segment of space. No one can exclude us from a portion of the moon or other celestial body.

The Outer Space Treaty therefore clearly advances the interests of the United States. In broader terms, it will facilitate international cooperation in outer space activity, and not just between the space powers. Perhaps as important will be the increased participation of those powers who have not yet developed a full-fledged space program, yet have much of significance to contribute to future activity in space.

VI

Considering the Outer Space Treaty as it relates to the foreign relations of the United States, it is highly encouraging that a treaty of such significance can be concluded during a period of severe international crises. Vietnam intrudes into and distorts many aspects of international relations today. It speaks well of the political maturity of the United States and the Soviet Union that despite their very serious differences, efforts to find areas of accommodation can be pursued to success. This is no small achievement. The arms control provisions in the treaty will place a clear limitation on future deployment of weapons. Weapons in orbit are not presently a practical weapon. But can anyone doubt that one day modern technology may make such a weapon a reality? Thanks to this treaty, we and our progeny will be spared the grim prospect of nuclear weapons ever-circling in space.

There is one aspect of the treaty which has been little mentioned, and deserves comment. This treaty is the product of a careful, deliberate law-making process pursued in the United Nations by many countries. The United Nations was an ideal forum for such a comprehensive, multilateral effort. That the goal was pursued purposefully, quietly, and successfully is a source of gratification for the supporters of the United Nations and a tribute to the skills and dedication of Ambassador Goldberg and his colleagues. It offers encouragement that the United Nations may indeed evolve into an organization where the great issues troubling the world can be met and resolved. The United Nations has seen many setbacks, many failures. Critics of the United Nations have dwelt on these, and often with justice. Indeed, the United Nations must do better. However, proportionate attention—if we are to preserve our perspective—should also be given to the organization's landmark achievements. This treaty is one. It is a genuine triumph for the United Nations and carries out the promise which so many found in its charter over 20 years ago. The United Nations deserves its full measure of credit.

VII

To summarize, the draft treaty before us marks the first major step in developing a system of law for man in space. As such, it is a historic milestone which tells us how far we have gone, and hints at how far, and in what direction we must go. The treaty, therefore, is the beginning, not the end of the lawmaking process. As such, the Outer Space Treaty is wise in its conception.

It is practical in its particulars.

It advances the basic interests of the United States in outer space.

It protects and enhances our security.

It promotes the cause of international peace and cooperation.

It, therefore, meets the basic tests to which this body must submit a treaty. I, therefore, urge that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the Outer Space Treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I rise to urge support of Executive D, 90th Congress, 1st session, the Treaty on Outer Space. This treaty was signed at Washington, London, and Moscow on January 27, 1967. The signatories are the United States, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, and 76 other nations. The signing of the treaty followed its unanimous endorsement by the United Nations General Assembly on December 19, 1966.

The treaty was sent to the Senate on February 7. On April 14 the Committee on Foreign Relations, without a dissenting vote, ordered the treaty favorably reported.

The Treaty on Outer Space has its roots in the Antarctic Treaty of 1959, which was designed to reserve Antarctica exclusively for peaceful purposes, and in a long record of interest within the United Nations in the peaceful exploration of outer space. Building on the record of interest and some accomplishment, President Johnson on May 7, 1966, proposed the discussion of a space treaty begin. After consideration of draft treaties offered by the United States and the Soviet Union, an agreement on the provisions of the treaty we now have before us was reached in December of 1966.

Before turning to the treaty itself, I wish to commend Ambassador Goldberg for the skillfully conducted negotiations which characterized the United States role in the drafting of the treaty. It is also important to note that the treaty on outer space has the strong, unqualified support of the entire executive branch, including the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I also wish to take this opportunity to note that the senior Senators from Vermont and Tennessee [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. GORE] served with distinction as congressional advisers on the United Nations Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. I should also like to congratulate the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] on their very fine performances as members of the U.S. delegation to the 21st General Assembly of the United Nations.

In the broadest of terms, the treaty on outer space has two basic objectives: first, to establish general guidelines for international behavior in the exploration of outer space and, second, to prevent outer space from becoming an arena of military competition.

In furthering the first objective, the treaty is designed to assure the freedom of scientific investigation of outer space, to guarantee free access to all areas of celestial bodies, and to prohibit claims of national appropriation. The treaty also urges the parties to share the benefits of space exploration. To achieve its second objective, the treaty we are considering today seeks to prevent military competition in outer space by obliging the parties not to place nuclear weapons in orbit around the Earth. The treaty also bars nuclear weapons and other instruments of mass destruction from outer space, including the celestial bodies. At the same time, I should like to make it clear that these restrictions will not prevent the use of military personnel or equipment in the U.S. space efforts.

Finally, the treaty guarantees inspection rights to installations and space vehicles on celestial bodies. Considerable publicity, and some opposition, has been stimulated by the fact that these inspection rights do not apply to objects in orbit. I will return to this important question of inspection of orbiting bodies in a moment.

The duration of the treaty is open-ended. It may be amended when a majority of the parties accept the proposed

amendment. However, it should be stressed that amendments are only binding on those states party to the treaty who accept them. There is no possibility that the United States, therefore, will be forced to accept an unpalatable amendment to the treaty. It should also be noted that any states party to the treaty may withdraw after 1 year of notification of intent to do so. Mr. President, I will not discuss the minor points in the treaty. Senators have before them the President's message, the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the committee report. I believe this information will cover most of the minor points adequately. I will concentrate instead on several questions that attracted the attention and interest of the committee.

During the hearings questions were raised as to whether some of the general statements of principles embodies in the treaty were vulnerable to misinterpretation. As evidenced by the committee approval without dissenting vote, these concerns were dispelled by the testimony of the witnesses and by clarification of the committee's understanding of these issues in the committee report. Nevertheless, I wish to review briefly the two questions of interpretation that attracted interest: the provisions of the treaty regarding the desirability of sharing the results of international space activities, and those provisions establishing international liability in outer space.

First, the treaty states that the exploration of outer space "shall be carried on for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development." The committee raised the question whether this language might imply a fixed obligation on the part of the United States to share the scientific results of its space activities. After listening to administration witnesses, we concluded that the treaty included no such specific obligations. Nevertheless, I wish to report the committee's understanding of this provision by noting that it is the committee's understanding that nothing in this treaty diminishes the right of the United States to determine how it shares results of its space activities.

The second main concern centered on the nature and extent of the international liability assumed by the United States under article VII. After a thorough discussion of this complex question with administration witnesses, we came to the conclusion that article VI pertains only to physical nonelectronic damage that space activities may cause to the citizens or property of another state. I wish to make the committee's position here quite clear. A separate convention on international liability in space activities is needed to establish rules for determining liability and creating a formal means of resolving differences.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has been given the unqualified assurance of the administration that such a convention will be negotiated and brought before the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not wish to overemphasize the importance of this treaty. The specific requirement it levies on the signatories are modest. Indeed, it could be argued that it is unnecessary to outlaw military activities in outer space, since apparently neither the Soviet Union nor the United States have any intention of extending their military competition into outer space. Nevertheless, I believe the history of the Antarctic Treaty and other arms control efforts suggests that it is easier to prevent an arms race than to slow or stop such a race once it begins. For example, we face such a problem in the antiballistic missile issue, where both superpowers may find themselves developing a missile system which they neither want nor need, but will defy arms controls once the race begins.

The case for ratifying this treaty is, in my view, bolstered by our experience with the Antarctic Treaty of 1959. Senators will remember that considerable opposition was expressed to this earlier treaty. I think it is significant, therefore, that the Secretary of Defense during his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations on the Outer Space Treaty spoke of "the outstanding success of the Antarctic Treaty of 1959." Mr. McNamara went on to say, "Since the Antarctic Treaty became effective there has been no hint, no suggestion, that any party was not living up to the terms of that treaty in all respects."

So I believe that the Treaty on Outer Space is part of an emerging pattern which may be of great importance. I refer to the growing international acceptance of the idea of preventing an arms race from commencing, rather than limiting our efforts to desperate—and often futile—attempts at controlling an arms race once it begins. The United States in accepting this treaty is giving up nothing; but we will gain the chance, and it may be no more than a chance, to prevent tomorrow's arms race in outer space.

I urge the Senate to approve the treaty. While it is a small step, I believe it is a significant step toward the reconciliation of the differences which have caused so much harm and at such great expense to this and all other countries during the last 20 years.

Finally, I again wish to express my appreciation for the assistance given in the hearings and in the deliberations of this body by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for the welcome words of support he has given to this treaty, and for the interest that he has consistently shown while the treaty was under consideration, and during this period of its consummation.

I concur with the Senator from Arkansas that this is a significant step in the right direction, on a road on which we have a long way yet to travel before we reach a safer and saner world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the treaty will be considered as having passed through all of its parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, signed at Washington, London and Moscow on January 27, 1967, on behalf of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (Executive D, Ninetieth Congress, first session).

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 184, S. 375.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 375) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 189—explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION

The purpose of this bill is to make it a Federal offense to make certain obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce or within the District of Columbia.

S. 375 provides for a fine of not more than $500 nor imprisonment for more than 6 months, or both, for anyone who, by means of telephone communications in the District of Columbia or in interstate or foreign commerce—

(*a*) Makes any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent; or

(*b*) Makes a telephone call, whether or not conversation ensues, without disclosing his identity and with intent to annoy, abuse, threaten, or harass any person at the called number; or

(*c*) Makes or causes the telephone of another repeatedly or continuously to ring with intent to harass any person at the called number; or

(*d*) Makes repeated telephone calls, during which conversation ensues, solely to harass any person at the called number.

The same penalty is applicable to whomever knowingly permits any telephone under his control to be used for any purpose prohibited by this section.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Obscene and harassing telephone calls have become a matter of serious concern. The telephone, despite its many benefits in our daily business and personal lives, unfortunately provides a ready cloak of anonymity

to the sort of person who can somehow derive satisfaction or pleasure from frightening other people. This cloak has been availed of by such people in various ways. The telephone may ring at any hour of the day or night, to produce only a dead line when answered. Sometimes the caller will merely breathe heavily and then hang up. Sometimes he will utter obscenities.

And, recently, a new and most offensive form of harassment has been devised. Families of servicemen are called and given false reports of death or injury, or even, hard as it is to believe, are gloatingly reminded of the death of a son or husband in service.

The depth of this vicious practice can best be illustrated by the following examples submitted by the Department of Defense. To prevent further harassment of the families mentioned, the names of personnel and families concerned have been deleted at the request of the Defense Department:

"Prior to departure for Vietnam in the early part of July 1966, a U.S. Air Force technical sergeant was telephonically contacted by persons unknown to him, and who urged him not to go to Vietnam. He was also called derogatory names. Since the sergeant's departure for Vietnam, his dependent wife has received numerous anonymous telephone calls, calling her a warmonger and other derogatory names and making reference to her husband's service in Vietnam. One of the remarks is as follows: "If you keep flying the American flag we will come over there and cut you to ribbons.' All the calls were made during the hours of darkness. On one occasion, when she was preparing to take her pet dog to the veterinarian for an emergency at 0435, as she was leaving the house, two men drove rapidly past her, threw a beer bottle at her, and called her a warmonger.

* * * * *

"In October 1966 the mother of a marine wounded in action in Vietnam received about six telephone calls at her Pittsburgh, Pa., home. The caller said nothing but played martial music, sometimes accompanied by sounds of heavy breathing or apparent shouted military commands.

* * * * *

"The parents of a marine killed in action in Vietnam received three telephone calls in November 1966 at their Washington State home. The caller asked on each occasion 'How do you like having your son killed in Vietnam?'

* * * * *

"In early December 1966, the wife of an airman stationed in Okinawa received a phone call at her residence allegedly from a Sergeant Miller, of Seymour-Johnson Air Base. Miller asked her to identify her husband which she did. Miller then stated that her husband had been killed in an explosion on Okinawa and that he and the chaplain planned to visit her in a few hours. Several hours later, after she had informed relatives and associates of the news, Miller called again and stated he had the final details of the incident including the fact that there were no remains and that she could go ahead with a memorial service for her husband. The Kadena Red Cross requested verification of her husband's death on December 6, 1966, at which time the Red Cross was informed that her husband was alive. Prior to this call (August or September 1966), the airman's wife had received 'mash' calls from a man in Randleman who requested that she go out on a date with him."

* * * * *

It is quite evident that the dimensions of the problem are large and still growing. The Bell Telephone System, which provides more than 80 percent of the Nation's telephones, received over 531,000 complaints from March through December 1966 concerning abusive telephone calls that threaten or harass the recipients. It received some 46,000 complaints of such calls in March 1966. Subsequently, the number reached a high of some 68,000 such complaints in August 1966. Some 51,000 complaints of such calls were received in December 1966.

A telephone company witness testified that most of the calls are probably intrastate but indicated that it is only after an investigation of a complaint has been successfully completed that the telephone company is able to classify offending calls as intrastate or interstate. It should not be overlooked that these figures deal with complaints actually received by the telephone companies. It is to be assumed that many such calls are made which never become the subject of such a complaint.

Some remedies do exist at the present time. Thirty-eight States have statutes, varying somewhat in content, but generally prohibiting the making of various types of obscene, harassing, or annoying telephone calls. These specific laws, many of which are of recent origin, appear to be helping. Eleven of the twelve remaining States currently have before them proposals to outlaw abusive calling. The telephone companies' right to discontinue service where making such calls violates company tariffs is probably also of some value. And it is to be hoped that telephone company publicity given to the problem and how they will serve customers who receive such calls will have a beneficial effect on the problem. But no Federal law deals with the problem (except 18 U.S.C. 875(c) prohibiting interstate communication containing a threat of personal injury and 18 U.S.C. 837(d) prohibiting use of the telephone to make threats of damage to certain property or threats to persons seeking to make specified uses of such property) and the witnesses before your committee generally agreed that Federal legislation directed to such abusive calls in interstate commerce is desirable to close the "interstate gap." This is a logical approach in view of the fact that the Federal Government has undertaken under the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a comprehensive scheme or regulation of the telephone system. Federal legislation dealing with interstate abusive calls should also simplify prosecutions of interstate calls by permitting them to take place where it may be convenient for the witnesses. In this regard, 18 U.S.C. 3237, would permit prosecution of such offenses in any district in which the offense was begun, is continued, or is completed.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

S. 375 was introduced by Senator John O. Pastore, chairman of your committee's Subcommittee on Communications. Hearings on S. 375 were held on February 16, 1967, by the Subcommittee on Communications.

Congressman Van Deerlin of California testified before the subcommittee of his concern with the growing problem of telephone harassment and stated that he had introduced an identical bill, H.R. 1422, in the House. He related that he had learned firsthand what it's like to be the target of abusive telephone calls. After receiving a series of such calls at his Washington home in January 1967, he reluctantly took an unlisted number. One such call occurred when his 13-year old daughter took a call from an anonymous person who used obscenities in threatening to kill her and her brothers and sisters.

Rosel H. Hyde, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, testified that, while enforcement of any such legislation would appropriately be the responsibility of the Department of Justice, the Commission was in full accord with the committee's efforts to deal more effectively with the problem of obscene and harassing telephone calls as set forth in S. 375 and strongly supports its enactment. He recalled an instance of a call to his home when his wife said: "I am certainly glad it wasn't Marilyn—our daughter—who received that call," because it was a revolting type of call that no one should be subjected to.

Brig. Gen. William W. Berg, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Personnel Policy, presented the views of the Department of Defense. General Berg testified that the Department of Defense strongly supports this legislation. In his May 1966 testimony he indicated that a spot check of only nine representative military bases in the United States to get some idea of the magnitude of the general problem of obscene and harassing telephone calls turned up approximately 500 reported cases of all types during the preceding year at those installations. Some 87 of those were incidents of harassment of about 50 military families related to military operations overseas, mostly in connection with service in Vietnam. Those contacts were mostly by telephone but also included letters, postcards, telegrams, and even face-to-face visits. General Berg indicated there has been a slight drop in the number of such cases since that time and attributes this to your subcommittee's earlier hearings on this subject and to the high degree of cooperation provided by the telephone industry. General Berg indicated the Department of Defense welcomes and will strongly support any legislation which promises a measure of protection to the members of our Armed Forces and their families from these vicious and despicable acts. He stressed the impact of such acts on the morale and well-being of our servicemen and their families, particularly as they relate to our military operations in Vietnam and elsewhere.

Mr. Hubert Kertz, operating vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., appeared on behalf of the Bell System telephone operating companies. Mr. Kertz referred to his previous testimony in which he had given the committee helpful explanations of some of the techniques used by telephone companies to identify the telephone lines from which abusive calls originate. Other techniques he had thought it best not to disclose publicly lest the information make it easier for annoyance callers to avoid detection.

Three basic detection devices are used. One is a tone set, a box equipped with an on-and-off switch and connected by a wire to the annoyed customer's telephone. When a crank call is received, the customer flips the switch which places a 20,000-cycle tone on the circuit and also activates an alarm in the central office, alerting a switchman on duty to start tracing the call. This tone cannot be heard by either party to the telephone call. Another device is a pen register attached to the line of a prime suspect in a crank-call case.

The instrument records the number called and the time of the call. A third device acts as a computer in the central office and puts the calling number, called number, date, and time on a punchcard.

Mr. Kertz testified that these detection techniques have grown more sophisticated as telephone switching systems have become more complex and that the Bell System is continually working on better and quicker ways of making line identifications.

Mr. Kertz stressed the Bell System's national advertising campaign to offer assistance to any victim of such calling within its operating areas. He outlined the company procedures followed in cases of abusive calls, stated that all successful prosecutions are publicized for their deterrent effect, and testified that local law enforcement authorities have been most cooperative and extremely helpful in investigating these cases.

Mr. Kertz testified that existing State and local criminal legislation is of great help to the telephone companies in their attempts to eliminate abusive calls. He stated that in the areas served by the Bell System the

courts convicted 358 abusive callers during 1965 and 788 abusive callers in 1966.

He emphasized that the Justice Department is not brought into a situation of this kind until after the technology of the Bell System companies has determined that an interstate call, as contrasted with an intrastate call, of an abusive nature has been made. He testified that such technology is not a bugging or monitoring device to overhear or record conversations, but is an electronic technique to register on tape the time of day and the called telephone number made on a particular line.

He stated that the Bell System believes Federal legislation will have a deterrent effect on potential offenders and would be of practical advantage to the telephone companies in attempting to deal with abusive calls. Mr. Kertz specifically endorsed legislation along the lines of S. 375.

Adm. William C. Mott, executive vice president of U.S. Independent Telephone Association (USITA), a trade association composed of some 2,300 telephone companies, testified in support of the legislation. Admiral Mott stated that a Federal statute prohibiting obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce should have a deterrent effect on the making of such calls and might further set an example for those States not now having statutes or whose statutes might need revision.

He testified that one added reason for the necessity for Federal legislation in this area is the increased usage of what is known as WATS (wide area telephone service) line for making an interstate call. WATS is a fast-growing service and national in scope. There is no individual charge for messages and in that respect it is similar to local telephone calling.

Mr. Paul Rodgers, general counsel, National Association of Railroad & Utilities Commissioners, expressed the view that State legislation in 38 States deals adequately with intrastate threatening or harassing telephone calls and 11 States now have specific legislation under consideration to deal with this matter. He testified that Chairman Ben T. Wiggins, of the NARUC Committee on Communications Problems, plans to present to his committee a model State bill dealing with this problem. The language of his model State bill will closely parallel the language of S. 375.

He testified that S. 375 will complement the State activity and NARUC supports its enactment to combat the making of such calls in interstate or foreign commerce.

Senator Edward B. Long of Missouri and Congressman Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey, submitted statements placed in the record supporting the enactment of S. 375.

CONCLUSION

There can be no doubt that the increase in these vicious and cruel attacks over the telephone must be reversed by legislative action. Your committee believes that passage of this legislation will aid in deterring obscene and harassing telephone calls generally and will provide an appropriate remedy to reach those calls made within the District of Columbia or in interstate or foreign commerce. The loophole which exists today because of the lack of a Federal law covering this subject matter will be closed. The enactment of this legislation will serve the public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

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

The bill (S. 375) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 223. OBSCENE OR HARASSING TELEPHONE CALLS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OR IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE.—Whoever by means of telephone communication in the District of Columbia or in interstate or foreign commerce—

"(a) makes any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent; or

"(b) makes a telephone call, whether or not conversation ensues, without disclosing his identity and with intent to annoy, abuse, threaten, or harass any person at the called number; or

"(c) makes or causes the telephone of another repeatedly or continuously to ring, with intent to harass any person at the called number; or

"(d) makes repeated telephone calls, during which conversation ensues, solely to harass any person at the called number; or

Whoever knowingly permits any telephone under his control to be used for any purpose prohibited by this section—

"Shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate this afternoon, in accordance with the order entered on Wednesday, April 19, 1967, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m., tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday April 25, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 24, 1967:

COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Dennis L. McElroy, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the term expiring July 15, 1972, vice Edward Steidle, term expiring.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

William W. Sherrill, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1954, vice Charles Noah Shepardson, resigned.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Four Hundred Pennsylvanians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have recently learned that some 400 young men from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have died since January 1966, fighting Communist aggression and defending freedom in Vietnam.

I would like to pay tribute to these men who have given their lives for a cause halfway around the world. And I would like to offer whatever consolation can be offered to their families, for if the loyalty and devotion to duty of these men belong to their country, their loss is felt most deeply by their loved ones.

I have called them men when many of them really were boys. And I referred to the cause of freedom halfway around the world. Freedom anywhere in the world remains an integral part of our own.

Mr. Speaker, it may be presumptuous of me to want to list the names of all 400 in the RECORD. But I would dearly love to include the names of nine who lived in the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the district which I represent, the northeast part of Philadelphia. In this small way I hope the memory of their courage will live on in the RECORD of the Congress which owes them much.

Pfc. George W. Abey, son of Mr. and Mrs. George W. Abey, 7809 Whitakes Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

LCpl. Charles L. Isley, III, Marine Corps, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles L. Isley, Jr., 5946 Hasbrook Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.

LCpl. Frederick G. Lynch, Jr., Marine Corps, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frederick G. Lynch, Sr., 999 Lardner Terrace, Philadelphia, Pa.

Cpl. Stephen P. Miller, Marine Corps, son of Mr. and Mrs. Peter A. Miller, 9581 Cowden St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Cpl. Anthony J. Nigro, Marine Corps, son of Mrs. Naomi Juisto, 12134 Sweet Briar Road, Philadelphia, Pa.

Sp4 Frank J. Nostadt, Jr., Army, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank J. Nostadt, 7527 Whitaker Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.

Sgt. Sofford S. Pye, Army, husband of Mrs. Judith Ann Pye, 2626 Hemlock St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Pfc. William Wilknowsky, Jr., Army, husband of Mrs. Gloria L. Wilknowsky, 75117 Totresdale Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.

A2c. Ronald C. Kinsky, Air Force, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles J. Kinsky, 7146 Lawndale Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.

Passover Season

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend

my greetings to those of my constituents of the Jewish faith. The Jews, throughout the world, are now celebrating the Passover season.

Not so very long ago, many American Jews were subjected to discrimination and religious prejudice. However, the work and accomplishments of the Jewish people in America could not be ignored. They were an enormous part of our American heritage and helped to broaden and better the lives of all Americans. Those who preach anti-Semitism are considered by Americans today as belonging to a lunatic fringe.

I joined with my colleagues in Congress in signing a statement this week, condemning the suppression of Jewish spiritual and cultural life in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is presently severely restricting the religious life of the Jewish people. Jews in Russia are forbidden to establish any nationwide federation of congregations or clergy.

It is my hope that this statement with the signature of 284 Members of Congress, may make the Soviet Government aware that we here in America strongly disapprove the Soviet Union's policy toward the Jewish people. It is my further hope that the Soviet leaders will amend their present policy and permit the people of the Jewish faith freedom to engage in their religious practices with no state discrimination.

It is time now for men to repudiate all forms of religious persecution, realizing what wise men have long known, that men of all nations and creeds are brothers.

Law and Order Must Prevail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned over the continued outbreaks of violence and disorder in our major cities.

If this trend continues, our democratic society will be weakened—because it is the cement of law and order which holds our free society together. We must rededicate ourselves as Americans to the principles of law and order that are the foundation of our Nation.

In this connection, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in law and order, I include my weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments, in the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

LAW AND ORDER MUST PREVAIL

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

It has become increasingly evident in recent weeks that forces and influences are at work in our country which are tearing at the very foundation of our democratic society. These disrupting forces and influences are manifest in the violence, demonstrations, lawlessness and unrest which have been too much in evidence in many sections of our Nation.

The lawlessness in Nashville, Louisville, Chicago and in many other of our big cities in recent weeks—if continued—will serve to undermine our system of laws. The cement of law and order must prevail to hold our democratic society toegther.

This Nation and its people traditionally have lived within the law—because to live outside the law is to live in a world of chaos, anarchy and disorder. This country was founded on a system of law and order—respect for law and order—and it is time we rededicated ourselves to these principles.

Our Nation was formed so that a democratic people could live together in peace and harmony, each engaged in his pursuit of happiness. Our society was formed in order that our people could think for themselves, govern themselves, fulfill themselves—in a land of freedom and liberty within the framework of law and order.

The only successful way to achieve these goals is to strive for personal objectives in a society of law and order. This Nation has made great progress in providing opportunities for our people—and the resort to violence and force leads to distrust and apprehension, and reacts strongly against further progress and advancement. Thomas Jefferson once said: "The execution of the laws is more important than the making of them."

Where law ends, tyranny begins.

Where order ends, anarchy begins.

Certainly there are conditions in our Nation that must be corrected—and this must be done at all levels, local, state and national. Great strides are being made in improving education, providing better housing, and in creating jobs and opportunities for all our people.

America became the greatest Nation in the world under a system of laws. With a disregard for law and order, our country would be weakened. Let us rededicate ourselves to the maintenance of law and order in our land and thus insure that freedom and liberty will be preserved, promoted and perpetuated.

Textile Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1967

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago a number of my colleagues expressed on the floor of the House their concern over rising levels of textile imports to the United States. The Members of Congress from Kansas are especially concerned with the drastic rise in wool textile imports since the close of World War II and the consequent disappearance of many of our wool textile plants. We know that this contraction has been caused to a large extent by the inability of these mills to meet the unfair competition from countries such as Japan and Italy, where wages and production costs are much lower than ours.

This problem affects all segments of the industry, including the wool growing segment. Wool growers in Kansas, as well as other States of the Nation, are concerned when they see their domestic markets shrinking and with the prospect that if wool textile imports are not held at reasonable levels they may eventually lose their only outlet for domestic wool; namely, the domestic wool manufacturers.

The concern of the entire Kansas delegation was expressed in a letter to President Johnson on April 18, 1967. Mr. Speaker, I insert this letter at this point in the RECORD:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., April 18, 1967.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Kansas congressional delegation would like to join with the many other members of Congress who are urging prompt implementation of the expressed policy of the Administration for reasonable limitations of imports of wool products.

While Kansas is not a wool manufacturing state, one of our agricultural products is wool. Our growers have no outlet for their wool except through our domestic mills. Since World War II some 300 domestic wool textile plants have disappeared, along with 60 per cent of key manufacturing machinery and tens of thousands of jobs.

Mr. President, in 1964 when you stated that imports of wool products must be held at reasonable levels and that the industry should be restored to good health, the volume of wool textile imports had reached 22 per cent of our production. However, this past year the ratio increased to 27 per cent. In some categories such as worsteds, knitwear and wool shirts, we are advised that import concentration is in the range of 50 per cent.

From your address to the agricultural groups who met with you at the White House a few weeks ago, we know that you share our concern for the well-being of agriculture as well as our wool textile industry. If wool textile imports continue to decimate our domestic mills, domestic wool growers in Kansas and the other 49 states (all of which produce wool) will have no market for their raw wool production.

Therefore, Mr. President, in the interest of our entire U.S. wool industry, we strongly urge the Administration to do everything possible to insure that wool textile imports are held at reasonable levels.

Sincerely,

ROBERT DOLE.
CHESTER L. MIZE.
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
JOE SKUBITZ.
LARRY WINN, Jr.
FRANK CARLSON.
JAMES B. PEARSON.

National Conference of State Societies—OAS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to your attention a recent event which I believe exemplifies public effort to further the worthy mission and goals of the Organization of American States. The notable occasion was the grand ball of the National Cherry Blossom Festival sponsored by the National Conference of State Societies and held for the first time in the Hall of the Americas, Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., April 4,

1967. An attendance of over 800 distinguished persons represented all of the States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Territory of Guam, and most of the Latin American countries. The entire court of princesses, as selected by State societies, military escorts, and beautiful young Latin American girls in native costume were presented to the 1966 festival queen, who flew into Washington from Chattanooga University, Tenn. The queen, Miss Adele Geraghty, was honored by the presence of His Excellency Dr. Savillia-Secasa, Ambassador representative of Nicaragua; dean of the diplomatic corps and OAS Council Chairman, His Excellency Dr. Ritter-Aislan, Ambassador representative of Panama, and Senora Ritter, who were seated adjacent to the throne. The spectacular pageantry was enhanced by the music of the Chilean Folklore Singers, Sonny Seixas Latin Orchestra, and the U.S. Drum and Bugle Corps. Television celebrities Miss Inga Runvould and Mr. Mac McGarry of WRC–TV officiated as mistress and master of ceremonies.

The well-chosen remarks of National Conference President Robert James Schissell, of Nebraska, which introduced the main presentation event, are considered most descriptive of conference background and objectives. Mr. Schissell said:

For over a century State Societies have functioned in our great Nation's Capital, bringing together those whose lives were influenced through past residence in their home State. The result was a rewarding experience for many individuals representing the fields of Government, business, the arts and communications. Noted public officials have served and are currently serving as leaders of their respective State organizations. The President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, in fact headed the Texas State Society while serving in the United States Senate.

So great was the impact of these groups on the social and cultural life of Washington that in the year 1952, the Congress chartered the National Conference of State Societies to "promote friendly and cooperative relations between the various State and Territorial Societies in the District of Columbia, and to foster, participate in, and encourage educational, cultural, civic, and patriotic programs and activities." On this occasion, the Grand Presentation Ball, the Conference has fully accomplished its educational and cultural mandate by joining all of the Americas within the international scope of the Cherry Blossom Festival.

This evening we are gathering in a magnificent building, rich in tradition, the House of the Americas and the permanent seat of the Organization of American States. For over 140 years the peoples of this hemisphere have been working together, in a cooperative fashion, toward peace, understanding and a better relationship. The OAS embodies today the aspirations of 440,000,000 Americans from Alaska to the southern-most tip of Argentina, and its outstanding achievements in the political as well as the economic and social fields are world history. It is therefore appropriate tonight in the presence of this distinguished representation from all states of the hemisphere, and in the spirit of the Cherry Blossom season, we salute the OAS and the Inter-American System on its 77th Anniversary, and express our hope for the continued success of its worthy mission.

The highlight of the evening was receipt of a telegram communication from honorary chairman HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States, and read to the audience by his sister, the charming, vivacious Frances Humphrey Howard, who served as vice chairman.

Mr. HUMPHREY's message read:

From Western Europe, I send warmest greetings to your gala Cherry Blossom Princess Presentation Ball. I have asked my sister to bring this message of pride and pleasure from afar. Best wishes for a joyous evening to one and all. My congratulations to the attractive Princesses and special thanks to the National Conference of State Societies. Hubert H. Humphrey.

Subsequent to his return from Europe, Mr. HUMPHREY kindly forwarded an autographed program to each of the court. Inasmuch as the majority of the 1967 princesses are currently attending college, it is believed that this fine gesture on the part of the Vice President will stimulate academic interest in the Organization of American States. Great personal interest in Latin America was expressed by all who witnessed the ball pageantry.

Serving the occasion were the Honorable CHARLES H. WILSON, Member of Congress, chairman of the ball; His Excellency, Dr. Jose A. Mora, Secretary General, OAS, honorary first vice chairman; his Excellency Raul Diez de Medina, Ambassador representative of Bolivia, honorary vice chairman; the Honorable SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, Resident Commissioner, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, honorary chairman; the Honorable F. Joseph (Jiggs) Donohue, District of Columbia, honorary vice chairman; His Excellency, Mr. Sol M. Linowitz, Ambassador representative of the United States to the OAS Council, honorary vice chairman; the Honorable JOSEPH MONTOYA, U.S. Senate, honorary vice chairman; the Honorable JAMES KEE, Member of Congress, honorary vice chairman; and Mrs. Rush D. Holt, chairman, princess committee.

President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey Carry Nation's Worldwide Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY are traveling extensively on missions of peace and good will, which are necessary and essential because of the Nation's position of world leadership.

President Johnson today is in West Germany, attending the funeral of former Chancellor Adenauer, to be followed by discussions with West German leadership.

Vice President HUMPHREY recently visited a number of European nations and President Johnson recently has attended the Latin American Conference and the Manila Conference of Asian Nations, among others.

In this connection, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter of foreign policy and our international responsibilities, I ask unanimous consent that my newsletter, Capitol Comments, be inserted in the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT TRAVEL EXTENSIVELY AS UNITED STATES EXERCISES WORLD LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES

The position of world leadership held by the United States again has been clearly demonstrated in recent weeks and months as President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey have traveled to Asia, Europe and South America as goodwill ambassadors and to exercise the responsibilities of this nation's leadership in world affairs and the promotion of peace.

The President last week attended a Latin American hemispheric conference in Punta Del Este, Uruguay in South America, to strengthen our Good Neighbor Policy—initiated by Cordell Hull—and to reassure our friends in this hemisphere of our continuing concern for their growth and progress. This nation's Alliance for Progress with South American nations is a part of the general effort to stop the onrush and spread of Communism by assisting these nations in eliminating conditions that provide seed beds for the growth of Communism.

The Vice President last week flew to Germany, Italy, Great Britain, Belgium, France and other European nations where in his visit he sought to strengthen the bridges of friendship with our European allies. He also has visited Canada earlier this year.

President Johnson recently played the major role in the Manila Conference of free Asian nations—and has twice met in Guam in the Pacific recently with representatives of South Vietnam and our military and civilian leadership from Saigon to discuss the progress of our effort to halt Communist aggression and promote accord and peace. En route from the Manila Conference, President Johnson went on to Vietnam to visit our fighting men there and to reassure them and our allies of our determination to stand firm and to halt Communist aggression.

Responsibility rests heavily upon the shoulders of our country as the most powerful nation in the world. In this modern world, with transportation and communications cutting distances constantly, events in any part of the world can have an effect upon our future. Each development must be studied and evaluated—and appropriate action taken.

President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey are striving constantly to bolster the cause of freedom in the world and their journeys to the far ends of the earth emphasize the concern and importance to our nation of developments everywhere.

It is significant that communism finds little support in nations that are healthy economically. Our technology and our agricultural and industrial know-how are assisting undeveloped nations in building strong foundations for democratic governments.

Representation of the District of Columbia in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, 1967, I addressed the Democratic

Central Committee of the District of Columbia on the subject of representation of the District of Columbia in Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include my statement and the text of House Joint Resolution 396, which I introduced on March 7, 1967, to amend the Constitution to provide for such representation.

REPRESENTATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN CONGRESS

I cannot tell you how pleased I am to be here with you tonight, and so to have this opportunity to talk to you about the constitutional amendment which I introduced to provide for one Representative from the District of Columbia in the House, and for such additional representation in the House and Senate as Congress may from time to time prescribe.

I consider this to be one of the most significant pieces of legislation before the House in the 90th Congress and I propose to have hearings before the full Judiciary Committee in a matter of weeks so that this proposal can move forward. I am not for one moment under the illusion that this will be an easy task. I am depending on people like you to give me and other like-minded Members every assistance you possibly can.

I need not tell you that opposition to this proposal will come from quarters who will hide the real reason for their opposition behind superficial arguments like—

(1) This is the Nation's capital and should remain in a special status;

(2) The people in the District are not really interested in having a Member in the House;

(3) We have committees in the House and Senate which can adequately look after the interests of the people of the District;

(4) Two committees in Congress can provide better representation than one Member out of 435 and, hence, a Member would be superfluous;

(5) The committees plus the Commissioners should suffice to protect the residents of the District;

(6) Let's not disturb the unique position of the District; and

(7) Taxes for the inhabitants of the District would increase, and so forth and so on.

I will not seek tonight to demolish each of these arguments. I think you know the answers as well as I do. I want to point out, however, a few very interesting facts. The population in the District, as indicated by the 1960 census, was 763,956. Based on the same census, we find that the average Congressional district is composed of 410,000, based on population count. No reason exists why 410,000 people living outside of the District are entitled to representation, and the 763 odd thousand people of the District are not. Significantly, Alaska was made a State with only 226,167 and Hawaii was made a State with 632,772.

The major prohibition, of course against representation in Congress for the District of Columbia lies in the Constitution. This we propose to remove. The Constitution does provide in Article 1, Section 8, that

The Congress shall have power . . . to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District, (The District of Columbia) not exceeding ten miles square, as may by cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States.

Article 1, Section 2 states that "No person shall be a Representative . . . who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen." The District of Columbia is not a State. Article 1, Section 3 requires that the Senate shall be composed of two Senators from each *State*. Once this constitutional amendment has passed the House and Senate and been ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, these provisions will not be applicable.

We must note that in the Committee on the District of Columbia in the House there are twenty-five members, only three of whom comes from States adjacent to the District. The chairman of the committee is from South Carolina. There is one member from Mississippi, two members from Illinois, two members from New York, one member from Texas, one member from North Carolina, one member from California, one member from Michigan, one member from Georgia, one member from Florida, three members from Minnesota, one member from Washington, one member from Indiana, one member from Wisconsin, one member from Ohio, one member from Virginia, two members from Maryland, one member from Kansas, and one from Arizona.

On the Senate committee, we have one Senator from Nevada, one from Oregon, one from New York, one from Maryland, one from Virginia, one from Vermont, one from Colorado, and one from Kentucky. There we have it, all around the mulberry bush, far and near, but the District stands in "splendid isolation"; that is, splendid isolation from representation in the House of Representatives or the Senate, but not isolated from all the needs and aspirations common to all the districts in the United States.

No home rule, no representation in national legislation—and it was only by dint of the hardest kind of labor that the people of the District of Columbia gained the right, the privileges, and the duty to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States.

Of course, if representation is a valueless thing, a hollow word, then why bother with representation for all the other areas of this vast country. Back in 1802, the inhabitants of the City of Washington and the District of Columbia could have a mayor and counsel; in 1812, the District of Columbia could have a mayor, a board of aldermen, and a board of common council to be elected by ballot, all of which elected officials were to be residents of the District.

All of that has long since changed. In what way have the people of the District of Columbia changed, that now it shall be presumed, and is presumed, that they can only exist as political wards of Congress?

Many is the time when a resident of the District of Columbia walks into my office, seeking advice and help. Were I to undertake all the chores requested of me by the residents of Washington, it might preempt all the time I must give to my own constituents; and what is true of me is true of all other Members of Congress. What recourse do I have but to send a supplicant to the District of Columbia Committee? Yet no one on the District Committee comes from the District of Columbia.

I need not belabor these points here. I had best save my ammunition for those who need convincing—and there are far too many who do! The argument I hear more often than any other is that the people of the District are not really interested in having representation in Congress. They must be convinced otherwise and this is part of your job. If you have friends in areas outside of Washington, let them make their wishes known to their Congressmen. We need every newspaper editorial we can get in *all* parts of the country; we need radio programs, television programs, magazine articles which will reach beyond the confines of this district, for the irony of it all is that the fate of this constitutional proposal will depend upon the will and whim of Members of Congress whose constituencies are far removed from this area.

If I make such a program seem difficult, I do so only because of my knowledge that the responsibilities of Members of Congress are so great, that the demands upon their time are so heavy, that it is understandable that a large chasm of indifference lies between the introduction of this proposal and its final enactment, and then upon its ratification by three-fourths of the States. If I exaggerate the enormity of the task, then I say, "Far better this exaggeration than to under-assess the difficulties." In that direction lies failure.

When I proposed the amendment granting the vote to the District in the Federal election of President and Vice President, I learned this lesson—one does not take justice and right and fair play for granted. These are earned by work, more work, and still more work.

Again I assure you that there will be hearings, that I will press with all the energy at my command for the adoption of this constitutional proposal. I believe that we will succeed if we want it badly enough, and as you know from my record, I do not brook failure easily.

The first proposal to give representation to the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives was introduced in 1877 in the 45th Congress. Shall we not say that we have waited long enough for this proposal to become a reality?

Thank you.

The text of the Joint Resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 396

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

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The people of the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall elect at least one Representative in Congress and, as may be provided by law, one or more additional Representatives or Senators, or both, up to the number to which the District would be entitled if it were a State.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 3. This article shall have no effect on the provision made in the twenty-third article of amendment to the Constitution for determining the number of electors for President and Vice President to be appointed for the District."

Armenian Sacrifice—A Lesson for Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, April 24 marks the anniversary of the greatest single disaster in the history of the Armenian people. It was on that date in 1915 that the Turks commenced the wholesale deportation of its Armenian population of 1,750,000 to Syria and Mesopotamia. Despite pledges of loy-

alty, the Turks claimed the Armenians comprised a dangerous foreign element and used this as a pretext for an outrageous act of genocide. The operation was conducted with extreme barbarity and brutality, and it is estimated that 600,000 Armenians died or were massacred en route with only one-third escaping deportation.

On the anniversary of this senseless, sad, and tragic event, let us honor the memory of those martyrs of the proud and ancient Armenian people whose lives were so needlessly sacrificed. While we cannot bring them back to life, we can, however, best memorialize them by following the lessons this catastrophe has taught, and we can also rededicate our own actions in remembrance of them.

First, let us realize the basic worth of all men. This is nowhere more evident than in the history of Armenia. Throughout the centuries the Armenian people have suffered enormously as a buffer zone between rival empires, yet its people have created and maintained a marvelously rich culture. Its architecture is distinguished by great diversity and holds an important place in the history of medieval art. Armenian sculpture and painting were known from before the Christian era, and as early as the 10th century Armenian carving was renowned for its decorating effect in the Church of the Holy Cross which was situated on an island in Lake Van.

The crafts of Armenia likewise have long been recognized, especially those of the gold- and silver-smiths and weavers. In addition, this venerable race developed and kept its own language, church, and literature. The present-day inheritors of this culture, who have immigrated to the United States, have brought these same gifts of creativity with them and we are the richer for it.

Second, let us recognize that man's inhumanity to man does not find a more debased expression than in senseless and unreasoning racial prejudice and injustice. History has consistently demonstrated that the first step to any nation's destruction has been the recourse to ethnic bigotry, prejudice, and the deportation or slaughter of minority groups.

Third, in memory of those who died in this terrible tragedy, let us vow to put aside racial animosity wherever it exists and go forward to preserve and uphold human dignity and existence whether threatened by disease, famine, or genocide.

Medical Mission Sisters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, a team of 700 women dedicated to medical assistance in developing countries has its American headquarters in Philadelphia. Trained as doctors, nurses, pharmacists, technicians, administrators, secretaries, and so forth, these women, known as Medical Mission Sisters, operate hospitals in the 13 countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Their aim is to give professional medical care, in its full scope, including surgery and obstetrics, and to educate local people in nursing, midwifery, and other paramedical services.

The Medical Mission Sisters were one of the voluntary agencies honored by President Johnson on December 12, 1966, for their work in Vietnam. Speaking for the President, Vice President Humphrey said:

> Throughout the years, the compassion of our people—by individuals, by private groups, such as are here represented today, and by our Government—has brought comfort to people in distress in many countries and under many and difficult circumstances.

Representing the Medical Mission Sisters were Sr. Virginia Sayers, M.D., of Toledo, Ohio, and Sr. Karen Gossman, of Louisville, Ky., administrator of Holy Family Hospital, Qui Nhon, South Vietnam. This hospital, started by the Medical Mission Sisters 6 years ago, has cared for over 100,000 Vietnamese people, many of them refugees.

Washington, D.C., was the birthplace of the Medical Mission Sisters in 1925. They were founded by a 33-year-old woman, Anna Dengel, M.D., with another doctor and two nurses. Dr. Dengel had worked for several years in northern India, where she had been overwhelmed by the vast medical needs of Muslim women whose religious and social situation would not allow them to be treated by male doctors. Realizing that a group of dedicated women, professionally equipped to give complete medical care, could make a much greater contribution than her own individual efforts, Dr. Dengel returned to Europe and the United States for help. For a number of years the Sisters concentrated their efforts on India. As the group grew in numbers, the Sisters spread out into other countries. Now they are in Vietnam, Indonesia, the Philippines, Jordan, Venezuela, and six countries of Africa, besides India and Pakistan.

Some of the American girls who join the Medical Mission Sisters already have professional training. The others are educated by the Sisters. As the medical standards keep rising, more and more specialization is necessary. This month Sr. Miriam Paul Klaus, M.D., of Louisville, Ky., will be installed as a fellow of the American College Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the first Sister to receive this honor. She is now practicing her profession at the Medical Mission Sisters' 150-bed Holy Family Hospital in Dacca, East Pakistan. Sr. Frederic Niedfield, M.D., of Brooklyn, Sr. Mathias Zimmerman, M.D., of Fort Loramie, Ohio, and Sr. Austin Jung, M.D., of Cincinnati, Ohio, are all fellows of the American College of Surgeons, and are practicing in India and Pakistan. Several others of the society's 50 doctors are also board-qualified in various specialties.

> When you're the only doctor around, and a woman is brought in from a village after three days of labor with a ruptured uterus, you *have* to know just what to do, and do it quickly—

Says Sister Mary Luke Gray, M.D., of West Hartford, Conn., who has just passed the exams that make her a diplomate of the American Board of Obstetrics and Gynecology, and will return to Pakistan.

The Sisters consider their training schools one of their most important contributions to the countries in which they work.

> We can't work like a hundred people—

Says Sr. Bernarda Bilsborough, a medical technologist who has spent nine years in Venezuela—

> but we can train a hundred people to work with us.

Last year, when the University of Zulia in Maracaibo, Venezeula, decided to open a school of nursing, they asked the Medical Mission Sisters to take charge of it. In Ghana, West Africa, they were asked by the Government to undertake the training of all the midwives in the Brong-Ahafo district.

The Medical Mission Sisters' work is financed through voluntary contributions and by help from the people of the countries in which they work. They report that it is a day-to-day struggle to make ends meet, and in some cases their work is severely limited by lack of resources. For example, the Government of Ghana has just upgraded nursing education to a state-registered nurses program. There are only two schools in the country qualified to give this type of training. The Brong-Ahafo district, where the Medical Mission Sisters operate a 100-bed hospital in Berekum, needs one of these schools of nursing for the benefit of its 600,000 residents. The Ghanaian Government has asked the Sisters to undertake the project, which would necessitate a 25-bed addition to the hospital and classrooms and dormitories for the students. The Government itself is unable to contribute toward it at this time. The Sisters have a promise of help from Misereor (an organization of German bishops in connection with the German Government), but still lack $200,00 to make the project possible.

The American Province of the Medical Mission Sisters is headed by Sister Miriam Hoover, at 8400 Pine Road, Fox Chase, Philadelphia. Over half the Sisters in the society are American. Other nationalities are Dutch, Indian, English, Filipino, and Indonesian. Working together for the people in developing countries, they try to show the brotherhood of man.