tential through higher education. Because of Democratic programs and in spite of overwhelming Republican opposition, for the first time in our history, through the Higher Education Act of 1965, scholarships and loans and work opportunities and facilities, will be available for one million young Americans every year who otherwise could not go to college.

Fourth. *Crime in our Streets.* In addition to programs designed to eradicate the causes of crime, the President proposed the most extensive anti-crime legislation in our history. All citizens concerned with living in a safe, secure neighborhood should be told again and again of the President's initiative in the Safe Streets and Crime Control Bill and of the overwhelming Republican opposition.

Read what the Washington Post said about the President's Anti-Crime program and the Republican effort to sabotage it: "If the Republicans are out to make crime and violence a campaign issue in 1968, they are going to have to do much better than they did in the House of Representatives on the Federal anti-crime bill. In one day of action on the floor, the Republicans teamed with States' rights Democrats to mangle that bill almost beyond belief. Instead of strengthening it, as Republican leaders are claiming, the House changed the bill in such a way that it can no longer be considered an effective instrument to help local police to fight crime in the streets."

And let me tell you that the Republican gutting of this legislation is only temporary—we don't intend to let them get away with it!

We have brought about so many other programs that will help every American family—measures to control air and water pollution, to add sufficient parks and recreation facilities near urban centers to take care of 20 million more people, to protect consumers, and to break the bottlenecks that make commuting a nightmare for millions of Americans.

My friends, these are some of the issues that directly affect the worker in the city who lives nearby, the American whose numbers increase each year, and who is apt to leave old party loyalties behind when he moves to the suburbs.

Well, we don't want to rely on old party loyalties. Furthermore, we don't need to! The Democratic Party is the Party that succeeded in overcoming Republic opposition and brought into being these historic programs of direct benefit to the vast majority of Americans.

If we don't get the message across, if we don't let these people know how much Democratic programs have helped them, then we will not have their votes—and we will *deserve* to lose them.

This is one of the great tasks that face us as Party leaders.

Get the word out to your communities. Talk about issues that concern your friends and associates.

We have a great record.

We have a great program.

But leadership, accomplishment, and aspiration are *not* enough.

We must also inform, and explain. And more important, we must organize, and we must organize ourselves to attack, when necessary.

I am too familiar with political organization to claim that it can account for more than a small percentage of the overall result. Our leadership and the candidates themselves must carry the major share of the campaign burden. But let us not forget for one moment that a small percentage can be the decisive percentage when the votes are counted. When elections are close, as they have been, and as they can be again, organization can make the difference between victory or near miss.

We have many difficult months ahead of us. The only prediction that I can make with certainty is that the Republican Party will continue to criticize, will continue to oppose.

But though I do not believe that the American people will turn the future of this nation over to the party with the empty record, we cannot merely sit back and rely on *our* record to win elections for Democrats. Many fine Democrats with good records were defeated last November. So past Democratic accomplishment and proven Republican incompetence are not enough.

For the Republicans have a secret weapon. That weapon is nothing less than Democratic disunity and internal strife. In all candor, we simply cannot afford, and the country cannot afford, the luxury of internal strife. Is there any Democrat in California or in the other 12 States in this Western Conference who is individually more important than the Democratic Party or its programs? Is there any Democrat among us who has the right to pursue a course based only on his individual ambitions and to the detriment of the party? This has occurred at times in the past and it is occurring now in some States.

Our leaders are dedicated. They can and will march shoulder to shoulder in party unity. But I am seriously concerned about those who are so selfishly motivated that they would destroy what we have accomplished, that they would see our unfinished agenda go down the drain.

I can tell you that Lyndon Johnson, Hubert Humphrey, Robert Kennedy and our other national leaders will stand together in 1968. But what about our leadership on the local level?

What I am asking of you is no less than the kind of cooperation that existed between John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

You know that in the best American tradition the two men fought valiantly for the Democratic Presidential nomination. When the decision was made right here in Los Angeles, neither man permitted the past to cloud his judgment. John F. Kennedy wanted the most able man he could find for his Vice President. That's why he picked Lyndon B. Johnson. He knew the problems we faced were too vast, the course of human life too uncertain to have anyone but the very best in the Vice President's chair.

My friends, the sense of mutual responsibility, the ability to forget past differences, paid dividends for our country in those terrible days of November, 1963. The result was continuity of leadership, and continuity in the constructive work of the Democratic Party.

That continuity began with cooperation right here in 1960. Let us restore and strengthen that spirit—that spirit of Los Angeles—and we will again assure continuity in the great unfinished tasks that face our country.

In the final analysis, you—the Democratic leaders in every state—must lead the way to victory in 1968.

My friends, the decision is in your hands.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1967

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

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

Lord and Master of us all, whate'er our name or sign, our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded—in Thee we trust. In Thee is our sure confidence that the way of the Republic is down no fatal slope but up to freer sun and air.

Thou knowest that these testing times are finding out our every weakness and calling for our utmost against the wrong that needs resistance, and for the right that needs assistance.

Set our feet on lofty places,
Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christlike graces
In the fight to set men free;
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage
That we fail not man nor Thee.

May we follow the gleam of the highest and best we know, as it leads o'er moor and fen and crag and torrent till the evening comes and the fever of life is over, and our work is done.

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

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966, in accordance with section 6 of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Of the $900 million of property vested under the provisions of the act, only $67 million still remained under the Office's control at the close of the fiscal year.

The Office of Alien Property ceased to exist as an independent entity on June 30, 1966. Its remaining functions are being performed by the part-time services of Justice Department personnel under the supervision of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Division.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 31, 1967.*

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 30, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives following the adjournment of the Senate today until noon Monday, September 11, 1967.

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 536 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

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

"PLANNING-PROGRAMING-BUDGETING: OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS"

The resolution (S. Res. 162) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Planning-Programing-Budgeting: Official Documents" was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 162

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations seven thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Planning-Programing-Budgeting: Official Documents", issued by that committee during the Ninetieth Congress, first session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 557), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 162 would authorize the printing for the use of the Committee on Government Operations of 7,000 additional copies of its committee print of the 90th Congress, first session entitled "Planning-Programing-Budgeting: Official Documents."

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing-cost estimate

Back to press, 1st 1,000 copies	$233.40
6,000 additional copies, at $54.04 per thousand	324.24
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 162	557.64

"PLANNING-PROGRAMING-BUDGETING: SELECTED COMMENT"

The resolution (S. Res. 163) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Planning-Programing-Budgeting: Selected Comment" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 163

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations seven thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Planning-Programing-Budgeting: Selected Comment", issued by that committee during the Ninetieth Congress, first session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 552), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 163 would authorize the printing for the use of the Committee on Government Operations of 7,000 additional copies of its committee print of the 90th Congress, first session, entitled "Planning-Programing-Budgeting: Selected Comment."

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing-cost estimate

Back to press, first 1,000 copies	$334.40
6,000 additional copies, at $88.82 per thousand	532.92
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 163	867.32

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The resolution (S. Res. 164) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 164

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 17, Ninetieth Congress, first session, agreed to February 20, 1967, is amended by striking out "$165,000" in section 4, and inserting in lieu thereof "$185,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 553), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

PURPOSE OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION

Senate Resolution 164 would increase by $20,000, from $165,000 to $185,000 the limitation on expenditures by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the study of matters relating to poverty it is currently engaged in pursuant to Senate Resolution 17 of the present Congress.

Senate Resolution 17 as agreed to by the Senate on February 20, 1967, authorized the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to expend not to exceed $165,000 from February 1, 1967, through January 31, 1968, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to poverty including, but not limited to, such matters as—

(*a*) The provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and other acts pertaining to poverty with a view to ascertaining the extent to which changes in such acts are desirable;

(*b*) The nature and effectiveness of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local government and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of poverty; and

(*c*) The degree of additional Federal action desirable in this area.

STUDY OF EDUCATION AND RELATED PROBLEMS OF INDIAN CHILDREN

The resolution (S. Res. 165) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the education and related problems of Indian Children was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 165

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the education and related problems of Indian children.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from September 1, 1967, to January 31, 1968, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

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

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $35,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 554), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 165 would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $35,000 by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from September 1, 1967, through January 31, 1968, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the education and related problems of Indian children.

ERNEST E. WILES

The resolution (S. Res. 167) to pay a gratuity to Ernest E. Wiles was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 167

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Ernest E. Wiles, widower of Yukie Wiles, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to five months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

KEEN JOHNSON AND CATHERINE JOHNSON REDANS

The resolution (S. Res. 166) to pay a gratuity to Keen Johnson and Catherine Johnson Redans was considered and and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 166

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Keen Johnson, brother, and Catherine Johnson Redans, sister, of Christine Johnson, an

employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to six months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON HOUSING LEGISLATION

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of additional copies of its hearings of the present Congress on housing legislation was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 42

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency one thousand five hundred additional copies each of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings before its Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs during the Ninetieth Congress, first session, entitled "Housing Legislation of 1967."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 556), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Concurrent Resolution 42 would authorize the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency of 1,500 additional copies each of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings before its Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs during the 90th Congress, first session, entitled "Housing Legislation of 1967."

The printing cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing cost estimate

Part 1:	
Back to press, 1st 1,000 copies	$3,913.83
500 additional copies, at $1,502 per thousand	751.00
Estimated cost, part 1	4,664.83
Part 2:	
Back to press, 1st 1,000 copies	3,288.08
500 additional copies, at $1,326 per thousand	663.00
Estimated cost, part 2	3,951.08
Total estimated cost, Senate Concurrent Resolution 42	8,615.91

TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The bill (H.R. 9837) to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, as it relates to transportation expenses of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 555), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

H.R. 9837 would amend the existing statutory provisions relating to reimbursement of transportation expenses incurred by Members of the House of Representatives (including the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico) by—

(1) Increasing from four to the "number of months Congress is in session" the number of round trips per year between Washington, D.C., and the district he represents for which a Member could be reimbursed; and

(2) Increasing from $300 to $750 the lump-sum payment which Members could elect to receive in any year in lieu of the round trip reimbursement specified above.

The amendments proposed by H.R. 9837 would be retroactive to January 3, 1967.

"WASTE FROM WATERCRAFT"

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 157) to print as a Senate document a report on "Waste From Watercraft" which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments at the beginning of line 2 to strike out "for the use of the Committee on Public Works two thousand five hundred copies of"; and in line 6, after the word "of" to strike out "1966." and insert "1966; and that there be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works."; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES. 157

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the report "Waste From Watercraft", of the Secretary of the Interior, in compliance with the provisions of section 17, Public Law 89-753, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966; and that there be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 558), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 157 would authorize the printing as a Senate document of the report "Waste From Watercraft," submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior in compliance with the provisions of section 17, Public Law 89-753, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. There would be printed 2,500 additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

The Committee on Rules and Administration is reporting Senate Resolution 157 with minor pro forma amendments to recast the resolution in the customary format.

The printing cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing cost estimate

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$2,453.25
2,500 additional copies, at $194.82 per thousand	487.05
Total estimated cost, S. Resolution 157	2,940.30

"MANPOWER AND TRAINING NEEDS IN WATER POLLUTION CONTROL"

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 158) to print as a Senate document a report entitled "Manpower and Training Needs in Water Pollution Control" which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "for the use of the Committee on Public Works, two thousand five hundred copies of"; and in line 7, after the word "of" to strike out "1966." and insert "1966; and that there be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works."; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES. 158

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the report "Manpower and Training Needs of the States and of Local Governments in Water Pollution Control", of the Secretary of the Interior, in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 89-753, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966; and that there be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 559), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

Senate Resolution 158 would authorize the printing as a Senate document of the report "Manpower and Training Needs of the States and of Local Governments in Water Pollution Control," submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 89-753, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. There would be an additional 2,500 copies of the document printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

The Committee on Rules and Administration is reporting Senate Resolution 158 with minor pro forma amendments to recast the resolution in the customary format.

The printing cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing cost estimate

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$1,253.87
2,500 additional copies, at $96.81 per thousand	242.03
Total estimated cost, Senate Resolution 158	1,495.90

"AUTOMOTIVE AIR POLLUTION"

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 159) to print as a Senate document a report on "Automotive Air Pollution" which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "for the use of the Committee on Public Works, two thousand five hundred copies of" and at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "89-272." and insert "89-272; and that there be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works."; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES. 159

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the sixth semiannual report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on the problem of air pollution caused by motor vehicles and measures taken toward its alleviation, dated June 1967, in compliance with the provisions of section 106(b) of the Clean Air Act, Public Law 88-206, as amended by Public Law 89-272; and that there be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 560), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 159 would authorize the printing with an illustration as a Senate document of the sixth semiannual report of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on the problem of air pollution caused by motor vehicles and measures taken toward its alleviation, dated June 1967, in compliance with the provisions of section 106(b) of the Clean Air Act, Public Law 88-206, as amended by Public Law 89-272. The resolution also would authorize the printing of 2,500 additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works. The five prior HEW semiannual reports on the subject have all been printed as Senate documents.

The Committee on Rules and Administration is reporting Senate Resolution 159 with minor pro forma amendments to recast the resolution in the customary format.

The printing cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing cost estimate

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$445.64
2,500 additional copies, at $44.95 per thousand	112.38
Total estimated cost, Senate Resolution 159	558.02

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONCLUSION OF SENATE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the business of the Senate until noon, September 11, 1967.

INVESTING IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today, as the costs of the Vietnam war continue to spiral and the price tag of maintaining existing domestic and foreign programs continues to rise, it is more important than ever that America turn to the vast resources of private enterprise for assistance. For too long, Government has failed to enlist the energies and talents of the private sector of our economy in meeting urgent national problems. Training programs, educational programs, poverty programs, housing programs—all these have been Government financed, and most have been Government run. These programs have fallen far short of their initial goals and simply are not enough to meet the challenges they were designed to resolve.

To rely exclusively, even primarily, on Government efforts is to ignore the basic traditions of American life and politics. To ignore the potential contribution of private enterprise is to have the Nation fight the war on poverty with one hand tied behind its back. Private enterprise is not just another part of America; in a significant sense, it is the very sinews and strength of America. Our productive assets, our machines, our money and plants are owned by private enterprise. It organizes the means by which we join with our fellow man to produce goods and roads, to bring food to our tables and clothes to our backs. Private enterprise has built our cities and industries. But it has not rebuilt the centers of poverty, nor put their people to work. And I believe that the lack of private enterprise participation is the principal cause of our failure to solve the problem of employment in urban poverty areas.

There is little question but that unemployment is one of the primary problems that creates the deprivation, frustration, and decay which tear at the very fabric of life in every major city in this Nation. In a special survey of slum areas, the Labor Department found that at least one-third of their residents who need work do not have the minimal decent jobs that they require for their own independence and the support of their families. This determination has been confirmed by every board and commission, expert and amateur, official and layman, which has examined the problem. The McCone Commission looked at Los Angeles and said that the most serious problem in Watts is unemployment. The Wall Street Journal looked at Oakland and said that its principal plight is unemployment. The Haryou study looked at Harlem and said that the key problem is unemployment. Upon employment hinge the answers to many of the other problems. Jobs cannot educate, but they can help create an atmosphere in which education can more easily take place. Jobs cannot cure disease, but they can help provide the incomes to buy better food and decent medical care. Jobs cannot guarantee happiness, but they certainly can reduce welfare and dependency on the government. Thus, the greatest challenge we have is to afford men the opportunity to contribute to themselves, to support their families, and to contribute to their community. And private enterprise has a vital and necessary role to play in helping America effectively meet this challenge.

I have long supported proposals to broaden the participation of private enterprise in programs to help the less fortunate. Since 1965, I have coauthored the so-called Human Investment Act to provide tax incentives to encourage private industry to offer job training opportunities. In 1966, I was proud to coauthor an amendment enacted by Congress to increase maximum participation of private enterprise in fulfilling the goals and policies of the Economic Opportunity Act.

In July of this year, I have coauthored a proposal—S. 2088—to provide incentives for the creation by private enterprise of jobs for the residents of urban poverty areas. I believe this proposal provides a sound approach to expanding employment opportunities in the slums and ghettos of our Nation. It creates no new bureaucracies nor does it require vast amounts of Federal appropriations. The Federal Government provides only a system of tax incentives, carefully designed to enable private enterprise to make its investments and carry out its operations in urban poverty areas.

Mr. President, no one doubts that increased Federal appropriations for one program or another will be needed in the future, but I believe that new ideas and creative approaches are needed even more. In this respect, it is vital that the resources of private enterprise be mobilized to spearhead an attack on the very core of urban poverty—unemployment. S. 2088 offers such an opportunity. It is a proposal which will not only engage the energies of a nation in a partnership of government, people, and business; but will give to thousands of Americans the most fundamental of all rights—the right to earn a living. Certainly, America can afford to do no less.

STATE DEPARTMENT WHITE PAPER ON PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier this month the Department of State issued a white paper thoroughly portraying the situation respecting American prisoners now held by the Communist Vietnamese. Unquestionably, this is one of the most angering aspects of this tragic conflict. The American people cannot stand mute before the brutal, barbaric, and murderous treatment of prisoners by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese. Last year the Hanoi regime threatened to hold public trials of captured American flyers on trumped-up "war crimes" charges. At that time, I pointed out that the holding of such farcical proceedings would be a tragic miscalculation. On July 13, 1966, I said in the Senate:

Let the Hanoi regime be fully warned in advance that any attempt to humiliate and execute captured American prisoners now in their hands will meet with a worldwide revulsion. It would unite the American people as no other act could unite them in the fight we are making for the respect and dignity of the people of South Vietnam.

Today, there are more than 650 American servicemen classed as prisoners of war or missing in Vietnam. Some 200 are known to be in Communist hands. The recent loss of airplanes in North Vietnam suggests that this number has increased.

Hanoi, like the United States and South Vietnam, is signatory to the Geneva Convention. Its shocking behavior is clear evidence of the double standard which the Communists have consistently applied in this conflict. On this issue, surely, there is no room for debate. Hanoi's infamy must be replaced by some signs of good faith if it expects ever to engage in serious discussions to bring this conflict to a close. I ask unanimous consent that the State Department white paper be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATE DEPARTMENT WHITE PAPER ON PRISONERS OF WAR

INTRODUCTION

In its handling of prisoners of war in Viet-Nam, the United States Government has placed great emphasis upon proper treatment in accordance with its responsibilities under international law and its desire to insure equal treatment of its own personnel captured by enemy forces. North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces captured in South Viet-Nam are detained by the Government of South Viet-Nam in PW camps inspected by the International Committee of the Red Cross where they are given the decent treatment required by the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of August 12, 1949. Sick and wounded prisoners have been repatriated to North Viet-Nam as the convention requires, and others have been repatriated or released in South Viet-Nam, in the hope that our adversaries will reciprocate.

The United States Government repeatedly has appealed to North Viet-Nam and to the National Liberation Front to treat prisoners of war humanely and to respect the requirements of the Geneva convention by which they are bound. On July 17, 1967, the White House issued a public statement calling upon the National Liberation Front and North Viet-Nam to permit impartial inspection of all prisoners and to repatriate sick and wounded prisoners. The statement reiterated our desire for an exchange of prisoners and emphasized that the United States Government is willing "to discuss such exchanges at any time and in any appropriate way, using intermediaries or directly, by public means or privately."

Despite our best efforts, however, both North Viet-Nam and the National Liberation Front refuse to observe the Geneva convention provisions. They have not yet agreed to repatriate sick and wounded prisoners. Their claims of humanitarian treatment of prisoners cannot be verified because neutral governments or humanitarian agencies are not allowed to visit the prisoners or to inspect their places of detention. The great majority of American prisoners have been isolated from every contact with the outside world.

In the past 2 years there have been several incidents of abuse of American prisoners of war, including the reprisal murder of three captured U.S. servicemen by the Viet Cong in 1965 and the parade of American pilots through the streets of Hanoi in 1966. Recently there have been indications that other U.S. personnel detained by the enemy are not being treated humanely. This spring several U.S. prisoners of war, in an apparently dazed condition, were publicly displayed in Hanoi, and there have been a number of broadcasts of alleged "confessions." In South Viet-Nam there have been more murders of U.S. soldiers captured by the enemy.

The United States Government has formally protested the atrocities committed against U.S. personnel detained by the enemy, and many governments and statesmen have intervened on behalf of U.S. prisoners. A United States protest, sent through the International Committee of the Red Cross on March 24, 1967, conveyed the strong feelings of the American people on this matter. It stated:

"For some time the North Viet-Namese authorities have made statements both public and private to the effect that their policy regarding treatment of American prisoners of war is a humane one. Because of North Viet-Nam's refusal to permit representatives of a neutral country or the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit the American prisoners, as required by the Geneva Conventions of 1949, and because of the restrictions that North Viet-Nam has imposed upon the rights of the American prisoners under international law to correspond with their families, it has not been possible to verify the North Vietnamese claims of humane treatment.

"In recent weeks information has come to our attention which casts the most serious doubts upon the North Viet-Namese statements that American prisoners are being treated in a humane fashion. We have reluctantly come to the conclusion that some of the U.S. airmen are being subjected to emotional or physical duress, which is a flagrant violation of the Geneva Conventions. . . ."

In these circumstances, it is important to set the record straight in regard to the rights of prisoners of war and the policies of the parties to the conflict.

SPECIAL STATUS OF PRISONERS OF WAR UNDER THE GENEVA CONVENTION

The special status enjoyed by prisoners of war under international law stems from the fact that there is no military justification for the injury or mistreatment of members of armed forces who have fallen into the hands of the enemy and who no longer present any military threat. Because prisoners of war are unable to protect themselves, international law requires that their persons and honor be respected and that they be protected from both physical and mental abuse. Although no nation today claims a right to mistreat prisoners of war, specific safeguards are necessary to insure their proper treatment. These protections are provided by the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of August 12, 1949, which has been accepted by 123 countries.

The Geneva convention requires that "prisoners of war must at all times be humanely treated." It establishes standards for PW camps and for the food, clothing, and medical care of prisoners of war. Among other matters, the convention regulates the labor of the prisoners of war and their discipline. It guarantees them the services of a "Protecting Power" and communication with their families. Finally, the convention guarantees the right of repatriation. Seriously sick and wounded prisoners of war must be allowed to return home as soon as they are fit to travel, even if hostilities continue. All others who are not released during hostilities must be given that opportunity as soon as active hostilities have ceased.

The specific protections afforded prisoners of war by the Geneva convention are vital to their safety and well-being. The United States, South Viet-Nam, and our allies have applied the convention in the current hostilities. Despite the appeals of the International Committee of the Red Cross, the other side has refused to do so.

APPLICATION OF THE GENEVA CONVENTION IN VIETNAM

Article 2 of the convention provides that it "shall apply to all cases of declared war or any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them." The principle parties to the conflict in Viet-Nam are all parties to the convention. South Viet-Nam acceded to the convention on November 14, 1953, and North Viet-Nam acceded on June 28, 1957. The United States ratification was deposited on August 2, 1955. [The other countries contributing troops have also ratified the convention, namely: Australia—October 14, 1958; Korea—August 16, 1966; New Zealand—May 2, 1959; Philippines—October 6, 1952; Thailand—December 29, 1954.]

On June 11, 1965, M. Jacques Freymond, Vice President of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), wrote to the United States Government, the Government of South Viet-Nam, the Government of North Viet-Nam, and the National Liberation Front, reminding each of them of their obligation to apply the Geneva convention in Viet-Nam.

On August 10, 1965, Secretary of State Dean Rusk wrote to the ICRC, stating: "The United States Government has always abided by the humanitarian principles enunciated in the Geneva Conventions and will continue to do so. In regard to the hostilities in Viet-Nam, the United States Government is applying the provisions of the Geneva Conventions and we expect the other parties to the conflict to do likewise."

South Viet-Nam made a similar reply to the ICRC on August 11, 1965. The allies have reiterated their determination to apply the convention in the Joint Statement of Honolulu on February 8, 1966, as well as in the seven-power communiques at Manila on October 25, 1966, and at Washington on April 21, 1967.

North Viet-Nam and the Viet Cong, on the other hand, have refused on various grounds to apply the Geneva convention for the benefit of prisoners of war held by them. The National Liberation Front has taken the rigid position that it is not bound by the convention, despite the quiet and correct insistence of the ICRC that the Viet Cong are bound by the adherence of both North and South Viet-Nam.

North Viet-Nam's position is stated in a letter to the ICRC of August 31, 1965, contending that American pilots captured in North Viet-Nam were "major criminals" liable for judgment under North Vietnamese law "although captured pilots are well-treated." At times North Viet-Nam has attempted to justify its refusal to extend the protections of the Geneva convention to the captured Americans on the ground that the convention does not apply in the absence of a declaration of war. However, article 2 of the convention specifically states that the convention shall apply to any armed conflict which may arise between the parties "even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them." There is an "armed conflict" between parties to the convention, and the ICRC has declared that the obligations of this humanitarian law are in force.

Despite the attitude of North Viet-Nam and the Viet Cong, the United States, South Viet-Nam, and our other allies have made a major effort to apply the provisions of the Geneva convention to the fighting in Viet-Nam. All prisoners of war taken by United States and other allied forces in South Viet-Nam are transferred to the custody of the Government of South Viet-Nam in accordance with article 12 of the Geneva convention which provides that prisoners of war may be transferred to a power which is a party to the convention willing and able to apply the convention. South Viet-Nam is a party to the convention and in statements to the ICRC and in joint communiques with the United States and other troop-contributing countries has pledged itself to apply the convention. The United States, for its part, recognizes that it has contingent responsibility for prisoners of war transferred from its control. The two governments together have developed a comprehensive program for the humanitarian treatment of prisoners of war as follows:

Instruction of troops

First, the forces of both the United States and Viet-Nam are instructed and trained to treat prisoners humanely and to apply the terms of the convention. Each soldier is provided with a card to be carried on his person which reminds him of the basic rights of prisoners of war.

Classification of prisoners

Second, each person detained by U.S. forces is treated as a prisoner of war unless and until such time as he is properly classified in accordance with the convention as other than a prisoner of war. All persons transferred from United States control are first classified by United States personnel, and prisoners of war are delivered directly to a PW camp by U.S. forces.

Under the Geneva convention, the main categories of prisoners of war include the regular armed forces of the parties to the conflict; certain civilians accompanying the forces; and guerrilla forces if they are subject to a commander, carry arms openly, wear a uniform or other distinctive sign recognizable at a distance, and comply with the laws and customs of war. By these standards, a great many Viet Cong., would not qualify for prisoner-of-war status because they do not wear any uniform, do not carry arms openly, and commonly violate the rules of warfare. These rules would disqualify many guerrillas as well as terrorists. However, South Viet-Nam and the United States have adopted broad definitions for qualifying prisoners of war which are more generous than those provided in the Geneva convention. All North Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops (other than terrorists) are classified as prisoners of war even if they do not meet the standards of the Geneva convention.

This policy is in marked contrast with North Viet-Nam's refusal to give prisoner-of-war which are more generous than those propersonnel, notwithstanding the fact that these American prisoners are uniformed members of the regular Armed Forces of the United States and incontestably qualify for prisoner-of-war status.

The Viet Cong do not consider any of their captives to be prisoners of war.

Prisoner-of-war camps

After classification, prisoners taken by United States and friendly forces in South Viet-Nam are promptly moved into prisoner-of-war camps which have been specially constructed and are maintained by the South Vietnamese Army in accordance with the Geneva convention. Prisoners are provided with adequate shelter, clothing, food, medical care, and exercise, and they are treated with dignity and respect by the prison guards. United States military advisers are assigned to each of these prisoner-of-war camps, and the camps are regularly visited by representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

At the present time there are six PW camps in which more than 6,000 North Vietnamese Army and Viet Cong prisoners of war are detained. This figure does not include the thousands of enemy cadre who over the years have defected and voluntarily returned to the Government's side under the "open arms" program. These persons after a few weeks of rehabilitation are released with full rights of citizenship.

MISTREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR BY NORTH VIETNAM AND THE VIETCONG

North Viet-Nam and the Viet Cong claim that they follow a humanitarian policy towards prisoners of war, but they have systematically deprived prisoners of their rights under the Geneva convention, and there are increasing indications of the deliberate mistreatment of prisoners. It is impossible to confirm the conditions under which prisoners are held by the enemy because neither North Viet-Nam nor the Viet Cong will permit independent verification by any neutral government or impartial gency.

IDENTIFICATION OF PRISONERS OF WAR

There are approximately 650 American military personnel who are classed as PW's or missing in North and South Viet-Nam. The United States believes that approximately 200 of these men are being held as prisoners of war. The total number of prisoners is not known, however, because North Viet-Nam refuses to identify all prisoners of war as required by the Geneva convention.

The convention requires each party to the conflict to establish an Information Bureau to collect names and other vital information concerning prisoners of war and to forward this information to the powers concerned through the intermediary of the Protecting Powers and a Central Information Agency to be created in a neutral country. The International Committee of the Red Cross has performed the functions of a Central Information Agency by soliciting all parties to the conflict to provide lists of prisoners of war to its Central Tracing Agency. The names of prisoners of war captured by U.S. and South Vietnamese forces are supplied to the ICRC by the Government of South Viet-Nam, but North Viet-Nam and the Viet Cong refuse to provide such information.

The prompt disclosure of the names of captured personnel is vital to keep account of prisoners of war so that they do not simply "disappear." The enemy's refusal to disclose the names of prisoners of war is a source of continuing concern. It not only causes needless uncertainty and anguish to the families of missing servicemen, but it also provides a basis for suspicion that North Viet-Nam and the Viet Cong do not wish to be held accountable for prisoners they capture.

PROTECTING POWER

Article 8 of the convention prescribes that the "present Convention shall be applied with the cooperation and under the scrutiny of the Protecting Powers whose duty is to safeguard the interests of the Parties to the conflict." The Protecting Powers are the key to the operation of the convention and to the protection of prisoners of war. It is their responsibility to verify the conditions under which prisoners are detained and to safeguard prisoners' rights as established by the convention. The Protecting Powers are entitled to visit privately with prisoners of war, to hear their complaints, to advise them of their rights, and to help resolve disputes between the parties to the conflict over the application of the convention. If formal protection cannot be arranged, the convention requires that a substitute organization or an agency such as the ICRC be appointed to assume the humanitarian functions performed by the Protecting Powers. No party holding prisoners has the right to deny those prisoners this fundamental protection.

Notwithstanding the clear requirement of the convention, North Viet-Nam has refused to allow American prisoners of war to have the benefit of a Protecting Power, and it has not permitted the ICRC to perform the humanitarian functions of a Protecting Power. Thus, North Viet-Nam has undercut the very structure of the convention and has made its application impossible. In South Viet-Nam, the ICRC performs many of the functions that would normally be performed by a Protecting Power for enemy prisoners of war, but it cannot fulfill that role completely because North Viet-Nam refuses to acknowledge that its forces are present in South Viet-Nam.

CONTACT WITH THE OUTSIDE WORLD

The Geneva convention further provides that prisoners are not too isolated from contact with the outside world. Prisoners are entitled to correspond with their families and friends and to receive parcels from the outside. The International Committee of the Red Cross is entitled to visit prisoner-of-war camps, to speak privately with prisoners of war, and to distribute parcels and comfort items to the prisoners.

South Viet-Nam and the United States have cooperated with the International Committees. ICRC representatives visit PW camps and civil prisons in South Viet-Nam, and ICRC doctors examine sick and wounded prisoners being treated in hospitals in South Viet-Nam. These representatives have been allowed to interview prisoners privately, and they are authorized to distribute comfort items to the prisoners. South Vietnamese authorities and the ICRC are also attempting to facilitate correspondence between enemy prisoners and their families.

North Viet-Nam and the Viet Cong have rigidly refused to comply with these provisions of the convention. Some U.S. prisoners in North Viet-Nam have been allowed to send a few letters and several prisoners have been seen by journalists and other foreign visitors; but the great majority have been cut off from every contact with the outside world. Parcels mailed to prisoners in North Viet-Nam are returned unopened, and we do not know whether letters sent to North Viet-Nam are delivered to the prisoners. The ICRC is not allowed to enter North Viet-Nam, and the prison camps and places of detention are not open to inspection. Moreover, North Viet-Nam has refused to disclose the geographic location of PW camps as the convention requires. This policy of isolation of prisoners of war is both illegal and inhumane, and it gives ground for deep concern as to the treatment of prisoners by North Viet-Nam.

HUMANE TREATMENT OF PRISIONERS OF WAR—ATROCITIES

Article 13 of the Geneva convention provides:

"Prisoners of war must at all times be humanely treated. Any unlawful act or omission by the Detaining Power causing death or seriously endangering the health of a prisoner of war in its custody is prohibited, and will be regarded as a serious breach of the present Convention. In particular, no prisoner of war may be subjected to physical mutilation or to medical or scientific experiments of any kind which are not justified by the medical, dental or hospital treatment of the prisoner concerned and carried out in his interest.

"Likewise, prisoners of war must at all times be protected, particularly against acts of violence or intimidation and against insults and public curiosity.

"Measures of reprisal against prisoners of war are prohibited."

South Viet-Nam and the United States have taken great pains to insure that these most fundamental provisions of the convention are fully complied with. Although some instances of abuse undoubtedly have occurred in the heat of battle, these incidents have been reduced to a minimum by a continuing program of education and by elaborate procedures for the processing of prisoners of war from the moment of capture.

The record of the other side has been deplorable. On June 24, 1965, the NLF announced the murder of Sergeant Harold Bennett by the Viet Cong in stated reprisal for the execution of terrorists by the Government of South Viet-Nam. Again on September 26, 1965, the NLF announced the reprisal murder of Captain Humbert R. Versace and Sergeant Kenneth M. Roraback by the Viet Cong. Article 13 of the convention specifically prohibits the taking of reprisals against prisoners of war, and the murder of prisoners of war is a grave breach of the convention. The United States immediately protested these "acts of wanton murder" to the ICRC, and appealed to the International Red Cross Conference which convened in Vienna the next week. On October 9 the Red Cross conference overwhelmingly adopted a resolution noting that reprisals against prisoners of war are condemned and calling for the application of the Geneva convention. This appeal has been ignored by our opponents in Viet-Nam.

On May 23, 1967, Marine Lieutenant William M. Grammar and Army Sergeant Orville B. Frits were captured in fighting with North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces in Quang Tri Province. When the enemy positions were taken a few hours later, the two men were discovered to have been tortured and executed by their captors. The Viet Cong have massacred numbers of Vietnamese prisoners rather than give them up to approaching government forces. In an incident on January 15, 1967, government troops discovered the bodies of 81 Vietnamese civilians massacred by Viet Cong forces retreating in front of government forces in the Mekong delta. Many of the bodies found in two trenches were mutilated. The South Vietnamese Government protested this action to the International Control Commission established under the 1954 Geneva accords.

U.S. civilians also have been victimized by the Viet Cong. On June 15, 1967, the Viet Cong "Liberation Radio," broadcasting from Hanoi, announced the name of Gustav C. Hertz as one of those American prisoners who "had paid their blood debt to the Vietnamese people." The broadcast implied that Hertz, who was captured on February 2, 1965, had been executed as an act of reprisal. The United States is seeking clarification of this announcement from the National Liberation Front.

Gustav Hertz is a civilian employee of the U.S. Agency for International Development working in Viet-Nam in the field of public administration. He is entitled to the protections of the 1949 Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which specifically prohibits reprisals against persons who fall into the hands of a party to the conflict of which they are not nationals. The murder of a civilian captive is a flagrant violation of international law.

Apart from incidents of gross brutality, North Viet-Nam has violated article 13 of the Geneva convention by failing to protect prisoners of war "against acts of violence or intimidation and against insults and public curiosity." In July 1966 North Vietnamese authorities paraded captured American pilots through angry crowds of people in the streets of Hanoi. At that time North Viet-Nam was giving indications that it intended to put captured American pilots on trial as "war criminals." The United States Government stated that such a move would be a transparent attempt to take reprisals against prisoners of war in violation of article 13. The prospect of war-crimes trials caused grave concern in the United States and around the world. Many American political figures and citizens spoke up in protest, and a number of governments and statesmen and the ICRC intervened on behalf of the prisoners. Both Secretary-General U Thant of the United Nations and His Holiness Pope Paul VI made statements in support of the humanitarian treatment of prisoners of war. On July 24 President Ho Chi Minh of North Viet-Nam announced that there was no "trial in view."

Nonetheless, acts of public intimidation and humiliation continue to occur. On May 9, 1967, the United States again protested "the parading of captured American pilots through the streets of Hanoi and their display at a press conference on May 6." This incident was particularly disturbing in view of indications that one or more of the prisoners was wounded or ill. In consequence, the American Red Cross sent the following message to the North Vietnamese Red Cross:

"As an act of mercy and in keeping traditional responsibility your Red Cross and ours we ask that you request your government on humanitarian grounds to permit repatriation of seriously ill and injured prisoners such as Lt. Col. Larsen, Lt. Col. Hughes, and Lt. Schively, who were so obviously helpless and incapacitated as shown in films exhibited in the United States. . . ."

The American Red Cross has had no reply to this message.

COERCION OF PRISONERS

Article 17 of the Geneva convention lays down the rule that: "No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind." There are nevertheless indications that U.S. prisoners of war in North Viet-Nam are being subjected to physical or mental coercion, and that one objective of this treatment is to extract from them propaganda statements critical of U.S. actions in Viet-Nam. There have been reports and films of U.S. prisoners in apparently dazed conditions on exhibit in Hanoi, and North Viet-Nam has released some 27 propaganda statements attributed to U.S. prisoners of war.

The case of Navy pilot Commander Jeremiah A. Denton, Jr. appears to confirm that U.S. prisoners are being abused in this manner. In May 1966 Commander Denton in an interview on a Japanese television network said, "I don't know what is happening [in Viet-Nam] but whatever my government's policy is I support it." The pilot said he felt pretty well. "I get adequate food, clothing, and medical care when I require it." However, a close-up shot of the American prisoner showed his face drawn and haggard, and his eyes appeared heavy-lidded. He spoke haltingly and rolled his eyes continually, at times staring blankly at the ceiling. He would occasionally close his eyes tightly when asked to answer a question. Two months later, on July 8, 1966, Peking Radio broadcast in English a statement attributed to Commander Denton denouncing the bombing of North Viet-Nam.

The appearance of Navy Commander Richard A. Stratton at a "press conference" in Hanoi on March 5, 1967, caused alarm. According to eyewitness observers, including Western journalists and diplomats, Comdr. Stratton appeared dazed and confused, his nose swollen, his skin blotchy, his eyes empty of expression. At command from his captors he bowed stiffly several times, but said nothing. While he was going through these actions a tape-recorded confession to "war crimes," said to be Stratton's voice, was played over a loudspeaker. The press conference, described by observers as a "frightening experience," was confirmed on film by an American photographer and a Japanese TV crew. It was this incident which prompted the United States protest of March 24, 1967. Since that time the Hanoi authorities have attempted to convey the impression that prisoners are well-treated by arranging interviews of Commander Stratton and other prisoners by Soviet, Cuban, and other Communist journalists, and other visitors to North Viet-Nam. However, North Viet-Nam continues to refuse to allow the ICRC or any neutral government or agency to visit the prisoners and their places of detention, as required by the Geneva convention. Without such independent verification, North Viet-Nam's professions of "humane treatment" cannot be accepted.

The United States Government continues to protest these violations of the convention, and it has asked the International Committee of the Red Cross and various governments to intervene on behalf of the United States prisoners. The ICRC has transmitted the U.S. protests and repeatedly has appealed to all parties to the conflict to assure proper and humane treatment of prisoners. Unfortunately, North Viet-Nam has not changed its position. The Viet Cong has severely criticized the ICRC for attempting to perform the impartial humanitarian tasks which are its special responsibility to victims of war.

THE REPATRIATION OF PRISONERS OF WAR

The Geneva convention imposes an absolute obligation to release prisoners of war. Prisoners who are seriously sick or wounded and who wish to return home must be sent back to their own country as soon as they are fit to travel. Other sick and wounded prisoners whose health would be benefited thereby should be accommodated in neutral countries. The parties to the conflict are required, throughout the duration of hostilities, to endeavor to make arrangements for such accommodation. The parties to the conflict "may, in addition, conclude agreements with a view to the direct repatriation or internment in a neutral country of able-bodied prisoners of war who have undergone a long period of captivity." Prisoners of war who are not released during the hostilities and who wish to return home "shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities."

The United States Government and the Government of South Viet-Nam have given high priority to the humanitarian treatment of prisoners of war and to the early release of all prisoners of war. In cooperation with the International Committee of the Red Cross, we are carrying out the obligation to repatriate sick and wounded prisoners of war. To facilitate the release of sick or wounded prisoners, medical doctors of the International Committee of the Red Cross are helping South Vietnamese authorities to examine all prisoners of war who might qualify for direct repatriation during the continuance of hostilities. Eligible prisoners who are fit to travel and who wish to return home at this time are repatriated direct to North Viet-Nam across the Ben Hai River bridge in the Demilitarized Zone. North Viet-Nam refuses to acknowledge that these prisoners are members of its forces, but it has accepted their return to North Viet-Nam.

In the absence of negotiated arrangements for the comprehensive repatriation of sick and wounded prisoners, it is necessary to limit repatriation to groups of manageable size and to schedule the releases at intervals when the course of hostilities will permit. Thus far, South Viet-Nam has repatriated 100 prisoners to North Viet-Nam in four releases scheduled since January 1966. The latest repatriation took place on June 12 and included 39 prisoners. As more North Vietnamese prisoners are taken, this program of limited unilateral repatriation will continue.

North Viet-Nam holds many American prisoners eligible for immediate repatriation, but it has yet to take any action to meet this obligation. We earnestly hope that North Viet-Nam will demonstrate a humanitarian policy by repatriating the seriously sick and wounded prisoners it holds without further delay. * * * have also attempted to persuade the other side to consider an immediate exchange of able-bodied prisoners. To this end we have contacted both North Viet-Nam and the National Liberation Front, directly and through intermediaries, to propose discussions of repatriation, exchange, and other matters pertinent to prisoners of war. On July 20, 1966, President Johnson publicly declared our willingness to meet with the Hanoi government on these matters at a conference table under sponsorship of the ICRC. The International Committee, national Red Cross societies, governments, and private persons have appealed to North Viet-Nam and the NLF to discuss these matters, but every initiative has been rejected. Both North Viet-Nam and the Viet Cong refuse to comply with these vital provisions of the Geneva convention, and both refuse to discuss the matter directly or through any intermediary.

The only hopeful note in these matters has been the practice of the Viet Cong to release a few of the prisoners from time to time. Four U.S. servicemen, two U.S. civilians, and a Filipino woman have been released by the National Liberation Front along with occasional Vietnamese. To reciprocate these actions and to encourage the *ad hoc* release of prisoners of war, the South Vietnamese Government has undertaken the periodic release of Viet Cong prisoners of war in South Viet Nam.

Since January 1966, 34 Viet Cong have been set free under this program. The latest release involving four Viet Cong prisoners took place on June 12 of this year. The United States welcomes these unilateral measures for the benefit of prisoners of war, and it is our hope that North Viet Nam and the National Liberation Front will choose to adopt a humanitarian policy of returning all prisoners of war to their families at the earliest possible date.

CONCLUSION

The Geneva convention establishes special protections for prisoners of war because these men who have fallen into the hands of the enemy no longer present any threat

and are unable to protect themselves. Together with the Government of South Viet Nam and our allies we shall insure that enemy prisoners of war are treated humanely in accordance with the Geneva convention. We will continue to make every effort to persuade North Viet Nam and the Viet Cong to apply the Geneva convention for the benefit of U.S. and allied prisoners of war. In the interest of the humanitarian policy which they proclaim, we appeal to North Viet Nam and to the National Liberation Front to respect the rights of prisoners of war and to comply with the Geneva convention.

LET US NOT REACH THE POINT OF NO RETURN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Adm. U.S. Grant Sharp, commander of our fleet in the Pacific, recently said that bombing of a railway bridge only little more than a mile from the heart of the city of Hanoi was not escalating the war. He said "escalating" is a dirty word. In Pentagonese gobbledegook Admiral Sharp used the term "progression of pressure on North Vietnam."

Intensive bombing of North Vietnam has been carried on for more than 2½ years. Billions of dollars of our warplanes and bombers have been destroyed. Hundreds of our airmen have been killed or taken prisoner by the Vietcong. Recently, for the first time a bridge, termed "Longbien Bridge," the ancient name for Hanoi, and in close proximity to many civilian homes in Hanoi was bombed. The bridge was badly damaged. It is not known how many civilian men, women, and children were killed or injured in this new and extremely serious escalation or "progression of pressure." It is known that there were many civilian casualties.

Mr. President, the generals and admirals continue to urge increased bombing of North Vietnam and that no targets, including Hanoi and the port of Haiphong, its docks, and even freighters entering its harbor, be immune from our air attacks. They argue that the bombing is seriously reducing the amount of men and supplies which move from North Vietnam south of the demilitarized zone into South Vietnam.

At the same time, Secretary of Defense McNamara has stated that all that bombing of North Vietnam is really accomplishing is imposing a price on North Vietnam which the government and the people are able and willing to pay. It consists of some loss of lives, considerable labor on repairing damage, some damage to unimportant industrial facilities, and the evacuation of the key cities by nonessential civilians.

Secretary McNamara says it takes less than a hundred tons of supplies a day to keep the Vietcong and those North Vietnamese forces serving with them fully supplied with arms, ammunition, and food and operating at their present level of activity. He has stated that a hundred tons of supplies can be moved by 200 men on bicycles or by very few trucks.

Secretary McNamara's statements completely refute those made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other warhawk admirals and generals. Escalation of bombing of all territory in North Vietnam urged by them would affect the course of the war only in terms of the additional American planes and pilots lost to enemy action. Their continuing shrieks for unlimited bombing in spite of the statements made by the Secretary of Defense are repugnant to the democratic process. This is one more manifestation of the arrogant power which the Military Establishment has taken unto itself, and which threatens the very basis of our Republic. The warhawk generals and admirals prove once again the truth of the statements made by Clemenceau, the great Premier of France during the First World War, that "war is much too serious a matter to be entrusted to generals."

There is no question but that the cost in priceless lives of young Americans and in aircraft far exceeds any gains resulting from the bombing of North Vietnam. The time is long past due for an announcement by our President that we will unconditionally cease the bombing of North Vietnam, hoping that there will then be a conference leading to an armistice and cease-fire.

After more than 2½ years of bombing at enormous cost to us in planes and men, the Vietcong has more than doubled its troop strength and is beginning to hit our bases and men with rockets, mortars, and new weapons of all kinds. Does it make sense to use a $2 million airplane piloted by a highly skilled pilot and carrying a $10,000 bombload to knock out a $50 grass hut or a rope bridge that will be repaired by nightfall? We could go broke trying to win the war in that fashion. Indeed, our involvement in this ugly civil war is now costing us $30 billion a year, with rising taxes and budget deficits ahead.

However, Secretary of State Rusk and the other administration warhawks refuse to face the fact, now well demonstrated, that the bombing of North Vietnam is a failure. They refuse to face the fact that the bombing, by every prudent estimate, will not end the war but may possibly expand it into a war with Communist China. They refuse to face the fact that unless we wish to pour millions of troops into total occupation of South Vietnam and possibly all of Vietnam north of the 17th parallel no solution is now possible except a political one.

Mr. President, let us hope that soon after the election in Vietnam next Sunday President Johnson and his advisers will begin taking meaningful steps toward ending our involvement in that ugly civil war in South Vietnam. Let us hope that they will begin working out the best possible arrangements for ending this war, or turning its conduct over to the South Vietnamese who are opposed to the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong fighting forces. The alternative is a steadily widening war, growing casualty lists, skyrocketing taxes and deficits, accompanied by upheavals and riots in our cities, and in the end perhaps world war III by causing the Red Chinese to invade North Vietnam with its ground and air forces. A way to the peace table must be found before that point of no return is reached.

FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, for more than 30 years, the United States has played a leading role in working with other countries to reduce unnecessary obstacles to foreign trade. This program of trade liberalization has greatly enhanced the opportunities for American agriculture and industry to participate profitably in the international exchange of goods. In addition, foreign trade has helped to bring increased prosperity to other countries around the world whose welfare is intertwined with our own.

Evidence of the importance of this increased trade is the rise of our economy since trade liberalization began in the 1930's. At the lowest level of the depression in 1932, coincident with the peak high of our tariffs and with stringent trade controls by other countries, our foreign trade fell to a low point of $1.6 billion of exports and $1.3 billion in imports. The Nation's economic health was never more precarious. Last year, as the United States enjoyed unrivaled prosperity, exports reached $29.4 billion and imports $25.6 billion, nearly 20 times the levels of 1932.

Past participation in the international General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—has been very fruitful, in that our exports covered by tariff concessions have exceeded imports covered by concessions. The recently concluded Kennedy round, the sixth major GATT negotiation, will have far-reaching influence for the Nation as a whole and for Kansas in particular. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 formed the basis for our participation in the Kennedy round, and I helped write that bill as a member of the Senate Finance Committee. While the negotiations did not go as far as I had hoped in regard to access to many of the markets in the European Common Market, I feel that significant gains were made overall. As a result of the negotiations, we accomplished an exchange of mutually advantageous trade concessions applying to an estimated $40 billion of world trade annually.

I am happy to say that the economy of Kansas has and will continue to benefit in a number of ways from the trade concessions made at GATT negotiations. With lowered tariff walls around the countries to which we export Kansas products, we have found increased marketing opportunities. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, Kansas experienced a growth in total exports of 29 percent between 1960 and 1963. The national export growth rate for this 3-year period was only 13 percent.

On the agricultural aspect of trade, American exports have been rising rapidly over the past three decades, particularly in wheat and feed grains. It is estimated that one out of every four U.S. harvested acres in fiscal 1966 was required to produce the agricultural products exported. Over 60 percent—$1.4 billion—of the U.S. production of wheat was marketed overseas, 47 percent—$1.38 billion—of total U.S. receipts from sales of feed grains was the result of foreign exports, and over 40 percent—$734 million—of the domestic production of soybeans was exported.

Kansas has had a major share of these agricultural exports. In fiscal 1966, our

State supplied $392 million worth of the U.S. total, giving Kansas the fifth largest share in the country. Principal commodities shipped were wheat at a value of $253 million; wheat flour, $20 million; feed grain, $50 million; soybeans, $16 million; lard and tallow, $7 million; hides and skins, $5 million; meats, $4.4 million; and dairy products, $3 million. One-third of Kansas' cash receipts from farm marketing in 1966 was the result of exports to foreign countries. This is a greater percentage than for any other State in the Union.

Kansas economy has also profited from industrial exporting. Latest available figures indicate that during 1963, foreign buyers purchased $117.1 million worth of goods manufactured in Kansas. In 1964, 422 industrial firms in Kansas exported substantial quantities of chemicals, pipes, valves, pumps, farm and industrial machinery, metal silos and prefabricated buildings, tubes and tires, carbon blacks, petroleum, coal, and fiberglas. In 1963, Kansas exported $2 million in stone, clay, and glass products, $2.4 million of fabricated metal products, and $4.9 million of machinery. During the period 1960–63, Kansas chemical product exports almost doubled, from $2.5 million to $4.7 million.

A very major export for Kansas is in the aircraft industry. The Boeing Co., in Wichita, reports that in 1966, 6 percent of its employees, or 1,760 personnel, were specifically engaged in manufacturing airline parts for export. These employees had a payroll of $15,260,000. In addition, two subcontracts worth $2½ million were fulfilled. As of July 1, 1967, the Wichita Boeing plant had a $62 million export backlog order. Cessna Aircraft anticipates that it will complete $36.9 million worth of aircraft for export from its Wichita plant during the current year, 1967, as well as a sizable quantity of equipment from its hydraulics plant in Hutchinson. Beech Aircraft, also of Wichita, will have exported aircraft valued at $32 million during the fiscal year ending September 30.

We should realize that our exports have created much more than an economic advantage for farmers and industrial employees, because at the same time they have strengthened our entire economy. The export business means more jobs for truckers, for employees of the railroads, and for employees of our water transportation systems. It means numerous jobs in the production of power and the providing of community services. According to a Kansas State University study, every wheat dollar in 1965 generated four additional dollars into the total Kansas economy.

Specifically, I want to discuss the effects of the Kennedy round on the Nation and on our State. The new tariff reductions will begin on January 1, 1968, at which time one-fifth of the agreed total reduction will become effective. The remainder will come in four equal annual cuts. In all major categories of industrial production, tariffs will be reduced by an average of 33 to 35 percent, but in many cases the reductions will range up to 50 percent. Tariffs on agricultural products will be cut by an average of 25 percent and range up to 40 percent. This is somewhat less than the cuts on industrial products, largely because of internal Common Market agreements on agricultural items. But for the first time in the history of GATT negotiations, agriculture was included comprehensively.

These agricultural concessions are of special importance for the State of Kansas. Improved export opportunities were obtained for soybeans, poultry, hides and skins, and wheat and feed grains. In particular, a world grains arrangement was negotiated as part of the Kennedy round package. One of the important elements in this arrangement is a minimum price system for the varieties of wheat of most importance in world trade, including a minimum price of $1.73 for U.S. No. 2 Hard Red Winter Wheat Ordinary. This is an increase from $1.45 but does not mean that world prices for wheat will rise immediately, because present prices are already above this new minimum by 10 cents.

A second key element in the new grains arrangement is a food aid program under which other countries have agreed to share with the United States the heavy but necessary task of supplying food to less developed countries. Four and a half million metric tons of grain will be sent each year, of which the United States will provide almost 1.9 million tons, or 42 percent. As the wheat stocks of the Common Market decline, we may be called upon to sell additional wheat to them so that they may fulfill their part of this sharing agreement.

The overall effect on agriculture as a result of the Kennedy round will be a step-up in the value of our exports. Originally the level of U.S. farm products shipped was slated to rise from the present $7 billion per annum to $10 billion by 1980. As a result of the recent negotiations, we may reach the $10 billion mark by 1970.

On the industrial side, Kansas will also enjoy enhanced export opportunities from the Kennedy round. Specifically, the Common Market has agreed to reduce by 50 percent its rates of duty on aircraft to new low levels of 5 percent, and the United Kingdom and Canada have agreed to comparable concessions. As the demand for American aircraft continues to grow, we can expect that Kansas will play a leading role in supplying these products.

The progress which was made at the Kennedy round in expanding trade of meats, dairy products, wool and textiles, and a variety of manufactured goods will not only increase our export opportunities, but also substantially increase our imports of these items. As a result, domestic producers have persuaded Congress to introduce numerous bills which would establish quotas to limit imports of these articles.

A much more plausible proposal is a currently pending bill to expand the use of "escape clauses" or "injury determination clauses" of our Trade Expansion Act, the basis for U.S. participation in international trade negotiations. The new proposal would require that when increased imports exceed a certain percentage of domestic production, the Trade Commission will report a serious injury for the particular domestic industry. Thus, when the specified conditions exist, it would become mandatory upon the President to provide tariff adjustment for the affected industry, to authorize adjustment assistance to employees of these industries, and to allow tax relief to affected businesses. At present, the escape clauses are inadequate because they allow too much discretion in injury determination and because they frequently require legislative action rather than administrative authority for adjustment.

A very interesting and urgent consideration in our trade policies is the effect of possible increases in East-West trade relations. There are convincing arguments both for and against such proposals. However, the issue becomes much more than a mere question of economic advantage, for the decision also involves political considerations. This has been brought into focus during the Vietnam war. Currently, we have higher tariffs on imports from Communist countries than for other countries. This limits U.S. export opportunities in Eastern Europe, since these nations cannot obtain hard currency to buy from us as long as they cannot sell to us.

Eastern European imports from the free world in 1965 were five times what they were in 1950. If our share of this market were equivalent to our share of the world market, our sales to that area would be about $1 billion annually, or five times the 1966 level. In 1965, we supplied only 2 percent of free world exports to Eastern Europe, while our share of total free world exports to all destinations is over 16 percent. If East-West trade involving the United States were to increase, we could expect increased sales of such commodities as soybeans, dry milk, hides and skins, wheat and feed grains—all Kansas products. In 1966 the United States exported over $90 million worth of wheat to Eastern Europe. Obviously, a tremendous potential market exists in the Communist market, but we must carefully weigh the economic benefits from expanded East-West trade against the political considerations.

In summarizing the effects of the Kennedy round, I would say that there will be increased export opportunities for a large segment of our economy, which means that our balance-of-payments problem may be eased. In addition, general employment will be enhanced. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that every billion dollars worth of goods we export supports nearly 100,000 jobs.

Of course, there are inherent ill effects in any mutual trade reduction, because we must both give and take to reach agreement. As our import duties are lowered, new consumer goods will reach our domestic market, and this will certainly precipitate charges of unfair competition. But as I mentioned earlier, there are a number of bills pending in Congress to help alleviate this problem.

For the future, we can expect continued trade liberalization. The United States conducts vigorous promotion programs to improve the access of our agricultural commodities and manufactured

articles to important foreign markets. These include product demonstrations, trade fairs, trade centers, and technical assistance. Altogether, about 45 U.S. trade and farm groups work with the Department of Agriculture in developing markets for virtually all agricultural commodities, and similar programs exist to promote industrial items.

As U.S. trade policies have become more and more liberal since the 1930's, we have steadily strengthened both domestic and international economy. Kansas in particular, as a major exporter of agricultural and industrial items, can look for continuing favorable effects. As our Nation further expands international trade, we are working toward continued prosperity and peaceful relations throughout the world.

THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL SHOULD HAVE TO MEET ITS RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with our distinguished and able majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and other distinguished colleagues who, in the past few days, have joined in urging the United Nations to exercise its responsibilities over the tragic Vietnam conflict.

On several occasions in the past the majority leader has encouraged the United Nations to act affirmatively to bring peace to Southeast Asia—a task which that body is well suited—indeed wholly constituted—to perform. I think, however, that the majority leader's proposal is particularly timely in view of the developments of the past several months.

While many avenues have been traveled in an attempt to get the parties in conflict to sit at the table and commence negotiating their differences, all of the efforts have thus far met with no success.

I believe that U.N. discussion of the conflict may be the only way left in which such a negotiated settlement may be accomplished.

The U.N. is a viable international forum. All concerned parties, whether members or nonmembers, could participate in discussions of this gravity.

The groundwork for such discussions is already present in the form of a resolution introduced in January 1966 by Ambassador Arthur Goldberg. This resolution called, in part, for "immediate discussions, without preconditions, among the appropriate interested governments to arrange a conference looking toward the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in Southeast Asia."

When this resolution was introduced there was no substantive discussion of it, largely due to the opposition of the Soviet Union and France.

I think that calling up the resolution and insisting that there be a vote and that discussions be held, would have the beneficial effect of putting these nations "on the spot." They would have to "put up or shut up," so to speak.

I think it is evident that the Members of the Senate and the overwhelming majority of the American people prefer an honorable solution of the Vietnam war through negotiation.

Thus, any discussions and subsequent vote by the U.N. Security Council would make clear to the world which nations are truly interested in bringing about peace and which are not.

If such discussions are to be frustrated by any nation or group of nations, I think that action should be open and on the record. Let the world know at whose feet and on whose shoulders rests the onus of continued conflict.

Hopefully, of course, there would be no veto. If this were so, the United Nations discussions might result in a truce being declared. This truce might then be followed by further negotiations aimed at reaching a just and fair settlement.

Too many lives have already been lost in Vietnam. I am sure that every one of these honored dead weighs heavily on the heart of our President. This is why I join in urging the administration to press for U.N. Security Council action on Vietnam.

The sooner such U.N. action is taken, the sooner the fighting possibly could end and the fewer American lives—as well as those of the South Vietnamese and the North Vietnamese—would then be lost.

I wish to congratulate the majority leader for renewing his efforts. He has demonstrated again that he is truly one of the Senate's finest scholars of international relations. I commend him for contributing his great abilities and knowledge to bring this suggestion to the attention of the Senate, the Nation, and the world.

The United Nations Security Council should face up to its responsibility as an institution designed to foster and maintain peace in the world.

The hour is already late.

APPEASEMENT OF CRIMINALS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Washington Daily News of October 28 there appears a well-timed editorial entitled "Appeasement of Criminals." This editorial emphasizes the lenient treatment being extended to those responsible for riots.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

APPEASEMENT OF CRIMINALS

Redress of social injustice is one thing; appeasement of crime is something else again. A confused mixture of the two encourages the big city riots.

While the riots are in progress hundreds of arsonists, snipers and looters are loaded into police wagons, hauled off to jail—then let off with light penalties or mere reprimands.

U.S. News & World Report, surveying the aftermath of riots in 1965 in the Watts area of Los Angeles, records that 3927 persons were arrested. Only seven were sent to state prison, four for burglary, one for aggravated assault, one for auto theft, one for drunken driving—and none for setting the fires which destroyed millions of dollars worth of property.

This was despite the fact that nearly three out of four of those arrested had previous police records.

The record concerning Chicago's West Side riots of last year is comparable. There were 533 arrested of whom only three have been sentenced to the penitentiary.

The records of prior offenses—11.4 per cent of those arrested in Los Angeles had been in prison—confirms the original impression that these burnings and lootings are the work of a criminal element seeking loot and destruction, rather than a form of social protest. Of those arrested in Los Angeles 151 were whites.

Light sentences—or none—for high crime logically are taken by the responsible criminals as condonation of their acts, implying that they somehow are justified. This kind of appeasement will no more work than Munich deterred Hitler from further aggression.

The probable consequences were well stated in a resolution adopted at the recent conference of chief justices of state courts:

Those persons and groups which ignore . . . orderly processes, but instead seek redress of grievances . . . or change in our social order . . . thru force, mob violence and riot, accompanied by looting, arson and murder . . . must be swiftly, fairly and surely prosecuted and punished according to the law which they have violated; such conduct is foreign to the American way of life, and if left unchecked is certain to result in the destruction of the rights and liberties of all our citizens.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Following the outbreak of these riots I received several reports that the Office of Economic Opportunity was furnishing the legal services to defend these rioters.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that there be printed my letter of July 18 to Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, asking for a report on this allegation. I also ask unanimous consent that this be followed by a copy of his reply thereto dated August 25.

This reply is signed by Mr. George D. McCarthy, Assistant Director for Congressional Relations, OEO, and it confirms that OEO does furnish legal assistance to defend those taking part in these riots.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1967.

Mr. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: I have received several inquiries from constituents regarding reports which they claim to have seen to the effect that the Office of Economic Opportunity is providing funds for the legal defense of several individuals who have been arrested in connection with riots which have occurred recently in cities such as Buffalo, Rochester, and Newark.

I realize such reports may be quite sketchy, but in order to assist me in responding to such inquiries, I would appreciate it if you would advise me to what extent, if any, funds from your office or from programs under the direction of your office are being used to provide legal assistance to individuals arrested during these riots.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you for your letter concerning legal assistance pro-

vided to individuals by our programs in Buffalo, Rochester and Newark.

As you know, Legal Services Programs operate in specific areas and under specific contracts with OEO. Under those contracts our Legal Services Programs provide representation in criminal matters (usually limited to misdemeanors) if the applicant's income is below the requisite eligibility level. Where the programs have been requested by an eligible person to provide such services they would not be permitted to refuse them. You may be interested in the attached letter which will give you one result of the representation we have provided in one community.

In the communities recently struck by riots, the assistance of OEO-funded legal services attorneys was requested by local officials to handle the influx of arrestees which threatened to overload local law enforcement machinery and local courts. Because of recent Supreme Court decisions defendants in criminal cases must be provided counsel. Local resources simply were not sufficient to meet the flood of cases arising from the riots. In some of the instances, and at the request of local authorities, OEO-funded legal services projects have provided some forms of assistance to persons charged with felonies, particularly at the arrest stage.

You may be interested in knowing that in many cases, our attorneys have established that the defendant was innocent of participation in rioting or looting activity. In such an emotion-charged atmosphere, the innocent tend to be gathered up with the guilty and it becomes even more critical that adequate counsel be provided to the accused in order to prevent miscarriage of justice.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. MCCARTHY,
Assistant Director for Congressional Relations.

CAMPAIGN REFORM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, one of the first orders of business following the Labor Day recess will be consideration in the Senate of S. 1880, a bill to revise the Federal election laws, commonly known as the Campaign Reform Act.

I have submitted two amendments to this bill. The first amendment closes the loophole in the Hatch Act and would prohibit solicitation of campaign contributions from Government employees.

The present law prohibits any public official or candidate for a Federal office from soliciting civil service employees, but there is no prohibition against having the respective State or national committee or other nongovernment employee from soliciting contributions on behalf of such candidate. This amendment proposes to close this loophole by preventing solicitation of political contributions either directly or indirectly. It would not interfere with the right of any Government employee to make a voluntary contribution to the party of his choice.

The second amendment closes a loophole in the present law which was intended to prohibit corporations and unions from making contributions to political parties.

The Department of Justice has acknowledged that this loophole does exist, and the purpose of this amendment is to prohibit either corporations or unions from making contributions to or expenditures on behalf of any candidate for national office. This amendment would not prohibit either the right of a corporation or the union to inform its stockholders or union members in the normal manner, but it would prohibit cash contributions or direct expenditures for political candidates or political parties.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 25, 1967, entitled "Outlining 'Voluntary' Contributions."

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

OUTLAWING "VOLUNTARY" CONTRIBUTIONS

Senator Williams' amendment to the election reform bill which is now pending in the Senate would outlaw forced election contributions from all sources—labor and business alike—and correct one of the great blotches on our society. It deserves the sincere and enthusiastic support of every right-thinking Senator and Congressman.

By the Senator's own account, his amendment is prompted largely by the unfolding stories of almost unbelievable excesses of political contributions by Steamfitters Local 562 in St. Louis. Although theirs is perhaps the outstanding abuse in the country, it certainly is not the only one, labor or business.

The Steamfitters have a $2 a day lug on their members for a fund which they whimsically call "voluntary." It is voluntary only to the extent that you either pay the money or you don't work. It's just as simple as that, with the added inducement that if a member complains publicly about it he runs a great risk of having his head bashed in.

Through this quaint device, the steamfitters have been able to give enormous sums of money, ranging up to an estimated half a million dollars a year, to candidates for public office on the national, state and local scene. Some of these are as far removed from St. Louis public life as a candidate for Senator from New York or Michigan.

The laws of the land now state that a business cannot contribute money at all, and that an individual can give up to $5000 a year to a single committee. There is no restraint whatsoever on labor unions if the fund is marked as a "voluntary" contribution from members.

It is basically wrong, morally and in every other way, for anyone—an individual, a union, a corporation, a foundation or any other single person or group of people to be able to contribute money in such huge and unaccounted-for sums that they can reasonably be suspected of buying favors or attempting to influence elections.

Money corrupts in any hands—good or bad—and no one has ever yet equated the steamfitters as being a force for good.

Senator Williams' amendment would at least set the scales in balance. It would rule out the "voluntary" feature of such funds, either by business or unions, where "voluntary" is a mockery.

Senator Williams, who for many years has been the conscience of the Senate and its standard of integrity, has made a notable contribution to good government in his proposal. We hope it is unanimously passed.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is today issuing its report on Federal personnel for the month of July 1967 along with a fiscal yearend summary of payroll costs and employment.

This report shows that during the month of July 1967, 32,228 additional employees were added. A part of these additions for July were as follows:

Agriculture Department (added)	6,442
Treasury Department (added)	4,822
Commerce Department (added)	2,312
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (added)	2,193
Veterans' Administration (added)	1,876
Interior Department (added)	1,432
Department of the Army (added)	6,877
Department of the Navy (added)	4,472
Department of the Air Force (decreased)	2,377

This report shows that the annual cost of the civilian payroll has now reached the staggering total of $11,832,000,000, while the cost of civilian employment in the Defense Department has risen to $8,664,000,000. This brings the grand total of the civilian payroll of the Federal Government to $20,496,000,000 per year.

During the fiscal year 1967, 266,076 employees were added to the executive branch, with the civilian agency employment reporting an increase of 105,682 while the civilian employment by the military agencies increased by 160,394.

This increase in the number of civilian employees in the executive branch of the Great Society's agencies should be particularly noted in view of the fact that in September 1966 the President issued an Executive order suppositively freezing employment at the July 1, 1966, level.

This additional 105,000 employees, which based upon the President's Executive order they did not need, are costing the taxpayers over $700 million annually.

I ask unanimous consent that this report by the joint committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF JULY 1967

Civilian employees

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of July totaling 3,012,387, compared with 2,980,159 in June. This was a net increase of 32,228.

The 32,228 increase in July reflects regular summer seasonal employment, temporary summer employment under the President's youth opportunity program, and general agency expansion.

Employment by civilian agencies for the month of July was 1,700,818, an increase of 23,324 as compared with the June total of 1,677,494. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in July was 1,311,569, an increase of 8,904 as compared with 1,302,665 in June.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Agriculture Department with 6,442, Treasury Department with 4,822, Commerce Department with 2,312, Department of HEW with 2,193, Veterans Administration with 1,876, and Interior Department with 1,432.

In the Department of Defense the largest increases in civilian employment were reported by the Army with 6,877 and the Navy with 4,472. The Air Force reported a decrease of 2,377.

Total employment inside the United States in July was 2,775,884, an increase of 31,907 as compared with June. Total employment outside the United States in July was 236,503, an increase of 321 as compared with June. Industrial employment by federal agencies in July was 611,813, an increase of 2,072.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Foreign nationals

The total of 3,012,387 civilian employees certified to the Committee by executive

agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 121,719 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during July who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in June was 120,309.

SUMMARY OF FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT COSTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967 (ENDED JUNE 30, 1967)

For many years the Committee, in its statement accompanying the monthly civilian payroll cost for June (the last month in the fiscal year), has compared the annual cost with the totals for previous years. The following comparison continues this practice.

The cost of civilian employment in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government in fiscal year 1967, ended June 30, totaled $20,496,000,000. This was $1,790,000,000 higher than in the preceding fiscal year; and it was an all-time high. At the same time, average employment for the full 12 months of the fiscal year increased 266,076, compared with average employment in 1966.

The fiscal year 1967 civilian agency payrolls totaled $11,832,000,000 as compared with $10,974,000,000 the year before; and payroll costs for civilian employment of the military agencies totaled $8,664,000,000 as compared with $7,732,000,000 in fiscal year 1966.

Figures by fiscal years since 1954 follow:

ANNUAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR CIVILIAN PAYROLL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FISCAL YEARS 1954-67

[In rounded amounts]

Fiscal year	Civilian agencies	Defense Department (civilian employment)[1]	Total
1954	$4,865,000,000	$4,588,000,000	$9,453,000,000
1955	4,921,000,000	4,700,000,000	9,621,000,000
1956	5,359,000,000	5,167,000,000	10,526,000,000
1957	5,602,000,000	5,399,000,000	11,000,000,000
1958	6,040,000,000	5,415,000,000	11,455,000,000
1959	6,564,000,000	5,766,000,000	12,330,000,000
1960	6,877,000,000	5,760,000,000	12,637,000,000
1961	7,622,000,000	6,026,000,000	13,648,000,000
1962	7,978,000,000	6,318,000,000	14,296,000,000
1963	8,743,000,000	6,603,000,000	15,347,000,000
1964	9,387,000,000	6,818,000,000	16,205,000,000
1965	10,137,000,000	7,102,000,000	17,239,000,000
1966	10,974,000,000	7,732,000,000	18,706,000,000
1967	11,832,000,000	8,664,000,000	20,496,000,000

[1] Excludes U.S. pay for foreign nationals not on regular rolls (totaling $341,000,000 for fiscal year 1967).

Executive Branch employment during fiscal year 1967 averaged 2,851,997 as compared with 2,585,921 in 1966, an increase of 266,076. Civilian agency employment averaged 1,617,523, an increase of 105,682 over the previous year; civilian employment by military agencies averaged 1,234,474, an increase of 160,394 over the previous year.

Average employment by fiscal years since 1954 follows:

AVERAGE CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FISCAL YEARS 1954-67

Fiscal year	Civilian agencies	Defense Department (civilian employment)[1]	Total
1954	1,183,389	1,252,775	2,436,164
1955	1,182,663	1,184,627	2,367,290
1956	1,189,458	1,174,584	2,364,042
1957	1,219,836	1,174,263	2,394,099
1958	1,242,942	1,104,403	2,347,345
1959	1,266,566	1,085,676	2,352,242
1960	1,331,605	1,054,740	2,386,345
1961	1,335,089	1,037,356	2,372,445
1962	1,385,132	1,058,676	2,443,808
1963	1,429,654	1,063,720	2,493,374
1964	1,445,813	1,042,552	2,488,365
1965	1,455,007	1,024,482	2,479,489
1966	1,511,841	1,074,080	2,585,921
1967	1,617,523	1,234,474	2,851,997

[1] Excludes foreign nationals not on regular rolls (averaging 127,311 for fiscal year 1967).

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in a letter dated August 21, addressed to Vice President HUMPHREY and House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Marshal Ky, Prime Minister of the Republic of Vietnam, protests what he describes as "persistent criticism without substantiated evidence on the part of some prominent American figures." His protest is clearly directed to statements made in the Senate and the House. The Prime Minister asked that his letter be conveyed to all Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my remarks, the letter from the Prime Minister may be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CASE. We are glad to hear anything Mr. Ky has to say, and his assurance of his government's devotion to what he describes as "our mutual commitment to the achievement of democracy and social justice" is, of course, most welcome.

But, basically, Premier Ky's argument is directed to the wrong audience.

Premier Ky's basic problem is not to persuade the Congress of the United States of his good intentions. His problem is to persuade the people of South Vietnam both of his good intentions and of his ability to carry them out. And this problem will by no means be resolved simply by a victory for his ticket, if there should be one, in the September 3 election.

Critics of the South Vietnamese Government in Congress—and, most assuredly, I have been and am one of them—are not concerned to make the South Vietnamese Government adhere to rigorous standards of conduct for the sake of American opinion. Our criticism is based upon the failure of the South Vietnamese Government to persuade the people of South Vietnam of its determination and ability to bring about those social and political changes in South Vietnam and those reforms in the South Vietnamese Government and military establishment without which all American efforts to help establish an independent and viable political and social structure in South Vietnam are bound to fail. What the American people and the Congress of the United States want—and are entitled to—is some solid evidence of progress by the South Vietnamese Government in this direction.

As I have said, the growing unrest in this country about Vietnam among the people, as well as in the Congress, is based on a realization that our real objectives in South Vietnam are not appreciably nearer attainment now than they have been during all the many years of our involvement, despite the administration's continuing claims of progress.

And so I say to Marshal Ky: "Your letter is irrelevant."

For a long time I have been deeply concerned by the lack of progress toward our real objectives in South Vietnam. During my recent visit in South Vietnam I heard a highly respected American officer, who had been working on the revolutionary development program and its predecessors for years, respond to a newsman who asked how long it would take "to win the hearts and minds" of the South Vietnamese peasants. He ventured with great hesitancy that at the present rate of progress it might perhaps be done in 10 years. He could just as well have said a hundred years or a thousand years, for the present rate of progress can scarcely be measured.

Within the week, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House of Representatives transmitted three reports to the Secretary of State dealing with the economic situation and related matters in South Vietnam. In each of these reports and in the subcommittee's letter of transmittal, the subcommittee expresses its deep concern "with the failure of the Government of South Vietnam to take substantive action, with conviction and determination, in a number of areas which vitally affect the future of that country and the support of its people."

The subcommittee expresses specific concern about "the lack of meaningful progress and reform in the lagging and floundering pacification program; in dealing with the problems of refugees, inflation, and land reform; in the conduct of the elections; and in overall administration with its entrenched, inefficient bureaucracy."

The subcommittee continues with these most significant words:

> The Secretary of State and responsible agency heads in Washington should specifically direct the U.S. Ambassador and other U.S. officials in Vietnam to take a firmer stand in U.S. representations to the GVN (Government of South Vietnam). It is the committee's view that U.S. officials have too often attempted to avoid "rocking the boat" rather than pressing for necessary reforms. This attitude, if continued, will lead to neither reform, nor progress, nor broad popular support for the GVN.
>
> The United States seeks only freedom for the people of South Vietnam and the achievement of our common goals. The cooperation of the GVN is absolutely essential in this effort. The continuing support of the Congress and the people of the United States is in large part dependent upon there being reasonable prospects for success. Without substantive GVN action in a number of areas . . . prospects for success are minimal, the advisability of continued United States involvement is questionable and could lead to a reassessment of the United States' position.

The subcommittee's views coincides exactly with my own. For many weeks I have been pointing out, as I said on the floor for example on August 22, that the missing ingredient in Vietnam is not manpower or airpower but willpower, the will of the present leaders of South Vietnam to focus all their resources on the task of nation-building.

I repeat that the failure of the Johnson administration in South Vietnam is not any inadequacy in U.S. military or material assistance. The Johnson administration's failure in South Vietnam is its failure to bring about those social and political changes in South Vietnam and those reforms in the South Vietnamese Gov-

ernment and military establishment without which victory in South Vietnam is impossible.

I raise again the question whether we have reached the effective limit as to the amount of influence we can exert in behalf of basic and rapid reform in South Vietnam. There are those who say we have, because American prestige is so deeply involved that we cannot withdraw and the South Vietnamese, knowing this, feel free to ignore our requirements.

Mr. President, we must not accept such a position. The House subcommittee's report makes clear its complete agreement on that point.

Yet, the President's decision to send more American troops to South Vietnam is hard to reconcile with any conclusion other than that this administration has allowed itself to be trapped in this intolerable dilemma.

Within the last few days I received a letter from an American newspaperman located in the Far East which bears so directly on this point that I quote the following passage:

In all the heap of debate on Vietnam, I have never heard a statement that hit the truth so squarely on the head as your comment that "American prestige is so deeply involved that we can't withdraw and the South Vietnamese, knowing this, feel free to ignore our requirements . . . (thus failing) . . . to bring about those social and political changes in South Vietnam . . . without which victory is impossible."

That situation was true in the summer of 1963 when I visited South Vietnam; it was true in the summer of 1965 when I was there; and judging from what I read now, it is also true at present.

My correspondent has clearly identified the state of mind which for years has stultified our Government's efforts in South Vietnam. I see little hope of any real progress so long as this administration refuses to face squarely what the trouble is and act with determination to correct it.

EXHIBIT 1

AUGUST 21, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Vice President of the United States, and President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I take the liberty to write to you at a time when the events in my country occasion passionate debates in the Congress of the United States. Since the American and Vietnamese nations are together defending freedom, and are consenting to tremendous sacrifices, I deem it my duty to affirm again the principles which command the conduct of national affairs by my Government.

The defense of freedom in Viet Nam requires more than our joint efforts at war, it involves first and foremost our mutual commitment to the achievement of democracy and social justice. Should we stray from that basic commitment, or should you misconstrue our purposes, our alliance would indeed be in jeopardy.

As my Government is nearing the completion of its term of duty, I sincerely feel that we have dispatched our task with honesty and effectiveness under most difficult circumstances. I take special pride in the fact that we have successfully started the course toward democracy and equality for a society which was imprisoned within the deep walls of feudalism, corruption and intolerable social discrepancies. In spite of war, subversion and several grave crises, my Government has undertaken to organize five nationwide elections of vital importance within about a year's time: elections for the Constituent Assembly in September 1966, elections for hamlet and village administration in April–May 1967, presidential and senatorial elections next September, and elections for the Lower House next October. I do not know of any better way to warrant our determination to stay the course toward democracy. For it would be proper for all concerned to acknowledge the painful dilemma of our nation, torn between the dream to attain the integrity of democratic life and the necessity to fight for survival. We have lost many of our people, our soldiers, our cadremen in the past elections, and undoubtedly we shall lose many more in the coming weeks; we must devote a great deal of resources to the exercise of democracy which are badly needed on the battlefield; we run the risk of subversion and division at a time when the nation must unite in the face of the enemy. Yet we have all accepted the challenge without a shadow of reluctance.

It seems cruel irony that some of our friends chose this very moment to voice doubt on our sincerity.

Perhaps the fact that my Government includes officers of the armed forces leads to misgivings, for I know of the inherent distrust toward military government in the advanced societies. But in our present historical context, the Vietnamese Armed Forces are of a very particular nature: 700,000 of our young men are under arms in a nation of 15 million people. Our Armed Forces are not composed of militarists or people inclined to the use of force or violence, but of all generations of Vietnamese within the age of offering the fullest measure of service to their imperiled fatherland. They are the present and the future of our nation.

Furthermore, my Government did not seize power; it was a civilian government which, unable to resolve instability and division, passed on to the Armed Forces the burden of preserving the nation from collapsing. We then formed a mixed team of civilian and military leaders, decided that our term of duty was to be a transitional one, and set out to establish the very rapid timetable for the advent of representative government. We are now reaching the final stage of that timetable.

Of course, two years are a very short period of time. We are convinced that we have engaged our country on the right path, but we are also aware that the tasks which we have begun, such as rural development, reorganization of the administration and of the army, reinforcement of the national economy, need to be continued. That is why, in good conscience, we deem it our duty to run for offices in due democratic process. We hope that the people of Viet Nam will entrust us with further responsibilities on the basis of our past performances. But should the people decide otherwise, we shall readily accept their verdict.

I am particularly sad to hear accusations that the Vietnamese Armed Forces will resort to coups in the event the election returns should be unfavorable to us. We have devoted the finest hours of the past two years to bringing about the first democratic institutions in our country, we shall not be the ones to destroy them. I have repeatedly warned our soldiers, our civil servants, our cadremen against rigging the elections in any manner, for I think that dishonest elections would deprive our country of democracy for a long period of time. In 1963, the people and the army overthrew a dictatorial government which was issued from dishonest elections.

That a few press correspondents should misquote my word of caution against unfair elections and make it sound like a threat of coup was, after all, understandable. But for a moment, I felt very discouraged to see some of the best friends of my country give credence to those inaccurate reports. Time and again I have proved that I am capable of placing the interest of our nation above all possible personal ambition; the decision I made on the 30th of June to withdraw from the presidential race and to seek the vice presidency instead was another instance of my sincerity.

I see therefore no reason for attributing to ill faith on the part of my Government the difficulties that the candidates may encounter in their campaigning. My country is short on physical facilities, several of our airfields are still unsafe, and the wind blows where it may. In my opinion, a dignified attitude for those among us whose ambition to be public servants by popular choice should be to endure those misfortunes and persevere in seeking the support of the electorate, and not to display resentment against the adverse conditions which prevail for our entire people. In the meanwhile, I am satisfied that our Government has done its very best to give all candidates a fair share of the means for campaigning. The same amount of money is allotted to all tickets. The government television and radio allow equal time to all candidates in direct broadcast, and anybody in Viet Nam can testify that those means are used at their fullest capacity by our opponents. The Vietnamese press is free, and, in part, quite virulently anti-governmental. On the other hand, the foreign press is at full liberty to cover the campaign and the forthcoming elections.

If by the standards of a country with a long experience in the exercise of democracy, and free from the predicaments of war and underdevelopment, our elections still present serious shortcomings, I am the first Vietnamese to deplore that situation. But I can say without any doubt in my conscience that my Government does not deserve any lesson in honesty and patriotism from any quarter.

I am afraid that persistent criticism without substantiated evidence on the part of some prominent American figures may, in the long run, impair the harmony of our joint efforts. The Vietnamese are a proud people; they will accept any amount of tribulations and sufferings, but their dead count as much as the dead from all the friendly lands, and they will admit no discrimination in all the men's supreme tribute to freedom and human dignity.

I see an urgent need, Mr. President, for all of us to keep an appropriate perspective in the partnership between nations, large and small, which are in pursuit of a common ideal, for intemperate reliance upon the physical scale of strength would be the negation of that very ideal.

Mr. President, may I ask you to convey my letter to all the distinguished members of the Senate of the United States.

I stand in profound respect for the great traditions of democracy and justice embodied in your institutions. I greatly value the support of the Congress of the United States for the cause of Viet Nam, and I am always ready to discuss in total candor with the distinguished Senators who wish to further examine the developments concerning the common endeavor of our two nations.

Sincerely yours,

NGUYEN CAO KY,
Air Vice Marshal.

IN DEFENSE OF SECRETARY McNAMARA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been somewhat perturbed, in recent days and weeks, at the stepped-up attacks against Secretary McNamara, in the press—but not necessarily by the press—in conventions, and elsewhere, though happily not on the Senate floor.

I would point out, Mr. President, that many of these attacks on the integrity of Secretary McNamara are in reality at-

tacks against the President of the United States, because Secretary McNamara, as Secretary of Defense, acts under direction of the President, and exercises, in a civilian capacity, the constitutional functions which have been set out for the office which he has the privilege to occupy at this time.

Mr. President, Mr. McNamara recently appeared before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee to offer testimony on the role of airpower in Vietnam. He discussed in particular the policies which govern the bombing of North Vietnam, and some of the issues involved therein. He stated as well that the bombing and mining of harbors such as Haiphong would not interfere vitally with the conduct of the war in the south, because the needs for enemy military operations are so small. In other words, the bombing, mining, or the quarantining of Hanoi would not stop the infiltration of *men and supplies* into South Vietnam.

Secretary McNamara was preceded and followed in the subcommittee hearings by the highest ranking generals and admirals of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. I look forward to reading the record of the committee hearings—which I hope will be released soon—with great interest and care, because then all the testimony will become available, and I want to study all sides.

Mr. President, the statement of the Secretary—the only one released in detail—is exceptional for its objectivity, candor, persuasiveness, and completeness. It lays it on the line, so to speak. It provides a clarification and thorough analysis of the present use, efficacy, and limits of airpower in Vietnam, in terms of military necessities and rational objectives.

Some points are very clear from Mr. McNamara's testimony. It is obvious, for example, that airpower is being used against North Vietnam with an unprecedented lavishness—that it is being used close to the points of saturation in terms of rational purpose.

There is a strong suggestion, moreover, that to go much further would be meaningless, except in the context of the barbarism of total war on the entire civilian population—a bombing back into the stone age, so to speak—or in a context which, while it would not bring significantly closer the end of the war, would raise sharply the likelihood of expanded war with the participation of China and, perhaps, the Soviet Union.

The testimony of the Secretary also underscores what has long been evident: Airpower alone in any rational use is not going to cut the flow of men or the relatively small flow of supplies to the south, which is necessary to keep the conflict going at its present level. And airpower alone is not going to force the North Vietnamese Government to the conference table.

In short, Mr. McNamara's testimony—and let us remember that he speaks for the President—puts into words the essence of the experience of the past 2 years in Vietnam. It is this: There are no decisive solutions which are going to be achieved on the ground in South Vietnam, where it has to be achieved, by way of the air over North Vietnam.

In this statement Mr. McNamara reveals again the wisdom of one of the most fundamental principles of our constitutional structure—civilian direction of the Defense Establishment. He supplied an essential civilian weight to the equations of purpose and procedure which would otherwise contain only and exclusively military factors. The result is a balanced and rational illumination of the problem which confronts us in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I would hope that, contrary to newspaper reports, there would be no challenge, direct or indirect, on the part of the military or the Congress to the predominance of the civilian officials in the conduct of the affairs of this Government.

While I have grave doubts—and have always had them—about the situation in Vietnam, I want to commend Secretary McNamara in the carrying out of his most difficult duties and to commend him also for the detailed and sound statement he made. He was, after all, speaking for the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Secretary of Defense which has appeared in the public press and an editorial in today's Los Angeles Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 26, 1967]

TEXT OF MCNAMARA STATEMENT TO SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BOMBING IN VIETNAM

WASHINGTON, *August 25.—Following is the text of a statement made today by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to the Preparedness Investigating subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee:*

I welcome this opportunity to discuss with you our conduct of the air war in North Vietnam. It is a matter of the greatest importance that the Congress and the people of the United States have a current and accurate picture of what the air campaign can and cannot accomplish. To address this issue, I should like to discuss these topics:

1. The objectives and achievements of the air war.

2. The target recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in relation to the objectives, and the extent to which the Chiefs' recommendations are being followed.

3. The proposals of those who argue that the bombing should be expanded, either on the theory that bombing can break the will of the North Vietnamese, thereby forcing them to the conference table, or that bombing can prevent the flow of military supplies into or through North Vietnam, thereby destroying its capability for continued aggression in the South.

1. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE AIR CAMPAIGN

In the light of the many recent public statements and speculations about the purposes and effects of our air attacks, it seems appropriate to preface this review with a restatement of the objectives that the bombing of North Vietnamese targets was intended to serve. As I have stated many times:

Our primary objective was to reduce the flow and/or to increase the cost of the continued infiltration of men and supplies from North to South Vietnam.

It was also anticipated that these air operations would raise the morale of the South Vietnamese people who, at the time the bombing started, were under severe military pressure.

Finally, we hoped to make clear to the North Vietnamese leadership that so long as they continued their aggression against the South they would have to pay a price in the North.

The bombing of North Vietnam has always been considered a supplement to and not a substitute for an effective counter-insurgency campaign in South Vietnam.

These were our objectives when our bombing program was initiated in February of 1965. They remain our objectives today. They were and are entirely consistent with our limited purposes in Southeast Asia. We are not fighting for territorial conquests or to destroy existing Governments. We are fighting there only to assure the people of South Vietnam the freedom to choose their own political and ecnomic institutions. Our bombing campaign has been aimed at selected targets of military significance, primarily the routes of infiltration. It has been carefully tailored to accomplish its basic objective and thus to achieve the limited purposes toward which all our activities in Vietnam are directed.

Weighted against its stated objectives, the bombing campaign has been successful. It was initiated at a time when the South Vietnamese were in fear of a military defeat. There can be no question that the bombing raised and sustained the morale of the South Vietnamese. It should be equally clear to the North Vietnamese that they have paid and will continue to pay a high price for their continued aggression. We have also made the infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam increasingly difficult and costly.

Complete interdiction of these supplies has never been considered possible by our military leaders. I believe that this point has been made to you by General Wheeler, General McConnell, Admiral Sharp and General Momyer.

Our experience in Korea demonstrated the unlikelihood that air strikes or other means could choke off the minimum amounts needed to support enemy forces. The nature of the combat in Vietnam, without established battle lines and with sporadic and relatively small-scale enemy action, lessens the requirement for a steady stream of logistical support and reduces the volume of logistical support needed. Moreover, it should be noted that the geography of the infiltration routes is less favorable to interdiction than was the case in Korea. There the entire neck of the peninsula was subject to naval bombardment from either side and to air strikes across its width.

The routes into South Vietnam are far more complex and protected and involve the use of territories of adjoining countries. Under these highly unfavorable circumstances, I think that our military forces have done a superb job in making continued infiltration more difficult and expensive.

Any discussion of the bombing of North Vietnam must first address the nature of the target. North Vietnam is a land of 18.5 million people. By no standards could it be considered an industrialized country. It is predominantly agricultural. Prior to initiation of the bombing, its significant industrial facilities could be counted on your fingers. It had no steel-making capacity and in 1965 its monthly industrial production of pig iron was only 5,000 metric tons, less than 1/20th of 1 per cent of U.S. output. It had no real war-making industrial base and hence none which could be destroyed by bombing.

North Vietnam's ability to continue its aggression against the South thus depends upon imports of war-supporting material and their transshipment to the South. Unfortunately for the chances of effective interdiction, this simple agricultural economy has a highly diversified transportation system consisting of rails and roads and waterways.

The North Vietnamese use barges and sampans, trucks and foot-power and even bicycles capable of carrying 500-pound loads to move goods over this network. The capacity of this system is large—the volume of traffic it is now required to carry, in relation to its capacity is small.

Precise figures on the amount of infiltrated material required to support Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces in the South are not known. However, intelligence estimates suggest that the quantity of externally supplied material, other than food, required to support the V.C.-N.V.N. forces in South Vietnam at about their current level of combat activity is very, very small. The reported figure is significantly under 100 tons per day—a quantity that could be transported by only a few trucks. This is the small flow of material which we are attempting to prevent from entering South Vietnam through a pipeline which has an output capacity far greater than that.

Those targets along the lines of communication which can be found are attacked. From January through July, we averaged about 13,000 sorties per month over the infiltration routes and base areas. About 75 per cent of these sorties were directed against lines of communication (LOC's) and goods moving over them. Air strikes are reported to have destroyed over 4,100 vehicles, 7,400 water craft and 1,400 pieces of R.R. rolling stock. In addition, we have struck approximately 1,900 fixed targets in North Vietnam, including 57 bridges, 50 major rail yards, troop barracks, petroleum storage tanks and power plants.

N.V.N. has been forced to divert an estimated 300,000 full-time and at least an equal number of part-time workers and troops, to the repair, dispersal, and defense of the lines of communication and other targets which have been damaged. This diversion of some 500,000 people in a society already strained to maintain a marginal subsistence is a severe penalty.

There can be no question that the bombing campaign has and is hurting North Vietnam's war-making capability. Accordingly, they are using every propaganda means to stop the bombing. Although there are some signs that war weariness is growing, these indications are accompanied by firm expressions of resolve. There is no basis to believe that any bombing campaign, short of one which had population as its target, would by itself force Ho Chi Minh's regime into submission.

I want to repeat, however, that from the military standpoint, bombing of N.V.N. supports our combat operations in S.V.N. It renders more difficult and costly the efforts of the D.R.V. to supply both their own and V.C. forces on the other side of the demilitarized zone. As General Wheeler has testified, we have under constant review the advisability of adding new military targets in the North and of conducting re-strikes against rail facilities, highways, bridges, military and other war-supporting targets that have previously come under our air attack. There is continuing study of ways in which our air and naval bombardment of N.V.N. can be made more effective in disrupting and interdicting North Vietnamese attempts to support aggression against their southern neighbors.

There also is continuing study of the optimum mix of sorties, both geographically and in types of targets. Consideration is given to every possibility of greater effectiveness through shifts in emphasis. These studies are designed to maximize the cost that our air campaign inflicts on N.V.N.'s infiltration of men and supplies while at the same time reducing to the minimum the price that we must pay in the lives of American pilots.

These efforts to refine and improve our application of air power will, I am confident, continue as long as the necessity for bombing remains. It must, however, be recognized that no improvements and refinements can be expected to accomplish much more than to continue to put a high price tag on N.V.N.'s continued aggression.

II. THE TARGET RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

To illustrate this point, I might note that the operating target list, currently used by the Joint Chiefs as a basis for the planning of attacks on fixed targets, contains a total of 427 targets. Of this number, the J.C.S. do not now recommend 68 for air attack. For the remaining 359 targets, strikes have been authorized against 302, 85 per cent of the total. There are only 57 targets recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff against which strikes have not yet been authorized. Whatever the merits of striking these 57 targets may be, I believe it is clear that strikes against them will not materially shorten the war. As a matter of fact, seven of the 57 targets are recognized by the Chiefs as of little value to the North Vietnamese war effort. For example, one is a tire plant reported to have a productive capacity of but 30 tires per day. Nine of the 57 targets are petroleum facilities which in total equal less than 6 per cent of North Vietnam's remaining storage capacity. The present importance of such targets as these has not been shown to warrant risking the loss of American lives.

Of the remaining 41 targets, 25 are classified as lesser targets in populated, heavily defended areas; four as more significant targets in such areas; three are ports; four are airfields (in total the remaining MIG's based in North Vietnam approximate 20); and five are in the Chinese buffer zone. In the case of a few of these targets, the risk of direct confrontation with the Communist Chinese or the Soviet Union has thus far been deemed to outweigh the military desirability of air strikes. Others will be considered for "authorization" at a later date.

The conclusive answer to any charge that we are inhibiting the use of our air power against targets of military significance lies in the facts. As I have noted, strikes have been authorized against 85 per cent (302 of 359) of the targets recommended by the Joint Chiefs. And the total number of fixed targets struck in North Vietnam stands now at about 1,900. As further targets are authorized and additional targets are found to be of military importance, this number will increase. But the decisions to authorize new targets cannot be expected to gain different objectives than those toward which our air campaign has always been directed.

III. THE PROPOSALS OF THE CRITICS

Those who criticize our present bombing policy do so, in my opinion, because they believe that air attack against the North can be utilized to achieve quite different objectives. These critics appear to argue that our air power can win the war in the South either by breaking the will of the North or by cutting off the war-supporting supplies needed in the South. In essence, this approach would seek to use the air attack against the North not as a supplement to, but as a substitute for, the arduous ground war that we and our allies are waging in the South.

It would obviously be possible for us to change our present selective bombing campaign. We could abandon the target-by-target analysis which balances the military importance of the target against its probable cost in American lives and the risk it presents of expanding the conflict to involve new combatants. Instead, our air and naval forces might be employed against North Vietnam in an all-out attempt to break their will and thus compel them to cease their support of military efforts against the Government of South Vietnam.

A somewhat less drastic revision of our air campaign might be undertaken in an effort to restrict the import of war-supporting materials so substantially as to prevent the North Vietnamese leaders from supporting their present level of military effort in South Vietnam. Any such effort would obviously require action to close the three significant North Vietnamese ports of Campha, Hongai and, most important, Haiphong.

In order to reach a reasoned conclusion on the key question of whether to abandon our present limited bombing objectives and adopt a policy intended to achieve either of these new objectives, the chances of success must be weighed against the inevitably higher risks such as revision would entail. To bring this question into perspective for the committee I would like to deal first with the likelihood that either of these objectives could be realized through a reorientation of our air attack against N.V.N.

Breaking the will of the North

As to breaking their will, I have seen no evidence in any of the many intelligence reports that would lead me to believe that a less selective bombing campaign would change the resolve of N.V.N.'s leaders or deprive them of the support of the North Vietnamese people. As previously pointed out, the economy of N.V.N. is agrarian and simple. Its people are accustomed to few of the modern comforts and conveniences that most of us in the Western world take for granted.

They are not dependent on the continued functioning of great cities for their welfare. They can be fed at something approaching the standard to which they are accustomed without reliance on truck or rail transportation or on food processing facilities. Our air attack has rendered inoperative about 85 per cent of the country's central electric generating capacity, but it is important to note that the Pepco plant in Alexandria, Virginia, generates five times the power produced by all of N.V.N.'s power plants before the bombing.

It appears that sufficient electricity for war-related activities and for essential services can be provided by the some 2000 diesel-driven generating sets which are in operation.

Perhaps most important of all, the people of N.V.N. are accustomed to discipline and are no strangers to deprivation and to death. Available information indicates that, despite some war weariness, they remain willing to endure hardship and they continue to respond to the direction of the Hanoi regime. *There is little reason to believe that any level of conventional air or naval action, short of sustained and systematic bombing of the population centers, will deprive the North Vietnamese of their willingness to continue to support their Government's efforts to upset and take over the Government of S.V.N.*

There is also nothing in the past reaction of the North Vietnamese leaders that would provide any confidence that they can be bombed to the negotiating table. Their regard for the comfort and even the lives of the people they control does not seem to be sufficiently high to lead them to bargain for settlement in order to stop a heightened level of attack.

The course of conflict on the ground in the South, rather than the scale of air attack in the North, appears to be the determining factor in N.V.N.'s willingness to continue.

Accordingly, as General Wheeler has pointed out, the air campaign in the North and our military efforts in the South are not separate wars and certainly they should not be regarded as alternatives.

An expanded campaign against the supply routes within North Vietnam

It could be argued that greatly expanded and virtually unrestricted bombing effort might substantially reduce the movement of forces and supplies through North Vietnam into S.V.N. even though N.V.N. resolve remains unshaken. Recent prisoners interrogations suggest that 10–20 per cent of the personnel dispatched to the South by the rulers of N.V.N. never reach the battle area—about

2 per cent are casualties caused by air attacks. A much higher percentage of the supplies sent South to support the D.R.V. fighting forces are destroyed in transit by our armed reconnaissance and heavy bombing attacks.

Conceivably an all-out air and naval bombardment might somewhat further increase the forces and supplies destroyed. But the capacity of the lines of communication and of the outside sources of supply so far exceed the minimal flow necessary to support the present level of North Vietnamese military effort in S.V.N. that the enemy operations in the South cannot, on the basis of any reports I have seen, be stopped by air bombardment—short, that is, of the virtual annihilation of North Vietnam and its people. As General Wheeler has observed, no one has proposed such indiscriminate bombing of populated areas.

The closing of sea and land importation routes

This leaves, then, as a possible new objective of our air campaign, the closing of the sea and land importation routes in an attempt to prevent entry into N.V.N. of the supplies needed to support the combat in the South. There can be no question that bombing the ports and mining the harbors, particularly at Haiphong, would interfere seriously with N.V.N.'s imports of war supporting materials.

But far less than the present volume of imports would provide the essentials for continued North Vietnamese military operations against S.V.N. As I have mentioned, it is estimated that the total tonnage required is less than 100 tons per day of nonfood supplies. This is dwarfed by North Vietnam's actual imports of about 5,800 tons per day. And its import capacity is much greater. The ports together with the roads and railroads from China have an estimated capacity of about 14,000 tons a day.

The great bulk of North Vietnamese imports now enters through Haiphong—perhaps as much as 4,700 out of the 5,800 tons per day. This includes most of the war-supporting material, such as trucks, generators and construction equipment but this category of supply represents only a small percentage of total sea imports. And little if any of the imported military equipment (which is estimated by intelligence sources to total 550 tons per day) comes by sea. Moreover, this present heavy reliance on Haiphong reflects convenience rather than necessity.

Haiphong represents the easiest and cheapest means of import. If it and the other ports were to be closed, and on the unrealistic assumption that closing the ports would eliminate all seaborne imports, North Vietnam would still be able to import over 8,400 tons a day by rail, road and waterway. And even if, through air strikes, its road, rail and Red River waterway capacity could all be reduced by 50 per cent, North Vietnam could maintain roughly 70 per cent of its current imports. Since the daily importation of military and war-supporting material totals far less than this, it seems obvious that cutting off seaborne imports would not prevent North Vietnam from continuing its present level of military operations in the South.

Elimination of Haiphong and the two other ports as a source of supply would not, in fact, eliminate seaborne imports. Our POL [petroleum, oil, lubricants] experience is illuminating. Our air strikes on petroleum facilities did destroy the in-shore POL off-loading facilities in Haiphong. However, the North Vietnamese have demonstrated a capability to adjust their methods, and they now off-load POL drums into lighters and barges and bring the drums ashore at night. There is no evidence of a POL shortage and stocks on hand equal an estimated 120 days' consumption.

The North Vietnam seacoast runs for 400 miles. Many locations are suitable for over-the-beach operations. The mining of Haiphong or the total destruction of the Haiphong port facilities would not prevent off-shore unloading of foreign shipping. Effective interdiction of this lighterage, even if the inevitable damage to foreign shipping were to be accepted, would only lead to total reliance on land importation through Communist China. The common border between the two countries is about 500 air miles long.

Accordingly, bombing the ports and mining the harbors would not be an effective means of stopping the infiltration of supplies into S.V.N.

A selective, carefully targeted bombing campaign, such as we are presently conducting, can be directed toward reasonable and realizable goals. This discriminating use of air power can and does render the infiltration of men and supplies more difficult and more costly. At the same time, it demonstrates to both South and North Vietnam our resolve to see that aggression does not succeed.

A less discriminating bombing campaign against N.V.N. would, in my opinion, do no more. We have no reason to believe that it would break the will of the North Vietnamese people or sway the purpose of their leaders. If it does not lead to such a change of mind, bombing of the North at any level of intensity would not meet our objective. We would still have to prove by ground operations in the South that Hanoi's aggression could not succeed. Nor would a decision to close Haiphong, Hongai and Campha, by whatever means, prevent the movement in and through N.V.N. of the essentials to continue their present level of military activity in S.V.N.

On the other side of the equation, our resort to a less selective campaign of air attack against the North would involve risks which at present I regard as too high to accept for this dubious prospect of successful results.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would like to restate my view that the present objectives of our bombing in the North were soundly conceived and are being effectively pursued. They are consistent with our over-all purposes in Vietnam and with our efforts to confine the conflict. We are constantly exploring ways of improving our efforts to insulate South Vietnam from outside attack and support. Further refinements in our air campaign may help.

I am convinced, however, that the final decision in this conflict will not come until we and our allies prove to North Vietnam she cannot win in the South. The tragic and long-drawn-out character of that conflict in the South makes very tempting the prospect of replacing it with some new kind of air campaign against the North. But however tempting, such an alternative seems to me completely illusory. To pursue this objective would not only be futile but would involve risks to our personnel and to our nation that I am unable to recommend.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 31, 1967]

BOMBING WON'T WIN THE WAR

The argument over whether North Vietnam can be bombed into submission continues to rage.

Proponents of victory through air power daily voice their conviction that the United States possesses sufficient air strength to destroy Hanoi's war-making capacity and thus end the flow of men and supplies to the south. Once that is accomplished, the supposition runs, the Communists will be unable to continue the struggle.

North Vietnam can be knocked out of the war, bombing advocates say, by the destruction of major installations which thus far have not come under attack. In particular, they contend the port of Haiphong should be closed down by bombing or mining, since the bulk of North Vietnam's imports enter the country through this point.

Other facilities such as factories, ports, airfields and storage areas thus far spared should also be made open to attack.

The Administration's answer to these contentions was presented last week by Defense Secretary McNamara, in a statement as detailed as it was persuasive.

The secretary first reminded his critics that all-out bombing of North Korea from 1950–53 failed to prevent adequate supplies from reaching the Communist troops. North Vietnam presents an even more difficult problem because of its geography.

Bombing, McNamara said, has been partially effective in reducing the flow of men and supplies from the north and in hurting Hanoi's economy. But North Vietnam is not an industrialized country, and its people are used to hardship. Although war weariness may be growing, he said, "there is no basis to believe that any bombing campaign, short of one which had population as its target, would by itself force Ho Chi Minh's regime into submission."

What of Haiphong? While it is the entry point for as much as 4,700 of the 5,800 tons of North Vietnam's daily imports, destroying the port would not put the Communists out of business in the war.

Little war materiel actually used in the south (about 100 tons a day, which can be carried in a few trucks) enters North Vietnam by sea. Most comes overland from China, across a 500-mile border where interdiction is difficult. In addition, off-shore and over-the-beach unloading from foreign shipping along North Vietnam's 400 miles of coastline could replace Haiphong if necessary.

In sum, bombing the north remains only supplemental to the total war effort. This is a fact many find hard to accept, given the immense difficulties in the south. But the truth must still be faced that there is no easy way out.

The magnitude of the task in the south has been illustrated again in the Viet Cong terrorist raids of recent days, which are aimed at disrupting the Sept. 3 elections. The success of these attacks points up again the freedom of movement the Viet Cong enjoy.

The only way to put an end to that is by rooting out the Communist organizational base in the villages, something that can only be accomplished by on-the-ground efforts in the south, not by bombing the north.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I associate myself with the majority leader in his adherence to the principle of civilian direction of the great strategy of this war and of the conduct of all great governmental activities.

I welcome his statement in regard to Secretary McNamara's position.

I was troubled by a statement which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post in an Evans-Novak column to the general effect that the Secretary was not expressing the President's view in regard to this matter of bombing and that the President had recently been veering toward the generals' position.

I wonder if we might have the majority leader's comment on that, because he was quite specific about the Secretary speaking for the President. To me, it is very important.

I would like, if it is possible, for the majority leader to give to the Senator from New Jersey and to the Senate and to the country some statement based upon an authoritative knowledge of this question concerning whether the Secretary of Defense actually represents the President's views.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, I did not show my remarks—which were dictated and transcribed this morning—to the President or to anyone in the administration. But I think I can say without fear of contradiction that it is a known fact that the Secretary of Defense does speak for the President and does speak with the approval of the President.

I would say also that the newspaper reports and columns, and what not, which seem to indicate that there is a wide gulf and wide divergence between the Secretary of Defense and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other high military figures in active service, have been stretched considerably further than the actual truth.

It is my understanding that while there are differences, naturally, those differences are small and minor and are not of great significance.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Jersey leaves the floor, I should like to compliment him for his statement made this morning on Vietnam.

The Senator from New Jersey is one of our most distinguished Senators. He is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. For him to endorse as strongly as he has the idea that the South Vietnamese must help themselves in order for us to continue our major participation in Vietnam is extremely important and refreshing.

I welcome anything that anybody can do—especially one in such high office and of such personal distinction as the Senator from New Jersey—to impress upon the military regime in Saigon and the people in Vietnam—at least those who are paying any attention to what voting means—how crucial the upcoming vote is. At long last, we are going to accept no compromise with the idea of self-help as the basis for mutual cooperation. This is especially important when we consider the extent of the casualties that we are suffering in Vietnam and the enormous sums of money we are expending there.

I congratulate the Senator again on the statesmanlike and very fine injunction which he delivered today.

I hope very much that he will—and I know that he will do so—continue to remain in the ranks of those who will not let go of this proposition after the election. The Senator has made his position crystal clear.

I join him in his approval of the report of the subcommittee in the other body.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his most generous and perceptive comment. It is a very deep gratification to have such a comment come from so distinguished a Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, the more we ponder the matter of the significance of our involvement in Vietnam and our efforts in other parts of the world, the clearer, it seems to me, this matter becomes.

What we are trying to do, or at least one of our very deepest objectives, is to demonstrate that the underprivileged and oppressed peoples of the world have some other course than to follow Communist lines of development in South Vietnam and elsewhere.

For only if we insist that our support be given to regimes which not only are resisting communism but which also are for progress and development of the peoples of the underdeveloped areas of the world in their misery and stagnation and backwardness, is there any possibility for us to make the victory against communism come true. The people of this earth are going to insist on progress. If there is no alternative to Communist direction of progress, then they will go Communist, no matter how much American effort is put into any particular situation.

So it is essential in all these cases not only that we resist aggression and subversion but also that, with equal force, we insist that the forces resisting those things, in which we are assisting, be forces in the direction of true progress for the people of the areas concerned.

Mr. JAVITS. Self-determination also enables people to choose a Communist form of government, if that is what they think is best for them. They can use that freedom of choice to enslave themselves, if they choose. I do not think the Vietnamese people will choose communism but they must make their choice, and show their determination to make it work. That is why what the Senator has said, and what others, and I have said, is so critical.

May I point out, finally, that few acts in history have elated mankind at a time of grave discouragement as did the victory of Israel in the war with the Arab States, which demonstrated—as almost a criterion for all small nations—what it means when a nation really believes that what it is doing is so good that it is worth dying for. I refuse to believe that this could not be done in Vietnam, if the people were given the same objective. I cannot see Messrs. Ky and Thieu leading the nation along that line, unless there is some very radical change in their outlook and in what they plan. We hope and pray that is so, if they become the winners in the election.

It is from that point of view that I welcome and congratulate the Senator from New Jersey upon speaking when he has and as forcefully as he has.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of August 31 entitled "The Most Powerful Bomb."

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

THE MOST POWERFUL BOMB

The attempt to achieve a military victory in what is essentially a political conflict underlies the deepening difficulty in which the United States now finds itself in Vietnam. It has been increasingly evident, even before Secretary McNamara's testimony last week, that further expansion of bombing in the North would not break Hanoi's will or reduce infiltration to the South. Nor will increases in American ground forces shatter the stalemate south of the seventeenth parallel, much less inject either development or revolutionary ferver into the so-called "Revolutionary Development" program, as the fifth pacification plan in a decade is called.

There is nothing wrong with the name of the program. What is wrong is the lack of content to bear out the name. The pacification package consists of a few pigs, some first-aid treatment, perhaps a one-room schoolhouse, a lot of propaganda, some protection from Vietcong attack—but not enough for long enough—and a great deal of C.I.A.-financed effort to get a lead on the Vietcong's local political cadre.

Saigon's failure is precisely that it has not given the country anything to fight for, apart from the negative slogan of anti-Communism. The thorough overhaul of South Vietnamese society that is urgently required is nowhere in sight, despite the lip service Premier Ky and General Thieu have long paid to reform.

The indifference or hostility of the population to the Saigon Government, the graft and corruption that permeates the civil and military bureaucracies, the war profiteering and import kickbacks of the ruling middle-class, the absence of a real will to fight in the South Vietnamese Army and, especially, in its officer corps, drawn from the same middle-class, land-owning élite—all testify to the lack of a political concept that can stir enthusiasm, loyalty and a sense of commitment.

It is not simply a matter of war weariness. The Communists should be just as weary. But they endure indescribable hardships and fight on with extraordinary tenacity against superior forces and weapons. Misled though they are, they are imbued with a sense of high adventure and they are fighting for an idea.

The total absence of a competing idea on the Government side was noted this week by Representative Ogden Reid of New York after transmitting a Congressional subcommittee report to Secretary Rusk on kickbacks and other ugly abuses in the Vietnam aid program. The letter, sent by Mr. Reid and Representative Moss of California, chairman of the subcommittee, called for a "reassessment of the United States position" unless the Saigon Government makes a basic commitment to social and economic reform.

Apart from a small amount of land distributed early in the Diem regime a decade ago, there has been virtually no land reform in South Vietnam. If, instead of a limit of 250 acres on landholding (often evaded by several parcels in one family), landlords were limited to ten acres—as in the American land refrom carried out in Japan in 1948—enough land could be distributed to make a dent in peasant apathy. A halt in rent and tax collections in Government-controlled zones might make peasants welcome Government troops instead of resent them. Now the landlords arrive behind them to collect back rent in violation of a Saigon administrative ruling.

Fundamental social reform that began to move the peasantry in numbers to the Government side would discourage Communist hopes of victory as no military casualties could. Joined with a generous offer of amnesty and fair representation for all political elements in the future life of South Vietnam, such reform could start all of Vietnam on the road to peace.

AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1967

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled the "Airport Development Act of 1967."

This morning I had the privilege of

testifying before the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Commerce, the subcommittee chaired by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], one of the most distinguished leaders, if not the most distinguished leader, in this field in Congress, which is dealing with the question of what to do about the crisis facing our major airports.

The measure I am introducing today is an effort to meet the issue by enabling, in an intelligent way, the user—commercial as well as general aviation—to pay the tab, without in any way interfering with what we are doing now in the way of financing airway costs—radar, control towers—through the existing tax on passenger fares, but giving new funds and new resources for the purpose, which will enable us adequately to deal with the grave national problem which faces us; that is, the overloading of the airports and the tremendous delays and dangers to safety which are there involved.

We are all quite aware of the general problems facing aviation today—incredible congestion at the major hub airports, need for improved safety equipment, inadequacy of terminals, parking, and ground transportation. At the same time, we are aware of the dimension of these problems. The FAA estimates it will need $3 billion by 1972 and $6 billion by 1975 for airport development, and Secretary Boyd on Monday told of 1 million air carrier passengers a day within 10 years. Yet, despite this knowledge, and the realization that it takes some 7 years to complete a new jetport, it seems to me we have been very slow in putting forward an imaginative program for national airport development.

When 10 million people enplane annually at O'Hare in Chicago, 12 million at three New York airports, and over 1 million annually in 19 other cities such as Seattle, Kansas City, Denver, and Los Angeles, we are certainly dealing with a national problem. By calling this a national problem, I do not mean to imply that it is exclusively a problem to be solved by the Federal Government. Any solution must involve not only Federal and local governments but the entire range of airway and airport users.

I think we have detected a certain reserve on the part of the administration in coming up with any recommendations. I was very hopeful when the President set up a task force last December to study airport development. A report was supposedly sent to President Johnson on May 1 by the task force, but to this date it has never been made public. According to knowledgeable sources, the varying interest groups—commercial, general aviation, airport operators, and so forth, disagreed on its recommendations. I think the public deserved to know the results of that study—even if there was disagreement. If the Congress had conducted this study, at least the public would have been assured of knowing the results.

During these hearings we have seen further examples of the failure of the administration to really come to grips with this dilemma. The Secretary talked of financing as a central problem—and I certainly agree. Yet, although he suggested a $1 "head" tax to make extra funds available, he would not commit himself to any one approach when actually pinned down. I think it is time we took the big step forward and united behind a single plan to raise funds for airport development. I propose such a plan today while being aware that the various aviation groups will criticize it. The sooner we realize that no plan for airport development will satisfy all the interests concerned—or answer all the problems—the sooner we can get on with doing the job as best we can.

For these reasons, I introduce today legislation to first, establish an airport development trust fund to channel moneys into the more efficient development of jetports. Today 157 airports handle jets; by 1970 an additional 346 airports will gain the jetport status. The trust fund would be used first, to pay the difference between 2 percent and the market rate of interest on locally issued bonds—so-called interest differential payments; and second, to pay for the entire Federal aid to airports program in the annual amount of $150 million; doubling the present authorizations of $75 million. Under the interest differential payment plan, $20 million of Federal grants out of the trust fund support $1 billion of local airport improvement bonds. Many others have talked of Federal guarantees of local tax-exempt bonds, but I must point out that the Treasury has consistently opposed this approach.

The moneys for the trust fund will be raised by new user taxes. I have always felt that the airways must make a far greater effort to pay their own way. The general taxpayer has too long borne a burden incommensurate with his benefits. The people who want to fly must know they will have to pay. But they must know also that the user taxes are being put back into building more airports and making airports more efficient and safer. The trust fund would be made up: first, of a tax of 2 cents on all commercial airline aviation fuel—including jet fuel—which would raise some $100 million: second, an increase in the passenger tax from 5 percent to 7 percent which will raise some $75 million. The 2-percent increase will go into the trust fund, but the 5 percent will continue to go into general revenues to pay FAA airway costs.

These in themselves are not new ideas. As far back as 1946, the House Appropriations Committee suggested increased user taxes and Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson have sought larger user taxes since 1959.

What I believe to be most significant about my plan is that it is based on the determination to use the major jetports to serve almost exclusively the great volumes of commercial aviation traffic and to get out of the business of handling all except essential general aviation. I believe this to be an inevitable result if we are to save our airports from chaos, on the ground as well as in the sky above.

I am convinced that commercial jet traffic and general aviation do not generally belong in the same airports in congested centers. In 1966, two-thirds of airline terminal delays at airports with FAA towers occurred at 23 hub airports. One-third of the delays at these 23 airports occurred at New York's three airports. Thus, New York alone accounted for over 20 percent of all air carrier delay. At the three New York airports, general aviation now uses 31 percent of the airport capacity and an unbelievable 46 percent of peak-hour capacity. As we channel our efforts toward exclusive use of jetports for commercial aviation, we will cut operating time—delays cost airlines $28 million a year—and in turn this added efficiency should be able to reduce fares and improve safety.

As far as general aviation is concerned, I believe we must adopt a "satellite" airport system in our metropolitan areas for this purpose. The average cost of general aviation airports is $25 million, as compared with some $750 million to $1 billion for a fourth New York jetport. But I feel that such airports are necessary and that general aviation must be called upon to pay a far greater share of airway and airport development costs. I recommend a 5-cent tax on all fuels used by general aviation which will raise approximately $22.5 million—still less than 15 percent of its share of estimated FAA airways costs. The receipts from this tax would be placed in the trust fund as well.

FAA Administrator General McKee, in testifying on Monday, said with regard to general aviation:

> We are convinced that this body of aviation will voluntarily separate itself, to a satisfactory degree, from high density airports used by air carriers, if convenient and appropriate airports are put at their disposal.

I do not have the faith in voluntary separation that the Administrator has.

Local airport authorities, in the interest of safety and efficiency, must, at the very least, restrict general aviation takeoffs and landings during peak hours. As satellite general aviation airports are developed, they must gradually phase general aviation from conventional airports. Of course, I am not talking about general aviation directly connected with commercial flights, such as helicopters and air taxis. This phasing-out process could be greatly aided by requiring truly adequate landing fees. At Washington National Airport a 727 pays $44 while a Cessna pays only 50 cents for essentially the same service. At La Guardia, a 727 pays $122 while a Cessna pays $5.

Finally, to insure that localities are doing a coordinated job in cutting across the scores of political jurisdictions within metropolitan areas, I propose that each State establish an agency or join a multistate agency responsible for the drafting and implementation of a plan for aviation development to be approved by the Secretary of Transportation. These plans would include improvement of the congestion problem at hub airports. No Federal funds for airport development would be available except under an approved plan. This "plan approval" approach is similar to one used in the Water Quality Act of 1965.

The fragmentation of decisionmaking for airport development is nowhere more apparent than in the current controversy

in New York City over a fourth jetport. The New York Port Authority, a creation of a bistate compact, is restricted in its geographic physical boundaries. In any event, any decision by the port authority would throw us into the political infighting of the State legislatures. Another concerned agency, the Tri-State Transportation Commission, is essentially a planning body with no actual power to implement its decisions. There is no machinery in existence today through which an effective decision upon the critical problem of metropolitan airport development can be made. We need a State or multistate agency with the power to implement its decisions and my proposal would require such a body.

Business as usual cannot meet the challenges of a revolution. The revolution in aviation is here—the 747's and the SST's are almost on the runways and we are still thinking as we did back in the forties and fifties. It is a time which demands imaginative concepts in efficiency and safety on a broad new scale. More of the same with larger inputs of money will not do the job. We must assign some of the technological genius which conceived of and built the 747 and the SST, to get an airlines passenger from the center city to the airport and then get him quickly to a plane which takes off in an atmosphere of safety without long delays.

The job must be begun now. The threat of complete saturation is estimated for John F. Kennedy Airport by 1969 and other airports will soon follow. There is an ever-increasing misallocation of the cost-benefit ratio of aviation. This trend has to be reversed. It is not only time for the user to pay his way but it is time we made sure he is getting his money's worth in efficiency and safety.

Mr. President, the purpose of the measure is for self-help by those who use the airports, and at the same time an effort to direct that self-help in the most creative way with the least budgetary impact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2379) to provide for essential development of public airports, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2379

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 "Airport Development Act of 1967".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Transportation;

(2) "airport development" means any work or the acquisition of land or structures for construction or improvement of an airport or for the construction or improvement of facilities for use in relation to an airport;

(3) "public airport" means any airport which is used or to be used for public purposes, under the control of a public agency, the landing area of which is publicly owned;

(4) "public agency" means a State or an agency thereof, a political subdivision of a State or an agency thereof, or a tax-supported organization; and

(5) "State" includes a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

AUTHORIZATION FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized to enter into one or more contracts with any public agency for the payment by the Secretary of reasonable debt service costs in excess of 2 per centum per annum incurred by such agency in borrowing amounts for any project for public airport development which (1) is approved by the State agency or official designated pursuant to section 4 if it has been so designated; (2) is in accordance with the State plan for airport development; and (3) is determined by the Secretary to be in accordance with the national airport plan formulated pursuant to the Federal Airport Act.

(b) In entering into such contracts the Secretary shall insure that adequate attention has been given to projects for the improvement of terminal facilities, the improvement of transportation to and from airports, and improvement of parking facilities at airports.

(c) Payments pursuant to this section shall be made from the Airport Development Fund established pursuant to section 5.

DESIGNATION OF STATE AGENCY FOR AIRPORT PLANNING AND AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of this Act and the Federal Airport Act each State shall designate a State agency or official for public airport planning.

(b) Section 4 of the Federal Airport Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1969, no grant shall be made pursuant to this Act for any project in any State in which an agency or official of such State has been designated pursuant to section 4 of the Airport Development Act of 1967 unless such project is approved by such agency or official as being in accordance with State plans for airport development."

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

SEC. 5. Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Federal Airport Act is amended by striking out paragraph (7), (8), and (9) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) For the purpose of carrying out this Act in the several States, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $399,000,000 are hereby authorized to the Secretary of Transportation over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $133,000,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, and shall continue to be so available until expended.

"(8) For the purpose of carrying out this Act in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $6,000,000 are hereby authorized to the Secretary of Transportation over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $3,000,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, and shall continue to be so available until expended. Of each such amount, 40 per centum shall be available for Hawaii, 40 per centum shall be available for Puerto Rico, and 20 per centum shall be available for the Virgin Islands.

"(9) For the purpose of developing, in the several States, airports the primary purpose of which is to serve general aviation and to relieve congestion at airports having high density of traffic surving other segments of aviation, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act for such purpose, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $42,000,000 are hereby authorized to the Secretary of Transportation over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $14,000,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years, ending June 30, 1968, June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, and shall continue to be so available until expended.

"(10) For fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1968, amounts authorized pursuant to this subsection shall be available for expenditure without further appropriation from the Airport Development Trust Fund."

AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT TRUST FUND

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the "Airport Development Trust Fund" hereinafter in this section called the "Trust Fund". The Trust Fund shall consist of such amounts as are appropriated to the Fund pursuant to this section.

(b) There is hereby appropriated to the Trust Fund out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated amounts equivalent to—

(1) 100 per centum of the taxes received in the Treasury after December 31, 1957, under the provisions of section 4042 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

(2) 2/7 of the taxes received in the Treasury after December 31, 1967, under the provisions of section 4261 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

(3) 2 cents a gallon for each gallon of gasoline taxable under section 4081 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is used after December 31, 1967 as fuel in an airplane.

The amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall be transferred at least monthly from the general fund of the Treasury to the Trust Fund on the basis of estimates by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts received in the Treasury under the provisions of such section of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to hold the Trust Fund, and (after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation) to report to the Congress not later than the first day of March of each year on the financial condition and the results of the operations of the Trust Fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected condition and operations during each fiscal year thereafter. Such report shall be printed as a House document of the session of the Congress to which the report is made. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of the Trust Fund as is not, in his judgment, required to meet current withdrawals. Such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. For such purpose such obligations may be acquired (A) on original issue at par, or (B) by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price. The purposes for which obligations of the United States may be issued

under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are hereby extended to authorize the issuance at par of special obligations exclusively to the Trust Fund. Such special obligations shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest, computed as to the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of such issue, borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the Public Debt; except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent, the rate of interest of such special obligations shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent next lower than such average rate. Such special obligations shall be issued only if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the purchase of other interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or of obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States on original issue or at the market price, is not in the public interest. Any obligation acquired by the Trust Fund (except special obligations issued exclusively to the Trust Fund) may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price, and such special obligations may be redeemed at par plus accrued interest. The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Trust Fund shall be credited to and form a part of the Trust Fund.

(d) Amounts in the Trust Fund shall be available, without further appropriation for (1) making expenditures after December 31, 1967, pursuant to section 3 of this Act, and (2) carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act after June 30, 1968.

IMPOSITION OF TAXES ON AVIATION FUEL

SEC. 7. (a) Subchapter E of chapter 31 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special fuels) is amended by renumbering section 4042 as 4043, and by inserting after section 4041 the following new section:

"SEC. 4042. AVIATION FUEL.

"(a) FUEL USED IN COMMERCIAL AVIATION.—There is hereby imposed a tax of 2 cents a gallon upon any liquid (other than any product taxable under section 4081)—

"(1) sold by any person to an owner, lessee, or operator of an airplane used in commercial aviation, for use as a fuel in such airplane; or

"(2) used by any person as a fuel in an airplane used in commercial aviation unless there was a taxable sale of such liquid under paragraph (1).

"(b) FUEL USED IN GENERAL AVIATION.—

"(1) LIQUID OTHER THAN GASOLINE.—There is hereby imposed a tax of 5 cents a gallon upon any liquid (other than any product taxable under section 4081)—

"(A) sold by any person to an owner, lessee, operator of an airplane (other than an airplane used in commercial aviation), for use as a fuel in such airplane; or

"(B) used by any person as a fuel in an airplane (other than an airplane used in commercial aviation) unless there was a taxable sale of such liquid under subparagraph (A).

"(2) GASOLINE.—There is hereby imposed a tax of 3 cents a gallon upon any product taxable under section 4081—

"(A) sold by any person to an owner, lessee, operator of an airplane (other than an airplane used in commercial aviation), for use as a fuel in such airplane; or

"(B) used by any person as a fuel in an airplane (other than an airplane used in commercial aviation) unless there was a taxable sale of such liquid under subparagraph (A)."

(b)(1) Section 4041(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on special motor fuels) is amended by striking out "motor vehicle, motorboat, or airplane" each place appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "motor vehicle or motorboat".

(2) The heading of section 4041 of such Code is amended by striking out "IMPOSITION OF TAX" and inserting in lieu thereof "DIESEL FUEL; SPECIAL MOTOR FUELS".

(3) The table of sections for subchapter E of chapter 31 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4041. Diesel fuel; special motor fuels.

"SEC. 4042. Aviation fuel.

"SEC. 4043. Cross reference."

(c)(1) Section 6416(a)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting after "special motor fuels)" the following: "or the tax imposed by section 4042(a)(2) (use of aviation fuel)".

(2) Section 6416(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (R) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and

(2) by adding after subparagraph (R) the following new subparagraph:

"(S) in the case of a liquid taxable under section 4042, sold for use as fuel in an airplane, if the vendee used such liquid otherwise than as a fuel in an airplane."

(d) The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply with respect to fuels sold or used on or after January 1, 1968.

INCREASE IN TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS BY AIR

SEC. 8. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4261 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on transportation of persons by air) are amended by striking out "5 percent of the amount so paid for transportation which begins after November 15, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "7 percent of the amount so paid".

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "5 percent of the amount so paid in connection with transportation which begins after November 15, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "7 percent of the amount so paid".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to transportation which begins on or after January 1, 1968.

AMENDMENT TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

SEC. 9. Section 209 (f) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (relating to expenditures from the Highway Trust Fund) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) TRANSFERS FROM TRUST FUND FOR GASOLINE USED IN AIRPLANES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay from time to time from the Trust Fund to the Airport Development Trust Fund the amounts appropriated to the Airport Development Trust Fund under section 6 (b) (3) of Airport Development Act of 1967 with respect to gasoline used as fuel in airplanes."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance in the Senate for the week of September 11. I will be absent on official business except for 1 day.

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

THE QUALITY OF AMERICAN LIFE—THE JOHNSON AGENDA FOR THE FUTURE AND THE 90TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the legislative record reflects the compassionate concern of the Johnson administration—and the Congress—for the basic needs and the commitments of the American people.

The 90th Congress is maintaining the momentum of previous Congresses—not to the same degree but nevertheless carrying forward. Twenty-five major bills have already been enacted. Fifteen treaties and conventions have been ratified. Eight other bills have been passed by both Houses. Twenty more have been passed by the House of Representatives. And another 13 have been passed by the Senate.

In all, the 90th Congress has already passed, in one or both Houses, almost 100 pieces of vital legislation.

I think it is appropriate, as we prepare to recess for Labor Day, to take stock of what we have accomplished. I, for one, believe we can say that we have achieved a very good record to date.

VIETNAM AND AMERICA'S SECURITY

To advance American civilization, the American Nation must be secure against foreign attack, and determined in its international commitments. To fulfill these responsibilities, the 90th Congress has already approved an extension of the military draft system, approved regular and supplemental Defense budgets so that our military men have all materials necessary to defend themselves, and voted one of the most generous GI bills of rights in history for Vietnam veterans and others.

Each time the President has called on the Congress to support our fighting men, wherever they are stationed, the Congress has responded in approving those programs necessary to maintain a strong position in the world.

THE FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

To raise the quality of American life, society must keep itself whole, and must have the tools and resources to turn back the rising tide of crime and violence which threaten it with a major social breakdown.

The President and the Congress both agreed—long before the recent riots—that local law enforcement across the Nation must be strengthened with Federal help, and that crime in the streets, delinquency, and disrespect for law and order must be halted at all costs.

The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967, introduced by President Johnson, has already been passed by the House of Representatives.

The Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1967 has been approved by a House committee. With the growing crime rate among young people, this measure becomes an indispensable tool for the Nation to control an extremely serious social problem.

A keystone in President Johnson's crime fighting program is the Firearms Control Act. Hearings are now in process in both Houses of the Congress.

The President has called this a priority item in his program, and the Congress is giving it most serious consideration.

REBUILDING OUR CITIES AND HELPING THE DEPRIVED

One of the principal programs of the Johnson administration has been its large-scale effort to rebuild America's cities, and help the educationally, economically, and racially deprived emerge from dependence to positive participation in society.

The 90th Congress has moved along a broad front to implement the President's programs.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967—with their main stress on aid for the educationally deprived—have passed the House and are now being worked on in committee in the Senate.

The Model Cities Act—the measure which provides the first modern blueprint for the human and physical transformation of our cities—has now been appropriated $537 million by the Senate Appropriations Committee. We are hopeful and confident that this landmark piece of legislation will go through the full Senate—and conference committee—and to the President. It is desperately needed today.

Rent supplements has been rescued from defeat by the statesmanlike action of the same Senate committee which voted it a full $40 million appropriation. Thousands of poor families have been given renewed hope for a decent home in a decent neighborhood.

The 1967 War on Poverty Amendments are now moving through committees in both the House and Senate. We are confident that this expanded program which has meant so much to millions of poor Americans will be increased by 25 percent and sent to the President for signature.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN THE WORLD COMMUNITY

The mantle of world leadership which the United States assumed in this century brought with it new responsibilities to improve conditions for world peace, and to help new nations develop into strong independent allies.

In this session alone, the Senate has ratified 15 treaties and conventions which strengthen America's position in the world community, and create new conditions to foster the growth of peace and international understanding.

Perhaps the most renowned was the Outer Space Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union and other nations of the world. That treaty prohibits the use of nuclear weapons in space, and provides for mutual cooperation in space exploration.

A Consular Convention between the Soviet Union and the United States was also approved. This agreement is a major span in President Johnson's program of bridge-building between the Russian and American peoples.

Congress expressed its strong support for emergency food assistance to India by approving U.S. participation in international efforts to help India achieve self-sufficiency in food production.

In addition, the President has persistently pursued a worldwide nuclear nonproliferation treaty and his efforts have been rewarded by a joint United States-U.S.S.R. presentation of a draft treaty to the Geneva Disarmament Conference.

HELPING THE OLDER CITIZEN AND THE DEPENDENT PERSON

President Johnson and the 89th Congress made history for the older American citizen by the adoption of a long-awaited medicare plan. Millions of America's citizens have already received hospital and medical benefits.

This year, the President and the 90th Congress have joined in yet another series of programs to give greater economic security and dignity to the older citizen—and indeed, to all our citizens who are dependent on society for help.

The Older American Act of 1967 has been adopted. It extends for 3 years a series of Federal grants to help States improve services to the elderly.

The Social Security Act Amendments of 1967, approved by the House Ways and Means Committee, will increase monthly benefits to all recipients and extend coverage of this act to new individuals. It also simplifies and makes more equitable tax laws for the older citizens.

A Mental Health Act extension has been signed by the President. It extends Federal grants to States for construction of community mental health centers.

The food stamp program, so essential for the needy families in the city and the countryside, has been passed by both Houses.

PROTECTING THE AMERICAN CONSUMER

In times past, the American consumer was often the loneliest man in town, as far as Government protection was concerned. The motto "let the buyer beware" was the rule of the marketplace.

But with the increasing affluence of our society; with the consumer shopping for a new home or a new car; with the level of consumer credit up almost to $100 billion; with thousands of new products on the market—it was time that Government came to the aid of working men and women.

The Johnson administration made a great consumer advance with its truth-in-packaging bill in the 89th Congress.

In this session, the Senate has already passed overwhelmingly the Johnson historic Truth-in-Lending Act. This act requires complete public exposure by banks and other lending institutions of rates and amounts of interest, and other charges.

Fire safety and flammable fabrics acts have been passed by the Senate, giving added protection to the citizens, against fires in general, and against flammable fabrics in particular.

The Senate adopted a joint resolution establishing a National Commission on Product Safety which will study hazardous products and the protection now afforded by laws and industrial self-regulation.

Much has been accomplished by the President and the Congress in the first 8 months of the 90th Congress. More remains to be done.

No major area of human concern has been passed over in our work.

We are considering major breakthroughs in public educational television. Business tax incentives have been restored.

This has been a responsible Congress supporting a responsible President.

We have made a pledge to continue building America under President Johnson, and we have made an excellent start in redeeming that pledge.

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.

REPORT ON INITIAL STAGE OF THE OAHE UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, SOUTH DAKOTA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the initial stage of the Oahe unit, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2378. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio P. Amable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2379. A bill to provide for essential development of public airports; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENTS NOS. 299 AND 300

Mr. RIBICOFF submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 31, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1633) to amend the act of June 12, 1960, relating to the Potomac interceptor sewer, to increase the amount of the Federal contribution to the cost of that sewer.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MONDALE:

Speech by Vice President HUMPHREY before American Federation of Teachers on August 24, 1967.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. 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.

PENTAGON REPORT ON PRIVATE FINANCING OF SST SUPPRESSED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in my testimony earlier this month before the Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I said that private financing of the supersonic *transport had* never been adequately explored.

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, in an illuminating column in today's Washington Post, have revealed that not only has the alternative of private financing not been adequately explored but at least one study of this alternative has been actively suppressed.

Evans and Novak disclose in their column that a high Pentagon official, Robert H. Charles, now Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, prepared a paper 2 years ago which concluded that practically all financing of the SST could be raised from private sources.

Congress should be given this report immediately. A decision is due in the Senate soon on providing an additional $142 million for the SST in fiscal 1968, raising the total appropriations for this project to $653 million. That decision should not be made on the basis of one-sided information. I am writing to Secretary McNamara today to ask him to release the Charles report.

As Evans and Novak point out, Congress is being frightened into "voting a massive Federal giveaway to beat the Europeans into the SST market" simply because it has not been given all the facts, because it has been bludgeoned into believing private industry was incapable of supplying its own financing for a project of this magnitude.

I commend the Evans and Novak column to the attention of all Senators and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 31, 1967]

STUDY OF PRIVATE FINANCING OF SST KEPT SECRET IN FACE OF HUGE WINDFALL

Contrary to the Johnson Administration's insistence that massive Federal aid is needed to build the supersonic transport (SST), a high Pentagon official two years ago prepared a confidential paper explaining exactly how private capital could do the job.

That paper, like all other dissent inside the Administration to total Government financing of the first commercial superjet, has been suppressed. Neither public nor Congress has been given the slightest hint that private industry could supply its own financing.

Without that information, Congress has been frightened into voting a massive Federal giveaway to beat the Europeans into the SST market.

The result is a stockholder's dream for the Boeing Co., designer of the proposed 1800-mile-an-hour airliner. While standing to reap windfall profits, Boeing and General Electric Co. (producer of the SST's engines) put up only 12 per cent of the cost. The airlines invest another 5 per cent, and the remaining 83 per cent is Federal tax money.

We reported earlier that a 1966 Treasury staff paper, cloaked from public view, had recommended substantially higher cash contributions from Boeing and GE. But in 1965, an Air Force civilian official, Robert H. Charles (now Assistant Secretary of the Air Force), prepared a paper with a more extreme conclusion: Practically *all* financing of the SST could come from private sources.

Although the Charles report is well known inside the Administration, Pentagon bureaucrats flirt with violation of the new Freedom-of-Information Law and refuse to make it public. They contend this was Charles's personal effort (although they acknowledge that the Charles report became an Air Force working paper) and therefore doesn't rank as an official document. Even the Transportation Department's advice to let it loose has been unavailing.

What makes the paper so interesting is its flat disagreement with testimony before Congress by Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) officials in charge of the SST, who say nothing about private alternatives to Federal financing.

The Charles report starts from the point that development of an American SST is definitely in the self-interest of the manufacturers and all U.S. airlines, who therefore should be willing to pay for it. He then makes a convincing argument of how they can pay for it.

In a detailed plan, Charles describes how 70 per cent of the production cost can be borne by three sources—the manufacturers, the airlines, and private investment. The private funds would be raised by a special corporation, 90 per cent of whose loans would be fully guaranteed by the Federal Government.

The remaining 30 per cent of the cost, under Charles' scheme, would come from special Government-guaranteed bonds issued to private investors. Thus, under ideal conditions Uncle Sam would only insure loans, not subsidize the aircraft.

Charles recognizes that conditions might be less than ideal. If costs rose above anticipation, the Government would lend a hand. If the entire project flopped (which remains a definite possibility), the Government would reimburse the manufacturers and airlines for a portion of their investment. But if the project becomes a bonanza, the taxpayer wouldn't be in the position of taking massive Boeing-GE profits.

In fact, as the Charles report points out, there are numerous methods of indirect subsidization without actually appropriating Federal money. Existing law permits generous tax deductions for the manufacturers. Government facilities and technical assistance would be put at the disposal of the producers.

But in the 1966 backstage in-fighting, Boeing—supported strongly by Gen. William (Bozo) McKee, the hard-driving FAA chief—insisted on nothing less than total Federal financing.

The Charles report, though strongly supported in high Pentagon circles, was first rejected, then suppressed.

With Congress about to raise SST appropriations to a total of $650 million, it is too late now to think about adopting the all-private financing envisioned by Charles. But Congressmen who are increasingly miffed at the largesse for Boeing and GE at a time of self-imposed Great Society restraint might be interested in getting a peek at the Charles report to see if any use at all may be made of it at this late date.

VIETNAM DEMAND CONSTITUTES NO BASIS FOR TAX INCREASE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Department of Defense has just issued the third in a new monthly series of Selected Economic Indicators in the Defense sector. The series was developed at the instigation of the Joint Economic Committee because of the great need for data on Defense contracts and expenditures in assessing the performance of our country.

The latest figures indicate that prime military contract awards in July were approximately $3.3 billion. On a seasonally adjusted basis, the contract awards in the second quarter of this year aggregated $10,667 million as compared with $10,144 million last year. This increase over last year of approximately a half billion dollars for the second quarter is not a startling increase, and the July figures do not indicate any substantial recent jump in these awards.

For the second quarter of this year, net expenditures for Defense came to $17,897 million as compared with $15,609 million in the second quarter of last year. This represents an increase of $2.2 billion for the quarter. Expenditures in the first quarter of this year were $4 billion higher than last year. The increase for the second quarter is not out of line with earlier expectations.

I shall not take time to discuss other details in the latest issue of the Defense Indicators, but I do commend this report to Members of Congress and to economists and businessmen who are interested in the effect of military spending on the economy.

I would merely add that here again, in the area where the greatest economic stimulation has been expected, that is, from Federal Vietnam and Defense spending—the case for the tax increase seems very weak indeed.

Certainly, this immense economy of ours, which has grown so sharply in productive capacity in the past 3 years, can handle the relatively gentle increase in Defense orders without the inflationary pressure, the fear of which constitutes the heart of the administration's economic case for the tax increase.

I ask unanimous consent that Selected Economic Indicators of the Department of Defense, dated August 30, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, SELECTED ECONOMIC INDICATORS

(NOTE.—The attached table shows selected financial and employment data related to the impact of Defense programs on the economy. The data reflected cover seven major subject areas, beginning with the first quarter of calendar year 1966 and continuing through the latest month for which information is available. Explanations of the terms used are also attached.)

EXPLANATIONS OF THE TERMS USED

I. *Military Prime Contract Award.* A legally binding instrument executed by a military department or Department of Defense Agency (DOD component) to obtain equipment, supplies, research and development, services

or construction. Both new instruments and modifications or cancellations of instruments are included; however, modifications of less than $10,000 each are not included.

The series includes awards made by DOD components on behalf of other Federal agencies (e.g., National Aeronautics and Space Administration), and on behalf of foreign governments under both military assistance grant aid and sales arrangements. It also includes orders written by DOD components requesting a non-Defense Federal agency to furnish supplies or services from its stocks (e.g., General Services Administration stores depots), from in-house manufacturing facilities (e.g., Atomic Energy Commission), or from contracts executed by that federal agency.

The series does not include awards paid from post exchange or similar non-appropriated funds, nor does it include contracts for civil functions, such as flood control or river and harbors work performed by the Army Corps of Engineers. Project orders issued to Defense owned-and-operated establishments, such as shipyards and arsenals, are not included, but contracts executed by such establishments are.

The distribution by broad commodity group includes only contracts which are to be performed within the United States or its possessions. Each commodity group includes not only the indicated end item, but also associated components and spare parts, research and development, and maintenance or rebuild work. Electronics and Communications includes only such equipment and supplies as are separately procured by DOD components. Electronics procured by an aircraft prime contractor is reported as Aircraft. Other Hard Goods contains tank-automotive, transportation, production, medical and dental, photographic, materials, handling, and miscellaneous equipment and supplies. Soft Goods includes fuels, subsistence, textiles and clothing. All Other contains services (e.g., transportation) and all new contracts or purchase orders of less than $10,000 each. Commodity identification is not available for these small purchases.

Work done outside the United States refers to the location where the work will be physically performed. About 55–60% of this work is awarded to U.S. business firms, but a lesser percentage of the contract dollars in this category directly impacts on the U.S. economy.

II. *Gross Obligations Incurred.* Total amounts recorded in official accounting records of the military departments and Defense Agencies from source documents such as signed contracts or any instrument which legally binds the government to payment of funds. Present coverage extends only to general fund accounts; obligations incurred in revolving funds are excluded. Included, and double-counted, are obligations which are recorded first when an order is placed by one appropriation upon another appropriation, and second when the latter appropriation executes an obligation for material or services with a private supplier. This duplication averages about 8% of gross obligations.

a. *Operations.* The Military Personnel appropriation and Operation and Maintenance appropriation of the Department of Defense.

b. *Procurement.* The Procurement appropriation.

c. *Other.* The RDT&E, Military Construction, Family Housing, Civil Defense, and Military Assistance appropriations.

III. *Gross Unpaid Obligations Outstanding.* Obligations incurred by the Department of Defense for which it has not yet expended funds. Present coverage extends only to general fund accounts; obligations in revolving funds are excluded.

IV. *Net Expenditures.* Gross payments less collections by the military departments and Defense Agencies, including revolving funds and Military Assistance. Payments represent checks issued.

V. *DOD Personal Compensation.* Wages and salaries earned by personnel employed by the Department of Defense. Military compensation represents pay and allowances to active duty personnel; reserve pay and retired pay are excluded. Civilian compensation represents gross pay and includes lump sum payments for final annual leave. Both figures are inclusive of individual contributions to retirement and social insurance funds, but are exclusive of any employer contributions to these funds.

VI. *Outstanding Payments.* Payments to contractors by the military departments and Defense Agencies made before the goods or services contracted for are completed and delivered.

a. *Advance Payments.* Payments to contractors in advance of performance of a contract.

b. *Progress Payments.* Payments to contractors as work progresses on a contract. These payments serve to reimburse the contractor for a major portion of the costs incurred to date.

c. *V-Loans.* Loans by commercial banks to defense contractors in advance of completion of work, in which the government agrees to share any losses resulting from default.

VII. *Strength.* The number of persons on active duty with the Department of Defense at the end of the period.

a. *Military.* Men and women on continuous or extended active duty. Excludes reserves on temporary active duty for reserve training.

b. *Civilian.* Direct hire personnel.

SELECTED DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ECONOMIC INDICATORS

[Dollar amounts in millions; manpower in thousands; quarters by calendar year]

	1966				1967								
	I	II	III	IV	January	February	March	I	April	May	June	II	July
I. Military prime contract awards:													
Aircraft	$1,945	$2,989	$2,696	$2,262	$784	$788	$530	$2,102	$432	$1,240	$1,377	$3,049	[1] $467
Missile and space systems	1,040	987	1,314	861	380	361	489	1,230	300	260	606	1,166	[1] 402
Ships	355	491	876	239	90	418	171	679	72	129	206	407	[1] 145
Weapons and ammunition	555	1,486	692	940	346	215	257	818	279	518	972	1,769	[1] 209
Electrical and communications equipment	918	1,574	666	915	377	265	329	971	480	338	1,030	1,848	[1] 154
Other hard goods	843	1,842	660	1,029	267	305	343	915	298	362	904	1,564	[1] 144
Soft goods	709	922	1,078	989	251	193	194	638	171	199	282	652	[1] 591
Construction	207	392	198	150	106	59	67	232	126	160	340	626	[1] 72
All other	1,406	1,963	2,356	1,639	534	575	496	1,605	517	507	963	1,987	[1] 1,178
Total (exclusive of work outside the United States)	7,978	12,646	10,536	9,024	3,135	3,179	2,876	9,190	2,675	3,713	6,680	13,068	[1] 3,362
Total, seasonally adjusted	8,703	10,144	10,716	10,149	3,338	3,849	2,984	10,171	2,920	4,121	3,626	10,667	[1] 3,561
Work outside the United States	521	1,195	856	672	183	112	158	453	227	228	379	834	[1] 320
II. Gross obligations incurred:													
Operations	8,326	9,604	10,426	9,702	3,495	3,226	3,508	10,229	3,664	3,531	(2)	(2)	(2)
Procurement	4,374	8,539	5,368	5,276	1,738	1,451	1,924	5,113	1,801	2,485	(2)	(2)	(2)
Other	2,429	3,470	3,453	2,230	823	774	922	2,519	726	1,130	(2)	(2)	(2)
Total	15,129	21,613	19,247	17,208	6,056	5,451	6,354	17,861	6,191	7,146	(2)	(2)	(2)
III. Gross unpaid obligations outstanding: [3]													
Operations	3,828	3,777	4,792	5,024	5,041	4,892	4,644	4,644	4,761	4,765	(2)	(2)	(2)
Procurement	18,023	22,119	22,736	23,173	23,134	22,982	22,780	22,780	22,613	22,947	(2)	(2)	(2)
Other	5,747	7,392	8,179	7,888	7,858	7,834	7,626	7,626	7,453	7,628	(2)	(2)	(2)
Total	27,598	33,288	35,707	36,085	36,033	35,708	35,050	35,050	34,827	35,340	(2)	(2)	(2)
IV. Net expenditures:													
Operations	7,689	9,076	8,968	9,087	3,267	3,219	3,516	10,002	3,416	3,335	[1] 3,745	[1] 10,496	(2)
Procurement	3,651	3,886	4,392	4,264	1,680	1,491	1,903	5,074	1,783	1,850	[1] 1,702	[1] 5,335	(2)
Other	2,757	2,647	2,484	3,092	1,015	887	1,277	3,179	918	749	[1] 399	[1] 2,066	(2)
Total	14,097	15,609	15,844	16,443	5,962	5,597	6,696	18,255	6,117	5,934	[1] 5,846	[2] 17,897	( )
V. DOD personal compensation:													
Military	3,181	3,249	3,551	3,606	1,200	2,221	1,203	3,624	1,230	1,196	(2)	(2)	(2)
Civilian	1,937	2,015	2,105	2,135	733	666	764	2,163	700	776	[1] 766	[1] 2,242	[1] 724
Total	5,118	5,264	5,656	5,741	1,933	1,887	1,967	5,787	1,930	1,972	(2)	(2)	(2)
VI. Outstanding payments: [4]													
Advance payments	66	79	90	83	-------	-------	-------	92	-------	-------	-------	80	-------
Progress payments	4,402	4,346	4,750	5,461	-------	-------	-------	5,981	-------	-------	-------	6,765	-------
V loans	53	51	52	55	-------	-------	-------	112	-------	-------	-------	64	-------
Total	4,521	4,476	4,892	5,599	-------	-------	-------	6,185	-------	-------	-------	6,909	-------

See footnotes at end of table.

SELECTED DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ECONOMIC INDICATORS—Continued

[Dollar amounts in millions; manpower in thousands; quarters by calendar year]

	1966				1967								
	I	II	III	IV	January	February	March	I	April	May	June	II	July
VII. Strength (manpower):													
Military	$2,969	$3,094	$3,229	$3,334	$3,357	$3,368	$3,371	$3,371	$3,371	$3,368	$3,377	$3,377	(2)
Civilian	1,088	1,138	1,184	1,230	1,246	1,260	1,268	1,268	1,273	1,274	1,303	1,303	[1] $1,311

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Information not available at time of publication.
[3] Revised through May 1967 to exclude unpaid obligations involving revolving and management Funds so as to be compatible with coverage pertinent to the "gross obligations incurred" indicator.
[4] Indicator No. VI information available only on a quarterly basis.

L. B. J. ACHIEVES HISTORIC ADVANCE FOR WORLD TRADE AND PROSPERITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the agreement reached in London last Saturday between the finance ministers of the 10 leading financial nations—the so-called Group of Ten—is a successful conclusion to 4 years of hard bargaining.

Our negotiators, especially Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler, deserve the Nation's thanks in achieving a vital first step toward the internationally agreed management of the supply of monetary reserves.

Yesterday, President Johnson said—as many of us heard him say on television—that the past week has been a "very good one," with several "most encouraging reports." I agree with him that it has been a good week for the President.

The first item he mentioned as the source of his happiness was agreement on monetary reform. The basis for the President's enthusiasm, I am sure, lies in the fact that this agreement, if put into full effect, will provide valuable assistance for the orderly growth of world trade and give the world a measure of insurance against the deflation and depression that characterized the 1930's.

Since the agreement will be presented for approval to the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund in Rio de Janeiro next month, and will thereafter, in all probability, require the ratification of national assemblies, including the U.S. Congress, I wish to express my conviction that it merits the wholehearted approval of Congress.

Without some agreement of this kind, the international monetary system would be headed for trouble in the long run, and perhaps in the not-so-long run. The United States, as the principal supplier of international reserves in the form of a national currency, would be caught in a bind: either to continue the deficit in our balance of payments that has made the United States the principal supplier of dollars to the world economy at the high rate of recent years, and in doing so suffer a liquidity crisis or a speculative run on gold; or else balance our international balance of payments and in doing so stop the addition of more dollar reserves to the world supply; the likely result: a deflationary squeeze on trade, probably applied to the weaker, less developed nations, and then an international free world depression. This agreement goes a long way toward ending that dilemma.

This is but one of the main difficulties in exaggerating the consensus among many economists of the rapidity with which the United States should move toward a balance in our payments. Although many deplore our adverse balance of payments—which should be deplored—it has served a useful purpose in supplying the money basis for world trade. World trade has immensely increased in the past few years. This prosperity has been a great thing for peace, for development, and for better living for people all over the world. The contribution of American dollars has been very important to this.

There has been a fear, and a very proper fear, that if we balanced our payments without providing for any mechanism to increase world liquidity, we could, in doing so, reduce the dollars available, the cash available, the money available in the world to finance the kind of increase in world trade necessary if we are going to have continued prosperity in the world.

The Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, has had a longstanding interest in this issue of international monetary reform. In March of this year there was unanimous agreement, in the annual report of the committee, on this first proposition in the field of international trade and finance: "Agreement on international monetary reform is a matter of increasing urgency."

My colleague from Wisconsin, Representative HENRY S. REUSS, has performed a superb public service in examining this issue through his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee. Although his interest in the subject extends back over many years, the recent publications of his subcommittee have provided a critically important contribution. I refer especially to the excellent report of August 1965, "Guidelines for Improving the International Monetary System," which has deservedly won praise as an example of constructive congressional work in clarifying an important issue of policy.

PRICE RISE FOR 1968 AUTOS IN FACE OF LAGGING DEMAND SHOWS TAX HIKE FEEBLE WEAPON TO FIGHT INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday I called the Senate's attention to the fact that in spite of a serious drop in demand for color television sets, so serious that plant facilities are being shut down in some areas of the country, a major color television manufacturer has announced price increases—and other price increases in the industry can be expected to follow.

The point, Mr. President, is that with demand dropping in this industry, prices are being pushed up. It is clear that a tax increase, such as the administration proposes aimed at diminishing demand further, will have little effect on this kind of inflation.

Today's papers announce that the Chrysler Corp. has decided on a substantial increase in its auto prices for next year. Ford is likely to follow suit.

Once again, Mr. President, here is an industry in which demand has been slack. The sale of cars this year has been far below last year, and far, far below the level at which profits are maximized. But prices are not reduced in order to increase sales. They are being increased.

Once again it is clear that the administration's tax increase proposal is not going to hold prices down in the automobile industry. The tax increase will reduce demand for automobiles. It will cut the amount of cars sold and the jobs involved in producing autos, but it will not hold down the price of cars. Auto prices will rise in spite of the lesser demand.

I have already documented the acknowledged fact that the tax increase will have no effect on the price of food which has and will continue to provide the principal increasing force in the cost of living.

The rapid rise in service costs, likewise, is unlikely to be significantly affected by the tax increase because so many services are insulated from demand forces.

The main thrust of the tax increase in diminishing demand would be precisely for such commodities as television sets and automobiles. Here, as we can see from current reports, prices are responding to costs, not to demand. The tax increase is unlikely to slow down price increases.

My own interest in the subject was focused by a study undertaken by the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, of which I was then chairman. The report on "The Balance of Payments Statistics of the United States" emphasizes the importance of high-quality information as a guide for policymakers.

The essence of the agreement reached last weekend, as I see it, is that the principal financial nations have agreed that there should be a new kind of international financial credit—special drawing

rights—through the International Monetary Fund. It is not precisely the creation of a new monetary reserve unit, which was the original aim of the United States, but it is, in effect, the creation of a new central bank asset that will, in transactions between the central banks of the world, be used in the same way as other forms of international monetary reserves, gold and dollars in particular.

This is a good safety valve—rather like a person's having a credit line at his bank. He does not actually have the money until he needs it, but if he does need it he can get it, up to a point and subject to rules. In the same way, a commercial bank is given a measure of safety but no escape from normal obligations of good performance, by being able to borrow from a central bank.

At the international level, where there is no similar authority to say that such and such an asset is legal-tender money, the International Monetary Fund has operated on the basis of national quotas of gold and national currencies. It has used its supply of national currencies as the principal source of lending to nations whose reserve position was temporarily in difficulties. But the IMF could not create further supplies of national currencies, only agree to increases in national quotas.

The limitation of that process was that one national currency, the U.S. dollar, was the linchpin, and that one nation, the United States, stood ready to sell gold to other governments at a fixed price in terms of dollars. Meantime, world trade had doubled since 1959—world imports, cost, insurance, and freight, are now above a $200 billion annual rate—and official reserves had grown between the end of 1959 and the end of 1966 from $57.3 to $70.3 billion. Of that $13 billion increase, country-held gold increased by only $2½ billion—this year it actually decreased—dollar liabilities to official agencies of foreign governments increased by $5 billion.

That is the big role the dollar has played. Meantime, the U.S. gold reserve dropped from $19.5 to $13.25 billion. So that about 80 percent of the increase in world liquidity was by U.S. action either in selling or by our dollar deficit.

The fact that the finance ministers have now faced is that the actual or potential increase in official gold reserves does not meet the needs of stable growth of the international reserves. No possible deviation from the steady U.S. policy of a fixed-dollar price of gold would improve matters, for raising the price of gold in terms of the major currencies would set off an unpredictable speculative disturbance.

It is not, as the Europeans have often said, that the recent U.S. deficits have created an oversupply of dollars. To be sure, we have been coming under increasing strain in terms of liquidity, and our gold stock is not inexhaustible. But I have yet to hear a foreign commercial dealer say that the dollar has not performed well as money. At the end of 1966, there were more liquid dollar liabilities to foreign private holders—banks, corporations, and individuals—than to foreign governments and central banks, a situation that has not happened before in the post-World War II period. Nobody makes private holders hold dollars. They hold them because they choose to.

But there is still a need to secure the growth of world monetary reserves by a less hazardous method than dependence on one national currency, the dollar, and its convertibility into gold.

Hence, the pact on monetary reform is vital. There is no substitute. We must approve it.

But we have to recognize that the finance ministers have decided what to create and how to create it, not how much to create, or when, and not how precisely to operate transactions using the new special drawing rights.

The provision for an 85-percent voting majority in the Board of Governors of the IMF makes possible a veto by the European Common Market countries, but if you want something to be treated as money you have to have something generally acceptable. If the past performance the IMF is a guide—and I think it is—the general pattern of decisions is unanimity. It is likely that the SDR's will be created by general agreement, and not likely that five members of the Group of Ten will repudiate before 1970 the project that they have labored so hard and too long to bring to realization.

Again, I have seen disparaging comment on the expected scale of creation of SDR's. There is no basis at present for thinking that a decision to create these credit lines will be either so restrictive as to make their supply totally inadequate or so lax as to make it excessive. It must be remembered, anyway, that SDR's will be a supplement to and not a wholesale substitute for other reserve assets, and that forecasts of developments in international economic conditions are notably hazardous.

What has been achieved, then, is what can be expected as a first step. A country is not going to be required to accept payments on SDR's in excess of twice its own allocation. That places a limit on a process that could end by making SDR's unacceptable. Again, however, we must remember that the process of consultation that goes on in the Group of Ten and the IMF and the OECD is going to place some pressure on countries whose policies result in large and continuing surpluses just as it is recognized that deficit-prone countries should be warned to mend their policies.

For all of these reasons, I believe the United States should welcome the pact and the U.S. Congress should, in due time, approve it. In any case, the Joint Economic Committee intends to continue its study of the subject of international monetary reserves. There will be an opportunity to present our views in more detail after the Rio meeting.

THE UNITED AUTO WORKERS STRONGLY ENDORSE POSITIVE SENATE ACTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—CXXXI

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today marks the 131st time I have spoken on the Senate floor during this session of Congress urging the Senate to give its advice and consent to the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

I have been greatly encouraged by the totally unexpected large number of people from all over our country who have written to me in support of my efforts. Many, many Americans care deeply about this Nation's failure to ratify a single one of the Human Rights Conventions. Lawyers, clergymen, teachers, housewives, and students have all written—and are continuing to write—to express both their dismay at the Senate's past inaction and their hope that the Senate will remedy this shameful situation soon.

Yesterday, I was further encouraged to receive a particularly cogent and thoughtful letter, as I am sure all my colleagues did, from Victor G. Reuther, the director of the international affairs department of the United Auto Workers.

Mr. Reuther, on behalf of the organization, strongly urges the Senate to give its advice and consent to the five Human Rights Conventions presently before this body.

Because I believe this letter from Victor Reuther will be of great interest and value to my colleagues and because I believe it is an eloquent argument for U.S. ratification of the Human Rights Conventions, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA—UAW,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I write in behalf of a large organization of working people, the UAW, which has extensive and earnest commitments to the international furtherance of human rights and the democratic processes. In barely four months, now, the International Year for Human Rights will begin, and it is a source of mounting embarrassment to us in our work abroad (as, indeed, it must be to others who represent this country in its many international interests), that the U.S. Senate has yet to ratify any one of the five UN Human Rights Conventions which have for years been before it, and that four others adopted by many others nations have yet even to be sent to the Senate for its consideration.

The Conventions on genocide and freedom of association were submitted to the Senate by President Truman in 1948. Those on forced labor, equality of political rights for women, and a supplementary convention on slavery were submitted by President Kennedy in 1963. Inasmuch as a UN resolution concurred in by the U.S. Ambassador to that body specifically asks that all nine of the Human Rights Conventions be adopted by the governments of the participating nations before 1968, further delay in bringing to a vote at least the five Conventions presently before the Senate will, inevitably, feed the assumption that silence is tantamount to rejection.

This is not, surely, the intent of the great majority of the members of the Senate, yet there is something inescapably shameful in such protracted negligence in approving declarations of credo which give the UN its deepest meaning and which, in fact, have for generations been embedded in our own Constitution. Further delay risks defacing our prestige abroad and offers a gloss of credi-

bility to Communist suggestion that we distrust our own laws and finest ethical traditions. Further delay amounts to a form of abdication by us of world moral leadership. It can only, moreover, puzzle and dismay our own citizens as the realization broadens that the United States is now among the tiny handful of nations whose governments have totally ignored the Human Rights Conventions.

If you will take a moment to glance through the enclosed tabulation of those Human Rights Conventions which, as of the present moment, have been ratified by UN member nations, you will note that several nations which we have presumed to tutor—and others which we condemn as totalitarian—have subscribed to virtually all of the Conventions. In our total silence, we stand in humiliating isolation with South Africa, Spain, Yemen, and the Maldive Islands.

I am confident that you, both as a legislator and as a citizen sharing our nation's deep concern for human rights, will exercise to the full your influence, both official and private, to assure that the Senate act promptly to permit this nation to greet the opening of International Human Rights Year in clear conscience and unreserved endorsement of those principles of personal freedom to which the national past has been so ardently and influentially dedicated.

Very respectfully yours,

VICTOR G. REUTHER,
Director, International Affairs Department.

CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN PLAN

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I have long been convinced that adequate and proper development of its waterways is a key to the Nation's future growth and development.

Without such utilization, the country's commerce and industry must inevitably fall short of their full potential.

Problems of municipal water supply and stream pollution will intensify as the population grows.

Uncontrolled flooding will destroy additional millions of dollars worth of property and ruin more thousands of acres of productive farmland. Other land lacking water will lie barren.

Boundless possibilities for recreation will be lost or lie fallow.

Perhaps nowhere else in the country is this truer than in my own State of North Carolina where only in the past few years has any appreciable progress been made in waterway development.

Much of what has been accomplished has resulted from long-range planning, with a vast amount of such preparatory work yet to be done.

A notable example of the comprehensive approach to the problem being taken in the State is an improvements program recently outlined for the lower Cape Fear River Basin by Col. George W. Gillette, a retired Army engineer and one of North Carolina's top experts on water problems.

A veteran of 32 years in the corps prior to 1948, Colonel Gillette has since gained State, National, and even international recognition of his specialty.

He is currently chairman of the Wilmington, N.C., Port and Waterway Development Commission, a member of the Governor's committee to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and a member of the NRHC projects committee, as well as an associate in Transportation Consultants of Washington, D.C.

For 6 years after retirement he was executive director of the North Carolina Ports Authority, and during that period planned and supervised construction of port facilities at Wilmington and Morehead City.

Colonel Gillette has served as a port consultant for the Agency for International Development, the World Bank, and United Nations at various times, as well as for a number of U.S. Government agencies.

In these assignments he operated in many of the world's major ports and waterways in Honduras, Nicaragua, Burma, Chile, Thailand, Pakistan, and the Belgian Congo.

A key element in Colonel Gillette's plan is a navigation project in which I have long been deeply interested, to deepen the channel in the Cape Fear River from the State port at Wilmington all the way to the inland city of Fayetteville. Working closely with Senator ERVIN and Congressman LENNON, I introduced an amendment to the 1965 public works omnibus bill authorizing navigation improvements in the Cape Fear between Acme and Navassa, and we are seeking funds this year to carry this work forward. This 26-mile project is the first step in the long-range plan to improve the channel from Wilmington to Fayetteville.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point Colonel Gillette's statement on his plan for this project.

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

LOWER CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN

(Long-range plan of improvements recommended by Col. George W. Gillette, engineering and economic consultant, ports, harbors, waterways, and chairman of the Wilmington Port and Waterway Development Commission)

This plan envisions development of the Lower Cape Fear River and its tributaries in a step by step improvement program, extending over a period of twenty-five years, with a five-year maximum period in each step of improvement.

The plan is a recommendation for future study and detailed planning. By no means is it all inclusive. In this general plan is included studies for navigation, health reclamation, flood control, fish and wild life propagation. Health is a big factor in the plan, to be accomplished by a broad drainage program.

In my studies of the economics of waterways of the world I draw the inspiration that prompts this plan. As in the beginning, so it is today. But for the water this country would still be the land of the Indians. But for water the Ports of the world would not be, as in the beginning, the economic spring stones to the countries who have developed them and followed a continuing program of improvement. Today the United States has more major ports for ocean-going ships than any other nation in the world. They are growing, both in numbers, size, and importance, to the economy of the states in which they are located, and to the nation. They have paid off well. They are kept modern by economic necessity. No modern mode of transportation within the foreseeable future will supplant them for bulk and heavy cargo.

As envisioned years ago when the value of the ports of this state to the well being of all of North Carolina was not generally recognized, today every citizen of that vintage tips his hat to the Pioneer who had the vision to fight for modern ports yesterday. One look at the industries that have located in North Carolina in the past fifteen years, directly due to deep sea ports, should be convincing.

The ships discharge their foreign cargoes in record time, reload with American cargoes at modern terminals and docking facilities, a quick turn-around and they are away. Their return cargo comes from the industrial complexes of the United States—North Carolina obviously included to a greater extent than if there were no North Carolina ports.

Southeastern North Carolina is rich in unknown resources as well as those we know about, i.e. water, pine, and marl.

Optimistically we look ahead. We know industry does the same. We realize that if industry needs water to float ocean-going ships and barges, other things being equal, it will gravitate to the locality that has had the vision to plan such a haven.

We know that bulk cargo ships being built today are growing in size and are almost completely automated—crews cut to half and greater. We know these ships can transport oil from the oil fields at considerably less cost than it can be transported by long pipe lines. We think we see a quiet protected harbor for these super-super 50′ draft ships in the center of the Eastern Seaboard of the United States, near the mouth of the Cape Fear River. We recognize that a 40′ depth to Wilmington is about the limit of economic feasibility. Hence our plan for a discharge point near Southport, protected from tropical disturbances, economically feasible of accomplishment, that will accommodate the deepest draft tankers known today. From this feeder point would radiate small tanker and barge lines to ply the coast North and South, the intercoastal waterway and inland barge canals. Short pipe lines would distribute to tanker trucks and cars on the right and left banks of the river.

We envision a great increase in water traffic in Southeastern North Carolina. The Lower Cape Fear River Basin with its natural surface waters and reservoirs are, in our opinion, not just impossible bogs and quagmires made to breed mosquitoes, but nature's invitational spots to be developed into agricultural oasis and connected by traffic lanes, water, highways, rail, and air, and spreading West across North Carolina to the heart of the country.

Fayetteville, in spite of the critics, is a natural head to economic navigation on the Cape Fear River. It must be admitted that the improvements on the Upper Cape Fear River to date have not paid off handsomely. However, this is a new day. In the first place, the tonnage into the Port of Wilmington when the Upper Cape Fear was being studied was 60,000 tons annually. Today it is approximately 5,000,000. Secondly, there is a bastard in the study. We have 8 feet to Fayetteville with three small lift locks for a single barge operation. No barge canal to any point should be less than the basic 12 feet of the Intercoastal Waterway. Anything less may be compared to a narrow gauge railroad hooking up to a standard gauge system. It just doesn't work.

The Intercoastal Waterway system, which after all is only an improved protected natural traffic lane, is the spine of the interior barge lines envisioned. It has an authorized depth of 12 feet. All other barge channels should be of a corresponding depth. Less than 12 feet would be inadequate. Thus this plan envisions barge canals of nothing less than 12 feet or more.

The Cross State Florida Canal will shorten the distance from New Orleans, Mobile, and Jacksonville to ports North of the St. John's River by more than 700 miles. It is bound to have a terrific impact on Eastern North Carolina. A barge canal through the Wac-

camaw River to a point just above Lock & Dam No. 1 on the Cape Fear River would shorten the distance to Fayetteville by 48 miles, to Wilmington 30 miles. Such a canal will drain and otherwise improve one of the richest agricultural sections of the state. A lock may be required to protect Lake Waccamaw by maintaining and equalizing the water level.

Today when we are virtually only two hours from London, Paris, Berlin, Moscow, Buenos Aires, Santiago, and Rio, and less to Mexico and Central America, and only slightly more to Tokyo and the Far East, one cannot escape the fact that our Ports, Harbors, and Waterways that are fed from the interior, are becoming a still greater economic necessity as a support for an expanding economy, both for the state and the interior of the country. We can no longer live within ourselves without shrinking. Our future economy must be geared to Latin America, Australia, and the Far East.

While on this subject, but not included in the general plan, it seems well to record that a possible barge lane from New River, via Stone's Bay and Stone's Creek, which penetrates as far as Dixons, might be considered in any broad plan as a step to the North East River via Holly Shelter Swamp. Radical? Not at all. It was considered when the Intercoastal Waterway was being planned. Today, even more than in 1920, it could well be studied for health and economic potentials. Probably the answer is not a connecting barge canal, but drainage canals.

Repeated is an oft-made statement: The industrial development of Southeastern North Carolina rests on deep sea transportation. That is the bedrock foundation for the future. Other environmental assets help attract these basic industries, such as oceanography, resorts, fishing, climate, and above all, educational facilities.

However, our greatest natural resource, other than the human resource, is water. Water to float ships and water to supply industry. This we know about. However, we do not realize our other resources above and under ground. The timber potential is terrific. Marl, lime and other bulk materials—many unknown at this time—are, we believe, vast in totals. Hence, our faith in the development of all of our resources brings us to the point of recommending water lines of communication, with attendant drainage of the lowlands for health and recreation, to the plan submitted here for step by step development as the economy of the state and nation develops.

SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY OUTLINES SOCIAL SECURITY AND WELFARE NEEDS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance is at present holding hearings on the amendments to the social security and welfare laws, amendments which the House of Representatives passed recently. Many of us have been concerned about the inadequacy of the increase in social security benefits which the House provided and about the restrictive changes in the Federal welfare law which the House passed.

The Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], in testimony the other day before the Committee on Finance, comprehensively stated the implications of the House bill in a detailed and thoughtful statement. Senator KENNEDY made a proposal for increasing social security based on the introduction of some degree of general revenue financing, which we must recognize will be necessary to provide a truly adequate level of social security benefits. He also made some thoughtful observations about the impact of the welfare provisions of the bill on poor people all over the Nation. I believe that Senator KENNEDY's testimony deserves the attention of the Senate; I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY ON H.R. 12080, SOCIAL SECURITY AND WELFARE, U.S. SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, AUGUST 29, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, in the midst of our great affluence, there remain thirty million poor people in this country today. That fact, more than anything else, is what these hearings are about.

For despite the growth of our Social Security System over the years a fifth of those living in poverty are over 65. These years should bring them a life of peaceful comfort and dignity—but instead retirement means a life beset with financial problems, burdened with dwindling savings and unpaid bills. Millions more approach 65 with apprehension—they know that when they stop work they begin not the golden years but years of life in poverty.

And despite the growth of our public welfare programs over the years, welfare at present, aids less than a fourth of the thirty million poor. And those who receive aid often do not get enough to satisfy even their barest minimum needs. For too many on welfare and for the rest of the poor, there are only days of misery without enough food for their children, and nights of fear in sub-standard housing, warding off marauding rats. And for those receiving assistance, there are also complex and degrading procedures; there are rules designed to qualify eligible applicants which often serve to disqualify or discourage people in need; there are rules which force families to stay apart in order to receive aid. For too many, then, welfare is not only inadequate, but appears as a reluctant handout designed to screen the poor away from the rest of society.

These figures, these conditions, these procedures define the magnitude and importance of the task before your Committee. And they also suggest the utter inadequacy of the legislation which the other body has sent over for us to consider. That legislation includes some good changes—the ideas of offering job training, day care, and work incentives to welfare recipients in order to enable them to seek productive employment; some changes that are not good enough—the increase in the minimum Social Security payment to $50 and the 12½ percent across the board increase in benefits; and far too many changes which can only be described as plainly regressive—a series of public welfare amendments, which taken together reflect a punitive attitude reminiscent of medieval poor law philosophy and will result in reduced assistance for millions in need, and a ceiling on Title XIX assistance that is unrealistic and unworkable.

Let me discuss each of these matters briefly, if I may.

I. SOCIAL SECURITY

Our Social Security system has grown extensively over the years—so that 95 million people are now insured and 23 million receive benefits—but we have not yet succeeded in lifting millions of older Americans into a retirement of security and self respect. Secretary Gardner told you last week that Social Security is the major source of income for nearly all retired beneficiaries, and the sole source for half. About 14 million retired workers and their dependents receive benefits. And last year these benefits averaged $84 a month—just $1000 a year for individuals, and $142 a month—$1,704 annually—for couples. In light of these figures, it is not surprising that some 5 to 7 million retired Americans live in poverty.

We in Congress must share the responsibility for the inadequacy of retirement benefits. The two increases of 7 percent which we enacted in 1958 and 1965 actually fell short of restoring the 1954 purchasing power of benefits—for the cost of living has risen about 25% since that time. Thus four-fifths of the 12½ percent increase provided in the House bill would be taken up just to give beneficiaries as much real income as they would have had in 1954. Meanwhile, wages have risen about 50 percent in those 13 years. The wealth of our nation has steadily increased, but because of our neglect, our older citizens have not shared in that affluence—instead, more elderly couples each year retire into a life of poverty.

With ten Senators of both parties, I introduced legislation earlier this year to make up the ground we have lost. That bill, S. 1009, would provide benefit increases averaging over fifty percent, and, crucially, would finance these increases by a gradual infusion of general revenues. It envisioned a levelling off of general revenue contribution at 35 percent of the costs of social security by the late 1970's.

At the moment, when we are engaged in a deepening war in Vietnam which saps our resources and consumes over $2 billion each month, it seems impractical to urge the full scope of these proposals.

I believe, however, that it is time we began a partial changeover to general revenue financing.

The payroll tax is scheduled under present law to increase to 4.85% each on employer and employee in 1973, plus a contribution for health insurance. The House bill would raise that to 5% each, plus .65% each for health insurance. As members of the committee well know, a tax on payrolls is highly regressive. For low wage employees particularly, a required contribution beyond that contemplated in the House bill would be very burdensome. Many workers already pay more in payroll taxes than they do in income taxes.

General revenue financing would be a far more equitable way to raise revenues for the social security system, particularly revenues which would be used to provide additional benefits for low-income people—for those who worked either so irregularly or at such low wages that their contributions do not really finance the benefits they receive.

I emphasize this because the proposal I shall make this morning to broaden the scope of H.R. 12080 would give relatively more help to the poorest of our elderly, to those who have the most difficulty in finding dignity and comfort in their retirement. If we are to provide a meaningful floor of protection for older people as a matter of social insurance, I believe it is only fair to other workers that we finance it through general revenues.

I propose that the Committee raise the across-the-board increase in benefits to 20%, weighting it, if possible, toward those beneficiaries at the lower end of the spectrum. I propose, in addition, that the minimum benefit be raised to $100 a month, $150 for couples. These proposals combined would produce an average benefit increase of 29%.

To finance this proposal, I suggest, first, that the contribution and benefit base be raised to $8,400 next January and to $10,800 on January 1, 1971; and second, that general revenue contributions be infused at the rate of 11% of the total financing of the system beginning in 1972.

This plan is feasible. I am assured by officials of the Social Security Administration that it is in long-range actuarial balance.

The increases in the contribution and benefit base are no more than what the Administration proposed in HR. 5710, except that the $10,800 figure would go into effect 3 years earlier than the Administration pro-

posed. This is substantially less than was proposed in S. 1009, under which the base would have risen to $15,000 on January 1, 1971.

These increases in the earnings base are justified to bring the social security system up to date. For 87% of American workers the $10,800 figure would result in benefits based upon everything they earned—a comprehensiveness of coverage lost nearly 30 years ago as workers' incomes grew faster than the earnings base was increased. For the man already 50 years old, for example, this change would mean an increase of over 40% in the benefits he will get when he retires.

In contrast to S. 1009, the general revenue contributions would not have to begin until January 1, 1972. What this means is that we would be promising now that we would spend $4.5 billion a year beginning 4½ years from now.

I believe this is a promise we can and must make. It is not a huge amount of money. Our gross national product will exceed a trillion dollars by that time, and 1972 is far enough off so that we can easily plan to set aside this amount of money. What we get for this promise is a 20% increase in benefits now, plus what I regard as all important—the increase in the minimum payment to $100.

I might add that an across-the-board benefit increase of an additional 5% beginning January 1, 1970, could be obtained for a relatively small additional promise of general revenues, and I would urge the committee to consider that as well.

The net cost of the increase which I propose would be considerably less than the financing I have described. For the people who will benefit from this increase are people who must now turn to old age assistance in order to eke out enough of a living to survive. Old age assistance has decreased markedly over the years as social security benefits have been liberalized. Only 11% of the elderly population receives such assistance now, as opposed to 22% of the population in 1950. Even now, more than half those receiving old age assistance in New York are on welfare because their social security pensions are inadequate. Thus, raising the minimum benefit to $100, and raising other benefits 20% or more, will correspondingly decrease the number of people on the old age assistance rolls and the amounts which those who remain on the rolls will require.

S. 1009 contained a number of other proposals for the liberalizing and up-dating of the social security system, but I would emphasize only two at this point.

First, I would urge that the committee consider a cost of living provision to make social security inflation-proof, and to ensure that future benefit increases granted by Congress do more than just make up for lost ground. The civil service and military retirement systems have cost of living adjustment features. It is time the social security system did likewise, although I emphasize that this must not be at the expense of benefit increases which allow older citizens to share in our expanding productivity.

Second, I hope the committee will consider raising the benefits for the uninsured to $50 a month for individuals and $75 for couples. The House bill raised this benefit only to $40. There are 1.2 million people, many of them quite poor, who have been helped by this constructive addition to the law. The difference in cost between the House bill and the $50 figure would be about $163 million annually from general revenues and $28 million from the trust fund. I hope the committee will decide upon the higher figure.

Mr. Chairman, what I have suggested are, I think, the minimum changes which we in the Senate must make if we are to keep faith with our older citizens. The conditions in which millions of retired Americans find themselves after having worked productively for decades are a disgrace to us all. Adoption of the proposal I have described would begin turning our social security system in the direction long advocated by experts in the field, and would allow us to provide real hope at last to our elderly poor that they will be able to live out their lives in some measure of ease and self respect.

II. WELFARE

About a year ago, the distinguished members of the President's Advisory Council on Public Welfare reported that welfare is "desperately handicapped" in both "legislative mandate and . . . financial resources." The Council prescribed "a major updating of our welfare system."

The House bill which is before you today not only fails to heed the Council's prescription, but is in my judgment a major step in the other direction.

I can well understand what motivated the other body in its action. It was concerned that the welfare system as it exists today has failed to enable its recipients to obtain jobs and end their dependency. I share that concern. It was concerned at the recent rise in the number of children and mothers on Aid to Dependent children. I share that concern. It therefore sought to create a system which would train children and mothers on welfare, provide day care, and establish incentives to work. I, too, believe such a system is needed.

Indeed, I believe that we will never succeed in restoring dignity and promise to the lives of people whose frustration exploded into violence in the cities this summer until we develop a system which provides jobs—enough jobs and good jobs.

For the people of the inner city live today with an unemployment rate far worse than the rest of the nation knew during the depth of the Great Depression. In the typical big city ghetto, only two out of five adult men have jobs which pay $60.00 a week or more—enough for each member of a family of four to eat 70 cents worth of food a day. Only half the adult men have full-time jobs at any rate of pay. Less than three out of five have any work at all.

I have suggested that we need an immediate impact project designed to put men to work and to restore some sense of hope to the young and the unemployed residents of the city slum. We should begin immediate programs of needed public tasks and works—providing jobs to build schools and roads, to restore parks and erect clinics, and to staff the schools and clinics and neighborhood centers when they are built. Our communities need these jobs done and the men of the ghetto need jobs. By matching the two we can return hope while meeting the most urgent needs of the nation.

We must, then, work out a system to provide jobs. But I do not believe that the approach adopted in the House bill will provide these jobs. The fact is, as the alarming unemployment and underemployment figures I have mentioned indicate, that there are not enough jobs available at the moment. We must find them, but in the meantime, it will not do to force people into training programs for jobs that are not there. That will only increase the pent-up frustration which has already exploded too often. In the meantime, also, we must not continue to place a premium on broken homes as the condition for obtaining public assistance. And we must not end up by venting our own frustration in a measure punishing the poor because they are there and we have not been able to do anything about them. They will still be there when we are done. It is not as though people choose to be poor, to need welfare assistance.

Consider, for example, that we have a school system in our slums which is plainly unsatisfactory. Of a quarter of a million Puerto Rican school children in New York City, only 37 went on to college last year. If young men are unskilled and unprepared for employment, then the schools which left them so bear a heavy share of the responsibility.

Nor, of course, is the problem merely in the schools. For the rest of ghetto life also there are statistics: 43% of the housing substandard and overcrowded; 14,000 people treated for rat bites every year; infant mortality at twice the normal rate; and, because of inadequate diets and medical care, mental retardation at seven times the community average.

These are the matters we must look to. For these problems welfare is neither the cause nor the remedy. But welfare has its job—helping those in need—and the bill before you will hinder it in doing that job. Indeed, instead of helping at all, it almost appears intended to punish the poor. And punish it will, particularly in areas of the country where welfare authorities have done their best to demean and degrade the recipient of welfare even under existing law.

First, the House bill says that no state may have a higher percentage of children on welfare than it had at the beginning of this year. Commissioner Ginsberg of New York City said the other day that this would force states and localities either to deny additional aid when more children are born into a family, or to come up somehow with the money needed to pay the difference. The latter, of course, would shift the burden from the level of government that can best afford it to the one that can least afford it. There is a third possibility—to find ways to cut enough families off welfare to stay within the freeze. This possibility cannot be discounted. For the House bill, with all of the other restrictions on eligibility which it contains, is an open invitation to welfare departments in some areas of our country to find ways to tidy up their caseloads and discourage new applications.

Second, the coercive provisions on community work and training fit into this pattern. The objective of enabling welfare recipients to obtain productive employment is of course laudable; indeed, as I have indicated, I believe it is the only hope we have for avoiding the deep division in our society which the creation of a permanent class of welfare poor would bring. But attempting to bring about employment by compulsion is not the way to do this. There are many mothers who should not work. Some, particularly in progressive states and cities, will be excused from working. But in other states with less enlightened welfare programs, many will either be driven off the welfare rolls or will be discouraged from applying. And *they will still be poor*—a little more invisible, for the time being, than they are now, but no less poor, no less miserable.

There is more than one state in this country which, even under existing law, has had what has come to be known as the "employable mother" rule. Under this rule, if the welfare officials judge the mother to be employable, she is stricken from the rolls. Coincidentally, these rulings tend to be made at the time of the year when people are needed to pick crops at $3 a day. This rule is being challenged in litigation, but the provisions of the House bill on compulsive work and training imply that from now on the "employable mother" rule would be sanctioned by a national policy.

Third, the punitive intent of the House bill is evident as well in the provisions on aid to children with unemployed parents. For the first time, the parent must have had a substantial connection with the labor force in order to qualify, a provision which will eliminate many men who have never had an opportunity for steady employment. In addition, the provision denying assistance to unemployed parents who have applied for or are receiving unemployment compensation will keep aid from many who need both forms of help in order to survive, and will cause some to receive neither kind of aid. The House provision will only succeed in forcing more families to break up, forcing more fathers to leave home so the family can obtain assistance by the traditional ADC route.

Fourth, the provisions giving States an incentive to provide custodial care for illegitimate children are also punitive. Once an illegitimate child is born, although we may have wished to discourage that from happening, his best hope is to grow up in some kind of family structure. Study after study shows that the worst thing that could be done is to consign him to an institution. So we punish illegitimacy by punishing the illegitimate child.

We in the Senate must go on record as opposing this almshouse approach. We must go on record as forcefully as we can that this is not the direction which we want welfare to take. We must not allow this backward step. What I would recommend, therefore, is that the Senate use H.R. 5710, President Johnson's original set of welfare recommendations, as its working bill. That bill's recommendations were limited to be sure, but they were at least not regressive. The expanded training and day care provisions which the House adopted can then be included but without the meat-ax compulsions which the House bill attached to them.

I would particularly urge the Committee to provide a greater work incentive than the $30 a month plus one-third of additional earnings which the House enacted. This incentive is so small that it may well fail to encourage significant numbers of welfare recipients to work, and opponents of the idea may then succeed in claiming it will never work.

I also urge the Committee to adopt the Administration's proposal regarding the management of the community work and training program. The Department of Labor has the potential to bring a job-oriented approach to the training involved, and has a developed system of placement services. The House bill, in my judgment, will waste resources by creating an unnecessary overlap between the Department of Labor and HEW which should be avoided.

Let me emphasize again that I do think our welfare system is unsatisfactory. But every reason why I think it is unsatisfactory will only be accentuated by the House bill.

I believe our welfare system is unsatisfactory, because, in general, it provides aid for broken families and not for whole ones. The House bill accentuates this by refusing to adopt the recommendations of H.R. 5710 to expand aid to unemployed parents, and by restricting that program instead.

I believe our welfare system is unsatisfactory, because it imposes degrading conditions on eligibility, and encourages the enforcement of those conditions by demeaning investigation. The House bill accentuates these defects by adding a whole raft of new conditions for eligibility and a whole new set of incentives for the state to investigate welfare recipients.

I believe our welfare system is unsatisfactory because, once a family does penetrate the bureaucratic maze and qualify for aid, the benefits it receives are in many states not even enough to live on. The House bill accentuates this by refusing to require states to meet their own definitions of minimum need, as H.R. 5710 proposed, and by enacting instead a freeze on ADC payments.

The Advisory Council's report called for "a nation-wide comprehensive program on public assistance based upon a single criterion: need." What a grim joke that is today as we look at the way in which the House bill gives heed to this recommendation.

A month ago, the prestigious American Public Welfare Association issued a major series of recommendations to make our welfare system into an effective weapon in the War on Poverty. The APWA proposed simplifying eligibility for welfare and re-deploying investigatory social workers to provide meaningful social services. It also proposed meaningful work incentives to allow welfare recipients to work without losing a dollar of their benefits every time they earn a dollar. What a sad thing it is to see the twisted application of these thoughtful recommendations in the legislation before you.

Mr. Chairman, we must have the perspective to see that the welfare system is not something that exists by itself, that has no effect on the world in which its recipients live. We cannot afford to bury our heads in the sand. Our nation has been ripped apart this summer by violence and civil disorder that have taken dozens of lives and caused billions of dollars of property damage. We face in our cities the gravest domestic crisis to confront this nation since the Civil War. We are not going to solve that crisis by lopping people off the welfare rolls. We are not going to solve that crisis by forcing welfare recipients to accept training for jobs when we have absolutely no idea whether jobs will be available to them after their training. We are not going to solve that crisis by punishing the poor and hoping that they will bear that punishment silently, invisibly, graciously, without bitterness or hostility for their "benefactors."

What we should be talking about here today is the enactment of H.R. 5710, and how to improve upon it as we pass it.

We should be discussing whether we are going to require the states to meet their own minimum definitions of need; instead we are constrained to decide whether we are going to lift an unconscionable freeze on the amount of Federal aid to dependent children.

We should be discussing whether we are going to provide a greater work incentive than that contained in H.R. 5710; instead we are forced to discuss whether to repeal the compulsions for work and training in the bill before us.

We should be discussing a national mandate to simplify eligibility for welfare; instead, we have to talk about whether we are going to strike restrictive conditions on eligibility added by the House bill.

We should be discussing ways to afford welfare recipients participation in making the policy of the agency which governs their lives; instead, we are confronted with a bill whose whole approach is not to listen to those recipients.

We should be discussing how we can make the welfare system more honest with itself and its recipients, how we can make sure that recipients can receive a full hearing when their benefits are in jeopardy; instead, we hear talk about ways to strike them from the rolls.

We should be talking about integrating welfare into our efforts to help poor people generally instead of viewing it as an isolated problem susceptible of being solved by new and greater restrictions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee to reject Title II of H.R. 12080, and develop a constructive set of proposals which the Senate can be proud to enact.

III. TITLE XIX

The last matter I would discuss is the provision in the House bill placing a limit on federal participation in programs under Title XIX.

The Administration's proposal in H.R. 5710 was vastly different and less destructive from what the House enacted. H.R. 5710 proposed a ceiling at 150% of each state's public assistance definition of minimum need. This provision would have forced a significant cut back in our program in the State of New York, and I was therefore not happy about it. I believe that we should not default in our commitment to bring better health care to those members of our population who have difficulty in paying for medical attention. We have our problems in the State of New York, but I think the appropriate place to resolve those problems is within the State.

The House bill is much worse for New York. Commissioner Ginsberg tells me that it will force the standard for a family of four to be cut back from $6,000 to $3,900. Since New York would have gone to $5,200 this year under the previous federal programs, wholly apart from Medicaid, this intrusion is wholly unreasonable.

But the House bill will be equally disastrous elsewhere. For instead of looking to a state's definition of minimum need, it looks to the amount which the state actually pays its public assistance recipients. Title XIX intended that medical indigency be defined at a level substantially in excess of a state's public assistance definition of minimum need. The House bill will in many states have the opposite effect, and is therefore totally unrealistic.

For example, Mississippi, according to HEW figures, was paying 22.8% of minimum need to its ADC children in January of this year. When the 133⅓% limitation in the House bill goes into effect, the ceiling for medical assistance in Mississippi will be approximately 30% of its own definition of minimum need. The State of Ohio is another good example. In January 1966 its definition of minimum need was $224 a month for a family of four. However, its ADC payments were actually $170 a month for a family of that size. When the 133⅓% limitation goes into effect, the ceiling on medical assistance for a family of four in Ohio will, therefore, be approximately $227 a month—an unacceptably low figure.

What is really involved even in the 150 per cent limitation originally proposed is a failure of insight about the connection between ill health and dependency, a failure to realize that the provision of adequate health care to the poor depends upon an infusion of funds of the magnitude which Title XIX as originally enacted was intended to supply.

If we cut into Title XIX, we cut into the possibilities of better health care for the poor. We must not do that.

Let me suggest, however, that the Committee might well allow for variations in eligibility levels within a state. The services provided under a Title XIX plan should remain uniform throughout a state, but we might appropriately begin to allow variations in eligibility based on differences in the cost of living within the state.

In New York, for example, the needs of New York City are clearly different from those of Jefferson County, or Franklin County, or Yates County. The $6,000 figure for a family of four is extremely reasonable in New York City, but may well be unnecessarily high upstate. I urge the committee to study the possibility of taking these variations in living costs into account in the federal law.

I would urge the committee, too, to consider instituting some form of regulation of costs and fees. A recent survey in one county in New York showed that physicians' fees have skyrocketed under Medicaid. The costs which have worried so many people around the country may be controllable in part. I hope the committee will examine this matter before it decides whether to limit federal participation under Title XIX.

IV. CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, the suggestions I have made to change the social security provisions of this bill are neither radical when viewed in light of the clear needs of the Nation's elderly, nor are they a revolutionary departure from past social security theory. Rather, I believe they are the beginning of reform, the steps we can take now—they are fiscally sound changes in an inadequate structure.

By increasing benefits we can provide a more secure future for millions of elderly people. By raising the contribution base we distribute more equitably the cost of these benefits. And by turning toward general revenue financing, we ensure that the noncontributory aspects of social security shall be financed out of the progressive income tax rather than the regressive payroll tax, easing the burden on middle and lower income wage earners.

The unsatisfactory and regressive features of the House welfare provisions should be manifest. It is unfortunate that we must retrace our steps to correct these errors. But we ought not hesitate.

We must act now to reform the archaic structure of rules and conditions that impose penalties on the poor for their misfortune. We ought to assist people to lift themselves out of poverty, with training and jobs and income. But it is a senseless ethic that punishes the poor, or disrupts family life, or tears children from their mother.

The frustration of poverty, the fury induced by want in the midst of affluence is not assuaged by foolish and debasing rules of eligibility. We must restore sense to this legislation so that we can restore hope to millions of people. That mandate should guide us in our deliberations.

THE TFX AIRPLANE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, some statements have been made by the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy that appear to respond to my comments of August 25 on the adaptability of the TFX airplane for all of the military uses contemplated for it.

These statements and a news article from Nellis Air Force Base, Nev., quote a few pilots who have flown test versions of the plane in words highly praising its performance.

I had suggested that the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] should hold hearings in November or December, after Air Force versions of the plane have been delivered to tactical units, and should call some of the pilots who will fly them on a regular basis as witnesses to obtain better information than Congress now has on the plane's performance.

Mr. President, the comments which are being rushed into print now from pilots, particularly from those who are unnamed by the Secretary of the Air Force, are very interesting and certainly appear to be reassuring. However, I do not consider them the last word on the TFX's performance.

It is my sincere hope that the TFX will be successful in all the military uses contemplated for it because the Nation has pumped billions of dollars into its development. In order to insure that the taxpayers' money has not been spent to develop a dud weapon and to make sure the planes delivered to tactical units are capable of performing the missions assigned to them, I hope the McClellan subcommittee will call the pilots who already have spoken, plus others who will have flown the planes, by next November or December to provide Congress with additional information.

I feel certain that far more will be known about the performance of Air Force versions of the plane in tactical situations next November or December than is known today.

This is evident from the news article entitled "Superbird Going to War Soon—Air Force Pilots Eager To Test F-111 in Battle," written by Jerry Flemmons under a Nellis Air Force Base dateline, and placed in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] on August 28.

This article makes it clear that Tactical Air Command pilots who are starting to receive the TFX now are under tight restrictions as to the maneuvers they can perform. What they are saying, in effect, in the comments quoted to date, is that this aircraft flies great on a straight and level path, and has a wonderful control system.

Let me quote from the article by Mr. Flemmons to illustrate my point:

> Pilots are undergoing the transition from conventional jet to the super F111. ("We take off and land and fly in between.") Here, there is no bombing—yet—nor is there an attempt to reach the maximum flight speed.

The article then makes this significant statement:

> TAC pilots work within a "tight envelope" of the plane's capability. Still, they test and suggest improvements within the restrictions imposed on them.
>
> What they think is important, perhaps more so than the political and high brass faction which has warred over the F111 since its conception—five years ago.

There are many questions, such as the amount of external stores or ordnance which the TFX can carry and still be maneuverable in combat, that remain to be answered, Mr. President. There are also questions about its effectiveness as a long-range strategic bomber to replace the B-52. Indeed, it is becoming more and more important to hear from the pilots who will fly these planes on a regular basis—not only the pilots selected by high officials in the Department of Defense—to comment, as Congress weighs the question whether to plunge deeper into this multibillion-dollar spending program.

SENATOR MUNDT'S ROLE IN URGING A BETTER URBAN-RURAL BALANCE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the crisis in the cities has heightened interest in encouraging the development of nonmetropolitan parts of our Nation as attractive places to work and to live. Many believe that one root cause of many of the miseries of the cities is that too many people are crowded together into too small an area. In this technological age we are becoming the victims of what one familiar with science and physics might call a "population implosion." Since other parts of the Nation are attractive but sparsely populated, there are strong arguments for a better balanced distribution of industry and population.

The Republican coordinating committee issued an excellent report on August 23 on methods of revitalizing rural America. Several editorials and articles on this general subject have recently been published, including one in the Washington Post of August 27, 1967.

I commend the Republican coordinating committee's task force on job opportunities and welfare and the able and talented leadership of Prof. Don Paarlberg, professor of agricultural economics, Purdue University, and the task force vice chairman and my good friend, U.S. Representative GEORGE H. W. BUSH, of Houston, Tex., for producing this thoughtful and cogent research paper.

It needs to be emphasized that these ideas are being given very serious consideration and study in the Senate. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has played a key and vital role in highlighting the need of modern America to reassess the value of its rural areas.

On April 6, 1967, Senator MUNDT introduced Senate Joint Resolution 64 to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development, which I was glad to cosponsor, along with 17 other Senators.

The proposed Commission would delve into many areas of pressing concern, and would include:

First, identifying and evaluating economic, social, and political factors affect the location of various types of industrial installations;

Second, identifying and evaluating which economic, social, and political factors are necessary and proper for general industries to operate efficiently outside metropolitan complexes of 500,000 or more population;

Third, exploring methods—both by legislation and expenditures—by which the Federal Government might effectively encourage better balanced industrial and economic growth throughout the Nation;

Fourth, identifying the size of city and political institutions which can most efficiently provide necessary public services to its citizens; that is, the optimum effective range of population concentration in cities;

Fifth, evaluating the effect on government efficiency of differing patterns and intensities of population concentration;

Sixth, evaluating the competence and potential of State and local governments toward encouraging balanced economic development within States and regions; and

Seventh, evaluating the desirability of more geographically balanced economic development.

In short, the Commission will plan for the future. If the riots, disturbances, and violence in our major cities of the past few weeks are to teach us anything, then I think they say that we must prepare ourselves for future difficulties and plan now for their prevention. It has been pointed out that 63 percent of America occupies 1 percent of our land. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has pointed out that the density of population in Harlem is so great that the entire population of the United States could be compressed onto the island of Manhattan if the same density as exists in Harlem were maintained.

Clearly a crisis exists. Clearly Senator MUNDT's proposal is geared toward the finding of new ideas and new directions which the Nation so desperately needs.

The Commission can explore the wide spectrum of ideas and proposals which exist—including the possibility of establishing brandnew cities across the landscape of America.

Establishment of an approach for a more desirable balance of industry and population between urban and rural areas must take into account the dramatic prospect that improvements in methods of transportation and communication will greatly expand the number of locales in which an individual can live and work. The possibility of building new cities in areas that are today considered

out-of-the-way places may become feasible. Certainly we cannot afford to leave such exciting opportunities unexplored.

There is no doubt but that the Nation must devote itself and its immense resources to solving and meeting the problems of the cities. But even if we solve today's crisis, there will be a new and different one tomorrow—and probably of greater magnitude. Senate Joint Resolution 64 will help to establish the machinery to determine the facts. The Commission will not be a continuing one which merely postpones decisions and stalls solid action. Rather, it will cease to exist after 2 years. Consequently, it will not prove to be a permanent burden on the taxpayer. The reverse should be true: the taxpayer will in the long run be able to save a great deal of money from the ideas and thoughts which will no doubt generate during the commission's study.

I ask unanimous consent that the Republican coordinating committee's statement and the editorial from the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

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

REVITALIZING OUR RURAL AREAS

(By the Republican coordinating committee task force on job opportunities and welfare, July 24, 1967, prepared under the direction of Republican National Committee, Ray C. Bliss, chairman)

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey . . . " was written of the English countryside nearly 200 years ago. But it might be written of rural America today.

Our rural areas are being depleted of people. From 1950 to 1960 the rural population—farm plus non-farm—declined by 400,000; the urban population increased by 28 million. These trends have continued. The Department of Agriculture anticipates further outmigration to the year 1970.

About one-fourth of the rural population consists of farm people. The others are part of the rural non-farm population, living in the countryside or in small villages. Since 1960 the farm population has been declining at an annual rate of about 6 percent, an accelerated pace.

Most of those who migrate from the rural areas leave in their teens and twenties, when on the verge of their productive years. They carry with them the investment in their upbringing and education. Conservatively estimated at $15,000 per person, this human investment is a contribution from the rural areas that runs about $12 billion a year, several times the total of all subsidies provided to agriculture.

What becomes of these people? They move into our great cities. Without necessarily desiring it and almost by default, we are becoming an urban society. Seventy percent of our people now cluster in cities that cover one percent of our land area. If present trends continue unchecked, by the year 2000, 80 percent of our people will be living in metropolitan areas and most of them will be crammed into five super strip-cities.

And will these be alabaster cities, gleaming, "undimmed by human tears"? Not likely. The migrants concentrate, unassimilated, in Detroit, in Cleveland, in the South Side of Chicago, in Watts, in Harlem, in Indianapolis and in a hundred other cities. Smog, congestion, water pollution, law enforcement and other problems of the megalopolis beset them and their uneasy neighbors. By generating a kind of "urban crush," they create a problem in the cities to which they go. By depopulating the countryside, they create a problem in the rural areas from which they come.

But move they must, if there are no nearby jobs.

And why are there so few jobs in the rural areas?

For several important reasons.

First, because of the agricultural revolution. The mechanization of agriculture has so multiplied the productivity of human beings that the production of our food and fiber is now accomplished by 6 percent of our population, as compared with about 18 percent only two decades ago. There simply are not as many farm jobs as there were. These revolutionary changes have by no means run their course. The Department of Agriculture says that from 1965 to 1980 farm employment will experience an additional decline of more than one-third.

Second, because imagination has been lacking. Little has been done to create job opportunities, in the rural areas, for people forced out of agriculture. Rural people do very well at off-farm jobs if the jobs are there and if they have the necessary education. They have manual dexterity and they know how to work. They do not want to live on a dole. If off-farm jobs are available within driving distance, they continue to live in their accustomed surroundings, among their friends and families, benefiting from increased incomes, providing improved education for their children and utilizing the services of the local community. But without such jobs they must go on relief or move to the city.

Seemingly, almost everything has conspired to prevent the creation of jobs in rural areas:

Federal farm programs have cut our cotton crop to 10 million acres, compared with 43 million acres before the programs began. Tobacco acreage is now only half as great as 35 years ago.

Local communities have not provided the services and utilities needed to attract industry.

Wage policies have discouraged industry from expanding into areas of abundant labor.

Industry, which has been urban-minded, has not sufficiently sought to decentralize.

The rural labor force lacks the federal employment services available to urban workers.

Educational policies have discriminated against the poorer areas. For example, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides more than twice as much help per pupil to the counties ranking *highest* on the index of rural well-being as it does to those ranking *lowest* ($350 as against $157). (Manpower Report of the President, April 1967, page 116.)

Farm programs, largely designed by the Democratic party, have continually sought parity of prices as an objective, when they should have sought parity of opportunity. For more than 30 years these programs have been commodity-oriented, when they should have been people-oriented. The following statistics vividly describe the disadvantaged position of rural areas. All are taken from the President's Manpower Report of 1967:

	Farm	*Urban*
Unemployment, rate, 1966, percent	6.5	3.4
Percent of population below $3,000 income per family, 1965	33.1	14.4
Median years of schooling, male, 1966	8.7	12.2
Percent of people with activity limitations because of health, 1963–65	6.4	4.7

These things need not be so.

It has been fashionable to point critically at the hardships which resulted from the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century and to find fault with those who could have alleviated these difficulties.

Now, in the twentieth century, we confront an Agricultural Revolution which creates problems and opportunities in some ways similar to those of the Industrial Revolution. There is no reason to accept, unquestioned, the social and economic consequences of this Revolution. Conscious efforts should be made to determine and assert the public interest.

The American people want some balance between the rural and the urban sectors. There should be some opportunity for those who wish to live in the country to find decent work there, to have access to reasonably good education and health services, and to pursue a way of living that gives diversity and balance to our economy.

What the American people really want and will work for, they can have. We are not the helpless objects of blind economic forces, we are capable of helping to shape the institutions which in turn help shape us.

These things can and should be done:

(1) *Locate more of our new factories in rural areas.* This can be done by local, state and national tax policies to provide realistic economic incentives. It can be done by providing better roads, better schools, and better public utilities in the rural areas. Factories may now be operated successfully in areas where this was formerly not possible. At an earlier time, when transportation was poor and the emphasis was on heavy industry, a factory had to be close to its raw materials or to its markets. This is far less true today. The Federal-Interstate Highway Program, established by a Republican Administration, has greatly facilitated transportation. For some industries a plant can now be established almost wherever a trained labor supply and the necessary supporting services are available.

(2) *Provide better education for rural people.* This means better education of all kinds, at all levels: elementary, secondary and advanced; vocational, technical and academic; continuing education for adults, apprenticeship, retraining and all the rest. It means on-the-job training as proposed in the previous Job Opportunities Task Force report entitled "The Human Investment," and it means Technical Education for the Future, also previously recommended by this Task Force. It means equal educational opportunities for the nonwhites, who comprise about one-fourth of the rural poor. Education is a great adjuster; people who are making great changes are in greater-than-ordinary need for it. Rural young people move freely across state and county lines. The sharing of the cost of education on a national basis is appropriate in view of the fact that we are concerned here with a national problem. The need is greatest where the taxable wealth is most scarce.

What is here proposed is not a blueprint for the economy, with a certain calculated number of people on farms or a carefully computed balance between rural and urban areas. Rather, we propose to redress the imbalance in education and opportunity which has worked to the disadvantage of the rural areas and threatens to make us almost totally urban.

To undertake the actions here offered does not introduce a rural bias; rather, it would remove an urban bias, largely unintended, that has been allowed to develop. We propose to provide the equality of opportunity which will give our people a chance to develop the kind of society they want. If this is done, we can safely leave with the people themselves the decision as to the balance between rural and urban living.

This is not a new idea. It was first proposed by President Eisenhower in his Special Message on Agriculture of January 11, 1954. In 1956, a Republican Administration launched the Rural Development Program, the first coordinated assault on this problem.

In attempting to find possible solutions to these root problems, Republicans realize there is no panacea. There is no one-shot, sure-fire, cure-all solution to rural unemployment, underemployment, and general rural underdevelopment. There are, however, a variety of programs, policies, and procedures that singly and in combination can

help to mitigate the consequences of this rural stagnation. What is required is a multi-pronged attack on the numerous ills that beset our rural areas. The recommendations here offered are in keeping with the Rural Development Program launched under President Eisenhower's pioneering effort in 1956.

SPECIFIC PROPOSALS TO IMPLEMENT THE TASK FORCE PAPER

1. Encourage state and federal legislation which would identify rural areas in which unemployment and underemployment are critical problems and give these areas preference:

a. In educational assistance, including various vocational training programs.

b. By providing economic incentives to industrial firms that establish new plants in these areas.

c. By contracting in these areas for the manufacture of defense materials and other government supplies and by building new government installations therein when feasible.

2. Push for enactment of Rural Community Action Programs under Title V of the Republican-sponsored "Opportunity Crusade Act of 1967," H.R. 10682.

3. *Push* the work of the Economic Development Administration in rural areas of low income.

4. Change the focus of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 so as to increase the number of area vocational-technical schools in rural areas.

5. Provide the rural areas with the same kind of employment services as are offered to urban workers.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1.—POPULATION IN URBAN AND RURAL TERRITORY, 1790–1960

[In thousands of people]

Year	Rural	Urban	Percent urban
1790	3,727	201	5.1
1800	4,986	322	6.1
1810	6,714	525	7.25
1820	8,945	693	7.19
1830	11,738	1,127	8.76
1840	15,224	1,845	10.81
1850	19,648	3,543	15.28
1860	25,226	6,216	19.77
1870	28,656	9,902	25.68
1880	36,026	14,129	28.17
1890	40,841	22,106	35.12
1900	45,834	30,159	39.69
1910	49,973	41,998	45.66
1920	51,552	54,157	51.23
1930	53,820	68,954	56.16
1940	57,246	74,424	56.52
1950	[1] 54,230	[1] 96,468	64.01
1960	[1] 54,054	[1] 125,269	69.86

[1] New urban definition.

Source: "Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957," p. 14; and "Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1965, p. 15.

MEMBERS OF THE REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE'S TASK FORCE ON JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND WELFARE

Don Paarlberg, Chairman, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University.

George H. Bush, Vice Chairman, Member of Congress from Texas.

Yale Brozen, Professor of Business Economics, University of Chicago.

Thomas B. Curtis, Member of Congress from Missouri.

Robert H. Finch, Lieutenant Governor of the State of California.

Len B. Jordan, United States Senator from Idaho.

Charlton H. Lyons, Chairman of the Republican State Central Committee of Louisiana.

James D. Martin, Member of Congress from Alabama, 1965–67.

Carl H. Madden, Economist.

Lee W. Minton, International President, Glass Bottle Blowers Association.

Arch A. Moore, Jr., Member of Congress from West Virginia.

Mrs. Helen M. Morris, National Committeewoman from Florida.

Marshall J. Parker, Owner, Oconee Dairies, Seneca, South Carolina.

Mrs. Elly M. Peterson, Chairman of the Michigan Republican State Central Committee.

Winthrop Rockefeller, Governor of the State of Arkansas.

John H. Stender, Vice President, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers (AFL–CIO).

Prentiss L. Walker, Member of Congress from Mississippi, 1965–67.

W. O. Walker, Director of Industrial Relations for the State of Ohio.

Miss Malise C. Bloch, Secretary to the Task Force.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 27, 1967]

URBAN-RURAL IMBALANCE

Both the major parties are now seeking a better balance between urban and rural population. Last week the Republican Coordinating Committee, composed of the top leaders of the GOP, came out for a five-point effort to revitalize rural areas. Its statement follows a very similar warning by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman that the rush of people into overcrowded central cities is creating a grave imbalance.

The main burden of the Republican complaint is that little has been done to create job opportunities, in the rural areas, for people who have been displaced by the agricultural revolution. Two decades ago 18 per cent of our people were required to produce food and fiber. Now the same tasks are performed by 6 per cent of the population, and most of the workers no longer useful on the farm have flocked into big cities where some of them are very poorly prepared to cope with the problems of urban life.

The cost of this brain and brawn drain from the countryside is enormous. Most of the migrants leave in their teens and early twenties, at the beginning of their productive years, after heavy investments have been made in their upbringing and education. Don Paarlberg, chairman of the Coordinating Committee's Task Force on Job Opportunities, estimates that "this human investment is a contribution from the rural areas that runs about $12 billion a year, several times the total of all subsidies to agriculture."

Rural America is in no position to make such a contribution to the economic prosperity of the remainder of the country. The disadvantaged position of the rural areas stands out in every test that is made. The President's manpower report of 1967 shows a farm unemployment rate last year of 6.5 per cent compared to the 3.4 per cent urban rate. The farm population has 33.1 per cent of its families below the poverty level compared to 14.4 for urban families. Schooling for farm youths averaged 8.7 years compared to 12.2 years in the cities. These figures doubtless explain a very large part of the "urban crush" which has created such grave problems for the big cities.

No progress toward righting the urban-rural imbalance can be expected until these inequalities are corrected. Families who wish to live in the country should at least have job opportunities, health and education services and some of the amenities of life that are available to urban residents. Nothing can be said for policies which tend to drive people into congested and smog-bound ghettos for want of equal public services and economic opportunities in a more congenial environment.

The GOP policy-makers call for more educational aid, vocational training, economic incentives for the establishment of rural industries and the channeling of defense and supply contracts into such areas when feasible. One specific recommendation is aimed at great expansion of the Economic Development Administration which seeks to utilize local resources and provide part- or full-time employment in rural communities. Another aim is to give rural workers employment services equal to those provided in the cities.

Much remains to be done by way of shaping programs and policies, but the objective is highly commendable. The forecast that 80 per cent of our people will live in "five super strip-cities" by the year 2000 is frightening to everyone concerned. Reversal of that trend has become one of our urgent national necessities.

LANDLORD, HALF-BILLION PUBLIC DOMAIN ACRES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Bureau of Land Management has for many years been overseeing the administration and utilization of some half-billion acres of public domain. More recently their activities have come into the limelight because of the work being done by the Public Land Law Review Commission. The renewed importance being given to land management is long overdue, and I am delighted that the administration of this Federal agency is in the hands of an old friend and extremely capable administrator.

The Director of the Bureau of Land Management is Boyd Rasmussen, at one time regional forester for the U.S. Forest Service at Missoula, Mont. He did a fine job in my State, then came to Washington to the administrative position in the Forest Service, and then was selected for the new position as Director of the Bureau of Land Management. In the short time that he has been in this position, Boyd Rasmussen has developed a reputation of confidence and sound administration. The August 1967 issue of American Forests contains an interesting feature on Director Rasmussen and the work of the BLM.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "A Place in the Sun," written by James B. Craig, be printed in the RECORD.

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

A PLACE IN THE SUN

(By James B. Craig)

Few agencies of government are so intimately identified with the history and romance of the Republic as are the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior and its predecessor agencies, the old Grazing Service, and the old Land Office.

Staffed exceedingly thin compared to some of its sister agencies, the Bureau nevertheless is responsible for a half billion Public Domain acres that last year realized revenues in excess of $434 million. This trend is up. By 1968 the Bureau anticipates an income from all uses of $625 million.

Despite the fact the Bureau today appears headed for a new place in the sun there is a "tentativeness" about the BLM that sometimes puzzles AFA members who tend to equate the start of conservation in America with Theodore Roosevelt and the founding of the national forests.

Actually, the Bureau's history goes back to genesis with the founding of the Republic. The single reference to the Public Lands in the Constitution is contained in the statement, "The Congress shall have Power to *dispose of* (italics ours) and make all needful

Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States." That this power resides in the Congress is beyond question and has been upheld by the Supreme Court.

Thus the landmark Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 creating the grazing districts under BLM management contains a preamble pegged on the uncertain note, "pending the final disposition" of the Public Domain. Again, the more recent Classification and Multiple Use Act giving BLM more management status is contingent on the findings of the Public Land Law Review Commission now engaged in reevaluating 5,000 land laws and empowered to make sweeping recommendations as regards the future of the public lands.

In reading scholars like Professor John D. Hicks there seems to be little doubt that the founding fathers, while they did not necessarily agree on ways and means, were of the view the Public Domain should be "disposed of." Alexander Hamilton, perhaps the first advocate of a strong centralized government, and who believed the public was a "Great Beast," was chiefly interested in the lands for their revenue-producing capacity, preferably in big blocks by big ownerships. Westerners of that era were more in tune with the thinking of Thomas Jefferson who believed in the "good sense and solid judgment of the people" and who wanted to see the Public Lands developed by farmers like himself.

Few if any of the founding fathers, all large landowners themselves for the most part, envisioned such reservations as the national forests or any of the other reservations. That came later under such Presidents as Harrison and Roosevelt. Mounting waste—terrible forest fires and overcutting being classic examples—led to the setting aside of large chunks of the Public Domain for management by government agencies. The high court further decreed that the Congress has the power to "reserve" as well as "dispose of" the public estate and the government has actually so reserved upwards of 400 million acres up to now. Some say this is far too much if the sense of the Constitution is to be upheld and the sovereignty of the states protected. And others say it is far too little.

This is a debate that has always been active in greater or lesser degree and there seems little question another round is coming up. Principle catalytic agent will be the Public Land Law Review Commission. Few AFA members and fewer nonmembers realize as yet the immensity of this Commission which will cut across 180 years of American land history and quite likely will have a bearing on 180 more. In some ways it is reminiscent of a giant iceberg moving quietly and slowly in the sea of public affairs. Only a small white cap glistens in the sunlight above the waters with the great bulk of it submerged. Already this Commission has sent the scholars, and the historians, the barristers, and some conservationists to their libraries. The Commission will most certainly be heard from.

DISPOSAL OF PUBLIC DOMAIN

In view of the attitude of the founding fathers, it might be assumed the great motivating force as regards the Public Domain is "disposal" but it hasn't worked out quite that way. Disposal will doubtless be one of the prime professional responsibilities of BLM for many years although it is interesting to note that revenue from sale of lands in 1966 was only $2,348,262 compared with the Big Three income producers with receipts of $248 million from mineral leasing on the outer continental shelf, $125 million from mineral leasing on other lands, and $47½ million from timber sales. Then too, three western forestry Deans who visited AFA's office recently reported that many small farmers, ranchers and other users will resist any large scale disposal of the Public Domain. This was further borne out by a recent report by BLM Director Boyd L. Rasmussen to the Senate subcommittee on Public Lands. He reported that a rumor in New Mexico to the effect that BLM was embarking on a large scale disposal program brought a strong objection from the Southeastern New Mexico Grazing Association.

In his initial reports to both the Senate and House committees, Director Rasmussen laid out his proposed classification work under the Multiple Use Act with precision and clarity. So far BLM has classified 2,500,000 acres for multiple use management and more than 900,000 acres are classified for disposal. By the end of the current year BLM will have processed 50 million acres and has published proposals on 12,500,000 acres. Most of this work is in 11 western states where BLM administers 175 million acres. In other words, these are lands that will be retained by the government where grazing, recreation, water, wildlife, wilderness, timberland management, mining and other uses will be managed similarly to the national forests. And while the recent predominantly Republican western Governors' Conference in July resoluted urging that this classification be halted, the temper of westerners generally would indicate a rising groundswell of opinion favoring retention by BLM of certain choice lands where the management function might more properly rest under the government arm—plus millions of submarginal, brittle acres facing increasing desiccation from past overuse. One appalling example is the four-million acre Rio Puerco area of New Mexico where 16 communities have become ghost towns and where sheet and gully erosion have taken over former grasslands.

CHANGE IN PUBLIC ATTITUDE

That there has been a big change in the public's attitude regarding the Public Domain appears likely and this attitude, as combined with the work of the Public Land Law Review Commission, will almost certainly catapult the BLM into the public eye and a permanent place in the land management sun. In view of these developments, conservationists are keenly interested in the progress of Director Rasmussen, the third Director to hold the post under the incumbent Administration. People everywhere are asking, "How is Mr. Rasmussen getting along?" after his first full year at the helm.

First let it be noted that BLM has had some extremely able men in the chair Mr. Rasmussen now occupies. Carl Landstrom was and is a first rate lawyer and student of the Public Domain. Charles Stoddard, with his far-ranging mind and idealist precepts, must be credited with envisioning the classification of the Public Domain and seeing it under multiple use. Few who recall having heard him outline the entire project chapter and verse, without so much as a note, will soon forget it. But it is no reflection on his predecessors, to state that Rasmussen can be properly termed a true managerial professional. In coming up through the management "chairs" in the Forest Service he gained a deserved reputation for administrative ability and toughness. He also has imagination, the writer learned. And he may be the right man at the right time in the history of BLM affairs.

"How are you getting along?" I asked him.

"This is the most challenging job I have ever tackled" he replied. "My first year I divided my time into three parts: one third for staff work here; one third for work with BLM field people; and one third for work with public land users, people in Congress, and conservationsts. And I want to say right here I am not sure that conservationists have always given BLM the support they should. Thus I want to work with all of you as closely as I can."

"How are you getting along with Mr. Udall?"

"I'm getting along with Mr. Udall just fine. He's given me his full support and it's greatly appreciated. He's very accessible and so is Assistant Secretary Anderson. Both are positive in their thinking and believe me, that helps. But this cooperation has to be a two-way street, you know. We're making sure that reports topside and to Congress are made on time and are properly executed. With the Public Land Law Review Commission on the job this is a time for good performance, exactness, and laying all facts right on the line when asked for. We are also working out cooperative agreements and good liaison arrangements with other agencies in Interior. I feel we should be brought into all discussions where BLM lands are involved in any way."

"What is your impression of your State Directors, District Managers and field men?"

"They are great. They are dedicated, professional people. I tell them I am going to stay on this job and that they will too. I've upgraded some of our field positions and I hope to build a better professional career ladder for the Bureau. There will be no bypassing of BLM unit heads. The word will go to the man in charge down the ladder—and vice versa. You people in AFA know about some of the fine work these men have done. I want to give them stability. I want to give them the feeling they can go right to [the] top positions when they perform well. Incidentally, we have sent Archie Craft to take charge in Portland, Oregon, and we are all pleased by the good reception he has received."

"He's a professional," I said.

"Yes, he's a professional—and a good one—as good a man as we have." Rasmussen replied.

"But there *are* problems?"

PROBLEMS

"Yes, there are problems. We're spread very thin. There are only 3400 employees in BLM who are responsible for management of one-half billion acres of public lands—nearly 60 percent of the public lands in America. Then too, we are faced by many diverse and complex laws. For example, there are four different laws under which we sell land—all complicated. Take leases for gas and oil. Under the law, leases have to be paid in full on the exact date due or the lease lapses. One day late, and the lease is lost. Our performance is curtailed by many laws much more so than is the case in the Forest Service. And most of these laws are of immense complexity. That's another reason for giving both the Congress and the Public Land Law Review Commission the best service possible.

"Don't think I'm not going to uphold these laws as they are written to the best of my ability, complicated or not. I intend to manage the Public Domain lands and so do our people. But in view of the complications, we sometimes have a tendency to theorize, temporize, or risk turning ourselves into barracks room lawyers. And our job should be management.

"Don't get me wrong. There's a great potential here for good performance and management. I'm convinced of that. In some ways I am more intrigued by the unknowns on and under the Public Domain than the knowns.

"What do I mean? Well, former Congressman French, of Idaho, actually said it first. Back in 1933, he said, 'As I see it . . . the astounding value of the public lands lies in the uses that have been overlooked.' He had reference to BLM lands of value as watersheds, for control of streamflow, for natural storage, for forest uses, and regulators for climatic conditions. Things like that. And he did not even mention such things as new uses for minerals yet unheard of plus proper management of surface values. Nor the uses of the desert. I am convinced more people are going to both live and play in the desert in the coming years. In telling the Sierra Club that these unreserved public lands are coming into their own I described the five

desert regions on the Public Domain that are fragile, yes, but also primitive, vast, alive, alluring and challenging. And people can meet the desert on its terms. There's solitude there and each desert is different.

"The Joshua tree could almost be the symbol of the Mojave desert, patiently drawing moisture from the soil over centuries of life. In California, along the transition zone between the Sierras and the Mojave desert, this strange yucca is called the 'candle of the gods.'

"And you should see the rockhounds that go into these areas right now. It's fabulous.

"We are well aware, of course, that one of the problems in this classifying process is that of anticipating human needs. We've got to have sufficient flexibility about this. We haven't any right to decide on today's knowledge what our classification might be by the year 2012. There is sometimes a strong temptation to draw general conclusions from specific instances but no true professional has any right to yield to it. That's one reason why I am inclined to believe there will not be any sudden, wholesale disposal of Public Lands although we will need to *offer* land that is needed for development of the West—maybe as much as 2¼ million acres by 1973."

Conservationists who are cheering Rasmussen's interest in recreation and wildlife values on the Public Domain also note that his interest in management of commercial uses, and particularly new management tools, is no less keen. Obtaining the services of Gus Hormay, California grazing research expert, to experiment with his "Rest-Rotation" system particularly delighted Rasmussen. The helicopter "hoversight" surveying work pioneered by BLM experts in Alaska was also described with gusto by Rasmussen who has particularly kind words for Research Chief Jerry R. Harris. In brief, he is beating the drums for his people with vigor. BLM morale is on the upgrade.

Speaking of the Forest Service, why two multiple use agencies in the government—BLM and the Forest Service?

"No comment" replied Rasmussen.

After a year on the job, who would he rather work for—the BLM or the Forest Service?

"No comment," the Director replied.

What are the prospects for uniform and realistic grazing fees?

"Our range cost study is now completed and it will be used as a basis to set up a uniform system. By this I mean the system for computing fees will be uniform but it doesn't mean fees will be the same on BLM and Forest Service lands."

UNIFORM TIMBER SALES

What are the prospects for uniform timber sale procedures?

"Here again we do not say they can be exactly uniform but they can certainly be similar. For example, our allowable cut is stated in terms of short logs while the Forest Service cut is based on long logs. Take O. and C. lands in Oregon. They are highly productive and in the lowlands. The national forests, on the other hand, are on the higher elevations. Sometime this fall we will have something ready in the way of a more uniform timber appraisal. Then we will have a year to discuss it with forest industry and ultimately to activate it. What we are actually working toward is a uniform system of computing fees."

Are professional schools providing BLM with the type of professionals it requires?

"Our people are getting a good professional education but I do look forward to more education in the humanities. We *do* need a more well-rounded professional. But this is not the fault of the system, in my opinion. It is due to changing times."

What does the Director see in the way of a BLM personnel expansion in view of the changing times?

"I see a modest expansion over a period of time. Right now I'm doing an awful lot of listening. Our aim is to make a professional outfit even more professional. We intend to concentrate on performance and I might add we have no intention of trying to get too far ahead of any direction by the Congress."

Thus the quest of Boyd L. Rasmussen and his BLM for a permanent place in the land management sun. Conservationists wish him well. Perhaps it is an indication of changing times and a mellowing of the conservation mood. At any rate, the recent movement of key Forest Service professionals to Interior has provoked no such hullabaloo as greeted "Greeleyism" back in the flaming twenties. That was the movement, with Forest Service Chief Greeley's encouragement, of professionals to the ranks of forest industry. It was his belief the industry needed them more than the government did. But no charges of "Udallism" have accompanied the exodus of Forest Service men to Interior. To the contrary. The truth is conservationists today are once again giving top priority to the needs of land above all other considerations.

And in the case of Rasmussen they tend to agree a good professional has been placed where he is needed most, exactly at the right time.

UNITED NATIONS ACTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Monday of this week the distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, renewed his call for vigorous U.S. efforts to seek United Nations consideration of the war in Vietnam. I join the many Senators who have voiced support for Senator MANSFIELD's suggestion.

Despite its critics, the United Nations has proved its effectiveness in restoring peace. In the recent Arab-Israel war, for example, the United Nations provided the forum which made a ceasefire possible. The United Nation's successful formulation of ceasefire resolutions gave the Arab nations a face-saving way to surrender rather than fighting on in a hopeless, destructive struggle which would have only cost more lives and made permanent peace less likely. The United Nations action also gave the Soviet Union a way to avoid direct intervention in the war, which would have escalated that conflict to an East-West nuclear confrontation.

In fact, the United Nations was, in the Middle East war, and is today, in the war in Vietnam, the only means immediately available for all nations to meet in peaceful debate in search of a peace, even as the war rages on.

Why not seek to repeat this successful United Nations peacemaking role in Vietnam? Why not have all parties to the conflict to the forum of the United Nations to debate the war and seek solutions to it? Is it not possible that the United Nations could provide in Vietnam, as it has in the Middle East, a peace formula which national involvement in the war—on all sides—now makes impossible among the belligerents themselves?

I think we must try every avenue for peace in Vietnam. We should use the United Nations.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY URBAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Metropolitan Office of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations of Cornell University is beginning an urban affairs program with some 35 unions in the metropolitan New York area. I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of this program and the members of the Cornell-Union Urban Affairs Council be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[A press release from the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Aug. 7, 1967]

NEW YORK CITY.—The Ford Foundation and the federal government have provided more than $200,000 for a program designed to give union members an inside look at the problems of urban growth facing metropolitan New York.

The three-year pilot program to be conducted by the metropolitan office of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University and over 30 unions in the metropolitan area was announced today at the school's Metropolitan District Office at 7 East 43rd Street.

The program, expected to be the prototype for similar projects in urban areas across the country, will include seminars and courses with union members in such problem areas as air and water pollution, transportation, housing, education, recreation and civil rights.

In addition, selected union members will work for a period of time in public and private agencies in the city so that they may glean first hand experience about what has been done, can be done, and should be done in meeting the problems of urban growth.

The program will enable an Urban Affairs Coordinator to serve full-time with the participating unions so that the unions may be kept better informed of the various decisions and activities that come before governmental bodies in the city and so that action by an individual union or groups of unions on urban problems may be facilitated.

Betty Goetz Lall, Field Director of the program, explained that it approaches the solving of urban problems on two fronts.

"In the first place," she said, "financing of urban programs requires citizen support and obviously the public wants to know how its taxes are being used to improve urban conditions. Secondly, the public not only has to support the programs but in the long run must also express its needs in the designing of programs."

Mrs. Lall said: "one of the most important groups in our cities is organized labor. Since union members are concentrated in cities, they have a vital stake in urban life. Union members and their families are often the victims of city deterioration, poor housing conditions, inadequate public transportation to jobs and lack of space for recreation."

The program is supported by a three year $175,000 grant from the Ford Foundation and a one year $40,000 grant from the Federal Government under Title I of the Higher Education Act. In addition to allocation of funds by the ILR School, contributions of several thousand dollars have been pledged by those unions deciding to participate in the program.

The Urban Affairs Program will include special courses on government, city politics, finances, special urban problems and programs of the Federal and State Government operating in the city.

Educational materials in the form of pamphlets and articles will also be produced and, finally, there will be a training program to enable union members to become more familiar with where to go and whom to see when specific urban problems arise among their members.

The program is one of a number of services performed by the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, which was

founded in 1944 to promote better relations among labor, business and community groups.

The Union-Cornell Urban Affairs Program will be guided by a council composed of union leaders and members of Cornell University's faculty. The following is a list of the persons and their affiliations who compose the Council. Several other unions and their leaders are expected to be added in the near future. The program has been developed with the cooperation of the New York City Central Labor Council.

MEMBERS OF THE CORNELL-UNION URBAN AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Leaders from participating unions

Betty Bentz, Secretary-Treasurer, Hotel, Motel and Club Employees Union, Local 6.

Morris Biller, President, Manhattan-Bronx Postal Union.

Peter Brennan, President, Building and Construction Trades Council.

Herschel Chanin, Co-Manager, Cap Makers Union, Local 2.

William Colavito, President, International Association of Bridge Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers, Local 455.

Leon Davis, President, Drug and Hospital Employees Union, Local 1199.

Thomas DeLorenzo, Assistant Regional Director, International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace, Agricultural and Implement Workers of America, Region 9A.

Fileno DeNovellis, Manager, United Shoe Workers of America, Joint Council No. 13.

Al DeProspo, President, Amalgamated Meatcutters, Local 400.

Charles Fay, President, International Union of Electrical Workers, Local 485.

Barry Feinstein, President, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 237.

Charles Feinstein, Director, Health & Welfare Fund, International Leather Workers.

Thomas Flavell, Manager, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Local 169.

Charles J. Garrahan, Manager, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, NY Joint Board of Skirt, Leisurewear, Robe, Glove and Rainwear Workers.

Patrick Gleeson, President, Retail Food Clerks, Local 1500.

Victor Gotbaum, Executive Director, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, District 37.

Louis Hollander, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, N.Y. Joint Board.

Sam Kovenetsky, President, Retail, Wholesale Department Store Workers Union, Local 1–S.

Sam Meyers, President, United Automobile Workers, Local 259.

William Michelson, Executive Vice-President, Retail, Wholesale Department Store Workers Union, District 65.

George Miller, Vice-President, Communication Workers of America.

Edward Panarello, Regional Director, Retail Clerks, Council 20.

Albert Perry, President, Building Services Employees International Union, Local 32–J.

Bertram Powers, President, International Typographical Union, Local 6.

Harold Pryor, Chairman, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, LIRR.

Michael Sampson, Business Manager, Utility Workers Union of America, Local 1–2.

Howard D. Samuel, Vice-President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Anthony Scotto, President, International Longshoreman's Association, Local 1814.

Al Shanker, President, United Federation of Teachers, Local 2.

Thomas Shortman, President, Building Services Employees International Union, Local 32–B.

Irving Stern, Organization Director, Meatcutters & Retail Food Stores, Local 342.

Edward Swayduck, President, International Typographical Union, Amalgamated Lithographers, Local 1.

Gus Tyler, Assistant President, International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

Ellis Van Riper, Secretary-Treasurer, Transport Workers Union, Local 100.

Members from the faculty of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University

Alice Cook, Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations.

Lois Gray, Director of the Metropolitan Office.

Betty Goetz Lall, Field Director of the Urban Affairs Program.

Al Nash, Labor Program Coordinator.

Eric Polisar, Associate Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations.

Robert Risley, Dean of Extension.

Barbara Wertheimer, Labor Program Specialist.

RISING CRIME RATE RECALLS IKE'S COURT AGE PROPOSAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial by Wendell Reynolds, which appeared in the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser on August 21, 1967, the editorial being titled "Rising Crime Rate Recalls Ike's Court Age Proposal."

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

RISING CRIME RATE RECALLS IKE'S COURT AGE PROPOSAL

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower must feel twinges of conscience about the effects of the political considerations that influenced him to appoint Earl Warren as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice had gained his reputation as Governor of California rather than as a distinguished constitutional lawyer before his appointment placed him at the head of the most important judicial body in the nation.

In recent years he has led the liberal majority of the court into hitherto unrecognized areas of constitutional rights for vicious criminals in the face of the most serious crime wave in the nation's history.

In view of this, it is no wonder that the former President has come forward with suggestions for fixing a definite term for court members and for establishing an age above which they cannot serve.

As outlined in a Reader's Digest article some time ago, the plan called for a tenure of no more than 20 years for all justices of federal courts. Those who reach the age of 72 before completing their term would be retired on full salary for life.

The article pointed out that besides the infirmities that come with age, removal of justices from the maincurrents and the new problems of life tends to cause inflexibility of opinions and actions.

A great many critics of the Supreme Court, including trial judges and other distinguished members of the bar, would probably agree with former President Eisenhower's proposal.

The Chief Justice was born on March 19, 1891, and is now 76 years old. Justice Black, who was born in 1886, has participated with the majority in some of the split decisions that have extended previously unrecognized rights to criminals.

Justice Douglas, another militant liberal who has been criticized perhaps more than the others because of his divorces and marriages to women young enough to be his granddaughters, was born in 1898. He is not yet 70 but has served for 28 years.

But age is not the only factor involved in the unprecedented decisions of the court. Justice Abe Fortas, who was appointed by President Johnson, was born in 1910, and he also was among the five who set up all but impossible restrictions on the questioning of prisoners.

The Eisenhower proposal for limits on age and tenure might help solve some of the difficulties arising from radical Supreme Court decisions, but Presidents themselves could help by using a little more mature judgment in their selection of justices.

Congress also could help by grappling more courageously with the probems and submitting constitutional amendments. There is urgent need at this time for an amendment giving police reasonable latitude in questioning prisoners, but so far Congress has stood aside while court decisions applied retroactively have allowed vicious murderers and other violent criminals to go free.

Possibly the next best action would be adapting the age and tenure limits proposed by former President Eisenhower.

CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS IN ARKANSAS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have received from the Little Rock District, Corps of Engineers, fiscal information on civil works projects in Arkansas. Projects listed include only those upon which funds have been expended in fiscal year 1961 and subsequent years. The information also shows total expenditures for any such projects started prior to fiscal year 1961, but which received continuing funding thereafter; and it shows projected expenditures for fiscal year 1968.

It is interesting to note that the total of expenditures for all these projects is approximately $1.3 billion—which amount is less than the current cost of 3 weeks of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the data from the Corps of Engineers be printed in the RECORD.

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

FISCAL INFORMATION ON CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS IN ARKANSAS

SUMMARY SHEET

Category	Expenditures prior to fiscal year 1961	Expenditures, fiscal year 1961 through fiscal year 1967	Expenditures projected for fiscal year 1968	Total
Construction, general	$463,091,241	$563,700,705	$121,570,582	$1,148,362,528
Operation and maintenance, general	53,387,450	78,703,716	8,494,400	140,585,566
General investigations	147,300	1,916,068	611,000	2,674,368
Total	516,625,991	644,320,489	130,675,982	1,291,622,462

FISCAL INFORMATION ON CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS IN ARKANSAS—Continued

CONSTRUCTION—GENERAL

Project name	Status of project	Expenditures prior to fiscal year 1961	Expenditures, fiscal year 1961 through fiscal year 1967	Expenditures projected for fiscal year 1968	Total	Year of first expenditure if subsequent to fiscal year 1961	Remarks
DeQueen Reservoir (Sevier County)	Under construction	0	$1,806,000	$1,000,000	$2,806,000	1963	
Dierks Reservoir (Howard County)	do	0	656,000	700,000	1,356,000	1963	
Gillham Reservoir (Howard and Polk Counties)	do	$38,000	5,247,000	1,100,000	6,385,000		
Lower White River—Augusta to Clarendon (Woodruff, Prairie, and Monroe Counties).	Continuing	1,429,830	21,663	0	1,451,493		
Helena Harbor (Phillips County)	Complete	3,844	124,807	0	128,651		
White River backwater levee (Phillips, Desha, and Monroe Counties).	do	8,554,539	3,010,190	0	11,564,729		
Big Slough and Mayo Ditch (Green and Clay Counties)	do	107,426	858,003	0	965,429		
Osceola Harbor (Mississippi County)	Continuing	0	12,818	6,682	19,500	1962	
St. Francis River and tributaries (Clay, Green, Craighead, Poinsett, Cross, Mississippi, St. Francis, Lee, and Crittenden Counties).	do	19,565,613	14,783,805	1,558,700	35,908,118		
Little River drainage (Mississippi and Poinsett Counties)	do	71,502	3,840,278	435,900	4,347,680		
Mississippi River levees (Mississippi, Crittenden, Lee, Phillips, Monroe, Desha, St. Francis, and Cross Counties).	do	33,176,184	3,583,275	567,000	37,326,459		
Mississippi River channel improvement (Mississippi, Crittenden, Lee, Phillips, Arkansas, and Desha Counties).	do	86,213,453	38,149,420	6,564,700	130,927,573		
Red River, Ark. (Lafayette, Miller, Hempstead, and Little River Counties).	do	0	79,000	0	79,000		
Harding drain (Jefferson County)	do	0	15,000	0	15,000		
Arkansas River levees, North Bank (Arkansas, Jefferson, Pulaski, Lonoke, and Prairie Counties).	do	3,266,000	995,000	0	4,261,000		
Arkansas River Levees, South Bank (Desha, Lincoln, Jefferson, Drew, Ashley, and Chicot Counties).	do	10,583,000	1,689,000	149,000	12,421,000		
DeGray Dam and Reservoir (Montgomery, Clark, Hot Spring, Dalls, and Calhoun Counties).	do	281,000	26,446,000	8,414,000	35,141,000		
Local protection, Pine Bluff (Jefferson County)	Complete	171,000	2,000	0	173,000		
Narrows Reservoir, 3d generating unit (Pike, Clark, Nevada, Ouachita, Calhoun, and Bradley Counties).	Continuing	0	643,000	680,000	1,323,000		
Mississippi River levees (Desha, Chicot, Drew, and Ashley Counties).	do	11,175,000	2,053,000	338,000	13,566,000		
Channel improvement, revetment (Desha, Chicot, Drew, and Ashley Counties).	do	39,427,000	22,495,000	3,165,000	65,087,000		
Bouef and Macon River Basin (Lincoln, Desha, Chicot, and Ashley Counties).	do	5,574,000	2,653,000	279,000	8,506,000		
Red River backwater (various)	do	0	937,000	639,000	1,576,000		
Ouachita and Black River navigation (Union, Bradley, Ashley, Calhoun, and Ouachita Counties).	do	0	8,012,000	3,952,000	11,964,000		
McKinney Bayou (Miller County)	Complete	576,700	463,000	0	1,039,700		Expenditures fiscal year 1961 through fiscal year 1967 includes $18,700 contributed funds.
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir (Lafayette and Hempstead Counties).	do	136,100	3,400	600	140,100		Completed except for additional recreational facilities.
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam (Miller, Lafayette, and Hempstead Counties).	Continuing	404,500	118,900	30,000	553,400		
Garland City (Miller and Lafayette Counties)	do	0	836,600	110,000	946,600		
Maniece Bayou (Lafayette County)	do	0	266,900	470,000	736,900	1962	
Bank stabilization (Crawford, Sebastian, Johnson, Yell, Pope, Conway, Faulkner, Perry, Pulaski, and Jefferson Counties).	do	58,057,571	45,217,324	5,037,000	108,311,895		
Navigation locks and dams (Desha, Arkansas, Lincoln, Jefferson, Pulaski, Perry, Faulkner, Conway, Pope, Yell, Sebastian, and Crawford Counties).	Under construction	0	205,655,711	69,730,000	275,385,711	1962	Expenditures, fiscal year 1961 through fiscal year 1967 includes $100,897 contributed funds.
Dardanelle lock and dam (Yell, Logan, Johnson, Pope, and Franklin Counties).	do	7,965,158	58,121,114	3,500,000	69,586,272		
Ozark lock and dam (Franklin, Crawford, and Sebastian Counties).	do	0	23,551,513	12,000,000	35,551,513	1962	
Clarksville (Johnson County)	Complete	30,628	242,389	0	273,017		
West of Morrilton, Arkansas River, Ark. (Pope and Conway Counties).	do	1,194,657	1,269,959	0	2,464,616		
South Bank Arkansas River, Tucker Lake, Ark. (Jefferson County).	do	378,126	409,115	0	787,241		
Holla Bend Bottom, Arkansas River, Ark. (Pope County)	Inactive—general design memorandum completed.	0	22,268	0	22,268	1962	5-year limitation issued Oct. 23, 1962.
South Bank Arkansas River, head of Fourche Island to Pennington Bayou, Ark. (Pulaski County).	Complete	1,372,206	32,646	0	1,404,852		
Petit Jean River, Ark. (Yell County)	do	0	104,448	0	104,448		
Grand Prairie, Ark. (Lonoke, Prairie, and Arkansas Counties)	Planning	19,000	1,000	0	20,000		Advance engineering and design.
Bayou Bartholemew, Ark. (Jefferson, Lincoln, Drew, and Ashley Counties).	do	24,000	37,000	0	61,000		Do.
Benton, Ark. (Saline, Grant, Dallas, Cleveland, Drew, Bradley, and Ashley Counties).	do	5,000	63,000	0	68,000		Do.
Lake Chicot at Town Lake (Chicot County)	do	0	54,000	0	54,000		Do.
Blakely Mountain Reservoir (Montgomery, Garland, Hot Spring, Clark, Dallas, Ouachita, Bradley, Union, and Ashley Counties).	Continuing	31,342,000	583,000	125,000	32,050,000		Complete except for additional recreational facilities.
Narrows Reservoir (Pike, Clark, Nevada, Ouachita, Calhoun, and Bradley Counties).	do	12,980,000	420,000	60,000	13,460,000		Do.
Engineering studies (various)	do	31,000	73,000	13,000	117,000		
Red River navigation and bank stabilization: Overton-Red River Waterway (Hempstead, Miller, and Lafayette Counties).	Complete	0	85,900	0	85,900	1966	Advance engineering and design.
Pine Mountain (Crawford County)	Continuing	0	58,399	200,000	258,399	1967	Do.
Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry levee districts (Jackson and Woodruff Counties).	do	0	644,877	0	644,877	1964	5-year limitation issued Apr. 21, 1966.
Blue Mountain (Yell, Logan, and Conway Counties)	do	4,780,056	131,988	59,000	4,971,044		Complete except for additional recreational facilities.
Bull Shoals (Baxter, Marion, and Boone Counties)	do	77,150,614	9,245,595	330,000	86,726,209		Do.
Greers Ferry (Cleburne and Van Buren Counties)	do	11,979,510	35,166,828	220,000	47,366,338		Do.
Nimrod (Perry and Yell Counties)	do	3,774,387	112,630	49,000	3,936,017		Do.
Beaver (Carroll, Benton, and Washington Counties)	do	2,635,543	42,299,953	0	44,935,496		Do.
Norfolk (Baxter County)	do	28,617,094	295,989	88,000	29,001,083		Do.
Total		463,091,241	563,700,705	121,570,582	1,148,362,528		

FISCAL INFORMATION ON CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS IN ARKANSAS—Continued

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—GENERAL

Project name	Status of project	Expenditures prior to fiscal year 1961	Expenditures, fiscal year 1961 through fiscal year 1967	Expenditures projected for fiscal year 1968	Total	Year of first expenditure if subsequent to fiscal year 1961	Remarks
Millwood Reservoir (Little River and Hempstead Counties)	In operation	$516,000	$43,332,000	$100,000	$43,948,000		
Helena Harbor (Phillips Coutny)	do	0	0	67,900	67,900		
White River (Woodruff, Prairie, Monroe, and Phillips Counties).	Continuing	1,360,579	968,608	175,200	2,504,387		
Ten Mile Bayou, stream clearance (Crittenden County)	Complete	0	48,344	0	48,344		
Blakely Mountain Dam and Reservoir (Garland, Montgomery, Hot Spring, Clark, Dallas, Ouachita, Bradley, Union, and Ashley Counties).	In operation	1,310,000	2,458,000	439,000	4,207,000		
Narrows Dam and Reservoir (Pike, Clark, Nevada, Ouachita, Calhoun, and Bradley Counties).	do	1,881,000	1,874,000	336,000	4,091,000		
Arkansas River levees, North Bank (Arkansas, Jefferson, Pulaski, and Prairie Counties).	Continuing	245,000	217,000	16,000	478,000		
Arkansas River levees, South Bank (Desha, Lincoln, Jefferson, Drew, Ashley, and Chicot Counties).	do	1,763,000	1,236,000	415,000	3,414,000		
Mississippi River levees (Desha, Chicot, Drew, and Ashley Counties).	do	3,937,000	462,000	103,000	4,502,000		
Channel improvement, revetments, dikes, and dredging (Desha, Chicot, Drew, and Ashley Counties).	do	29,443,000	9,847,000	2,421,000	41,711,000		
Ouachita and Black River locks and dams (various)	do	4,526,000	+1,765,000	287,000	6,578,000		
Repair and rehabilitation (various)	do	0	227,000	3,000	230,000		
Removing sunken vessels (various)	do	42,000	44,000	0	86,000		
Mapping (various)	do	167,000	225,000	26,000	418,000		
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir (Lafayette and Hempstead Counties)	do	6,300	14,300	2,300	22,900		
Miller County Levee District No. 2 (Miller County)	Complete	0	37,300	0	37,300		
Red River Levee District No. 1 (Lafayette County)	do	0	33,900	0	33,900		
Bank stabilization (Desha, Arkansas, Lincoln, Jefferson, Pulaski, Perry, Faulkner, Conway, Pope, Yell, Sebastian, and Crawford Counties).	Continuing	415,691	4,686,582	550,000	5,652,273		
Navigation locks and dams, Arkansas River (various)	do	0	95,094	460,000	555,094	1962	
Dardanelle Reservoir (Yell, Logan, Johnson, Pope, and Franklin Counties).	do	0	1,108,111	575,000	1,683,111	1965	
Blue Mountain Reservoir (Yell, Logan, and Conway Counties).	In operation	769,894	794,451	155,000	1,719,345		
Bull Shoals Reservoir (Baxter, Marion, and Boone Counties)	do	2,523,282	3,579,680	648,000	6,750,962		
Greers Ferry Reservoir (Cleburne and Van Buren Counties)	do	0	1,617,892	625,000	2,242,892	1963	
Nimrod Reservoir (Perry and Yell Counties)	do	982,262	790,897	165,000	1,938,159		
Beaver Reservoir (Carroll, Benton, and Washington Counties)	do	0	698,217	440,000	1,138,217	1965	
Norfork Reservoir (Baxter County)	do	3,499,442	2,543,340	485,000	6,527,782		
Total		53,387,450	78,703,716	8,494,400	140,585,566		
Helena, Ark., F.C. (Phillips County)	Complete		$2,479	0	$2,479	1967	
White River, navigation (Woodruff, Prairie, Monroe, Arkansas, and Phillips Counties).	Continuing		20,245	(1)	20,245	1962	
Camden, Arkansas, flood plain management (Ouachita, Calhoun, and Nevada Counties).	do		0	$20,000	20,000		Flood plain studies.
Bayou Meto (Lonoke, Jefferson, Arkansas, Pulaski, and Prairie Counties).	do		15,000	20,000	35,000		Survey report.
Engineering studies and surveys (various)	do		1,801,444	532,900	2,334,344		
Bayou Dorcheat (Columbia, Nevada, and Lafayette Counties)	Complete	$23,300	13,200	0	36,500		
Red River comprehensive review (Miller, Lafayette, Columbia, Hempstead, Nevada, Little River, Sevier, Howard, and Polk Counties).	Continuing		35,700	8,100	43,800		
Terre Noire Creek (Clark County)	do	124,000	28,000	30,000	182,000		
Total		147,300	1,916,068	611,000	2,674,368		

[1] Funds allotted to date have been expended.

ROANE COUNTY COURT ENDORSES S. 1236

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, last Saturday, August 26, 1967, the Roane County Court endorsed my revenue-sharing bill, S. 1236, to return part of the Federal income to the Sates without States attached.

I am very pleased at the support which has developed in Tennessee for revenue sharing. The Hawkins County Court and the Van Buren County Court along with all the Republican members of both houses of the Tennessee General Assembly have voiced backing for this bill.

The fiscal problem for our State and local governments grows more acute with each passing day and month. The responsibilities and demands placed upon local officials grow constantly. The recent strife in our major cities highlights the need for moneys; yet, specific grants-in-aid do not always meet the need. Local officials who are near the problem understand the source and solution to the problems far better than those of us in Washington who are not at the root of the problem on a day-by-day basis.

I commend the Roane County Court, Judge Sterling Roberts, and County Attorney Bill Newcomb for their efforts in behalf of tax sharing. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Senator Howard H. Baker of Tennessee introduced into the United States Senate on the 9th day of March, 1967, Senate Bill Number 1236 which provides among other things that the Federal Government is to return certain portion of revenue collected by the Federal Government to the State and local governments for their own use without any restrictions by the Federal Government on said funds, and

Whereas, this would be a tremendous assistance to the State and local government and a more economical method of controlling funds, and

Whereas, it is the desire of the Quarterly County Court for Roane County, Tennessee, to give its full support to said Senate Bill, and

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Quarterly County Court for Roane County, Tennessee, meeting at an adjourned session on the 26th day of August, 1967, that the Quarterly County Court for Roane County, Tennessee, endorses Senate Bill Number 1236, commends Senator Howard H. Baker for its introduction and urges its immediate passage.

Upon motion of Squire Thomas Guettner, seconded by Squire Charles Wilson, the following Squires voted for the resolution: Unanimous

The following Squires voted No: None.

The following Squires passed: None.

Thereupon the County Judge announced that said resolution had received the constitutional majority and had been adopted, and ordered the same spread of record.

Approved:

STERLING ROBERTS,
County Judge.

Adopted:

JAMES C. EASTER,
Clerk.

Attest:

JAMES C. EASTER,
Clerk.

OPPORTUNITIES, INC. AND OEO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, not long ago I received a letter from Mr. Francis Mitchell, director of Opportunities, Inc. of Great Falls, Mont. Mr. Mitchell addressed himself thoughtfully and thoroughly to a matter soon to be debated by this body: I am referring to legislation to extend the life of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In the interest of assuring informed discussion on this subject by Members

of the Senate, I should like to share with Senators some of the major points made in Mr. Mitchell's letter.

Mr. Mitchell talks about Community Action. We know that OEO's Community Action Division is responsible for stimulating such programs as Headstart for preschool children; Upward Bound a precollege program for talented but underprivileged teenagers; the Job Corps for unskilled and unemployed teenage men and women; legal services for the exploited poor; and other programs essentially conceived by OEO and encouraged at the local level. But Mr. Mitchell reminds us that Community Action is even more than this. He said:

I feel that a vital part of success in Community Action is the stimulation and coordination of *non-Federally* related activities to assure the community comprehensiveness in the poverty attack. We are involved in the areas of Neighborhood Improvement, preventive health care, student tutoring, and the stimulation of other agencies activities, stimulating a coordinated youth plan among the numerous youth-serving groups, and providing community information about local and Federal resources. Although these activities are not directly related to a Federally funded project, they are possible only because of the administrative framework and staff provided through the OEO administration grant. We consider this type of stimulation, coordination, and community support as products of a good Community Action Program. Therefore, when Congress views administrative costs of a local Community Action Agency, it ought to keep in mind that one of the important jobs Community Action Agencies have to do is mobilize all segments of a community in the effort. It is not just a matter of administering a Neighborhood Youth Corps or Head Start project.

Mr. President it is this great flexibility that Community Action gives to the OEO which is jeopardized by the ill-conceived suggestions that some OEO functions be "spun-off" to other Federal agencies. Many of these programs are imaginative and still experimental, they belong in OEO where they were begun and under whose aegis they are beginning to show results. As Mr. Mitchell points out:

For Congress to prematurely diminish the role of OEO or restrict the flexibility of Community Action planning and funding in favor of transfer of operations to the "old line" agencies (even with newly established bureaus) is to reject a hopeful and yet unproven innovation (Community Action) for the *stated* intent of these old line agencies to commit the departments and people who have not in the past shown a special interest in the problems of poverty. For example, the Department of Labor says—We are reorienting our thinking and, therefore, should control all Manpower activities—while OEO has hardly been given the time to begin to prove its commitment and ability to innovate the Manpower area. Stating it more simply, let the old line agencies prove their ability to carry out their intent at the local level before OEO and Community Action are abandoned or weakened.

OEO has shown a remarkable responsiveness to the needs of a local community. In his letter, Mr. Mitchell reminded me of the willingness of OEO officials to grapple with problems which called for unique and different approaches:

As you also know, you have not been bothered by requests from us to facilitate funding through OEO. You in Congress said that we will set up OEO to provide the funds and to respond to local needs. In our experience this is exactly what OEO has done and it has not required costly rewriting or frustrating bickering and calls for legislative assistance.

Finally, Mr. Mitchell offered some interesting comments on expeditious OEO practices in handling project applications. He had the highest praise for the OEO procedure of accepting for consideration proposals which required certain changes instead of returning them for frustrating and time-consuming rewriting and resubmission. The OEO practice, he explained, is to negotiate minor changes and include them as conditions to the approval of a grant.

By direct and indirect experience with application to such agencies as the Department of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare I have seen project proposals returned for complete rewriting contrasted to the OEO practice of negotiating minor changes and including them as conditions to a grant. The OEO practice, therefore, eliminates hours and hours of paper work, wasted postage, and wasted man hours on the local and Federal levels. Representatives of OEO come in with the apparent attitude of "How can we help you make your program better?"

Mr. President, we can help make the antipoverty program even better than it is by strengthening and continuing the Office of Economic Opportunity.

FAULTY X-RAYS HELD FATAL TO THOUSANDS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by J. V. Reistrup, Washington Post staff writer, which appeared in the August 29, 1967, edition of that newspaper, entitled "Faulty X-Rays Held Fatal to Thousands."

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

FAULTY X-RAYS HELD FATAL TO THOUSANDS

(By J. V. Reistrup)

As many as 29,000 people may die each year in the United States as a result of exposure to radiation for medical and dental diagnosis, an expert in radiation estimated yesterday.

The estimate was made before the Senate Commerce Committee by Karl Z. Morgan, director of the health physics division of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee. Morgan cited a range of possible radiation fatalities running from 3500 to the upper limit of 29,000.

He used a chart showing that between 2000 and 26,000 of the deaths could be attributed to genetic mutation—damage to the genes of parents that results in offspring who die; 3500 to 1100 to leukemia; between 50 and 400 to thyroid tumors from dental X-rays; between 5 and 40 to thyroid tumors from mass chest X-rays; between 170 and 550 to bone tumors and 1000 to general life-shortening effects.

Morgan noted that he made no estimates for damage short of death or for deaths from other causes than those listed.

Morgan reached both the upper and lower estimates of death on the basis of published scientific literature.

"I would like to emphasize that in some cases these numbers are little better than guesses" and may be high or low, he testified.

The Committee opened three days of hearings yesterday on a bill authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to step up research and set limits for radiation standards.

Morgan supported the bill and took the admittedly risky step of putting numbers on the estimated fatalities in order to strengthen his argument that the largest and most neglected source of hazard from ionizing radiation is from diagnostic equipment.

Morgan charged that while such equipment accounted for more than 90 per cent of the population's exposure, the problem has been neglected by standard-setting organizations such as the International Council for Radiation Protection and the National Council for Radiation Protection and Measurement.

As for the interagency Federal Radiation Council chaired by HEW Secretary John W. Gardner, he said, "they have shunted, they have bypassed what I consider to be the principal problem, namely patient exposure."

Morgan argued that if better techniques were adopted and enforced, better X-ray results could be obtained even with as much as a tenfold decrease in * * *.

Morgan backed a Public Health Service recommendation that chest X-rays be limited to only those population groups with a high incidence of tuberculosis, and made these other suggestions to cut diagnostic dosage:

Require the teaching of radiation protection in medical and dental schools.

Require examinations on the subjects for X-ray technicians, physicians and dentists.

Require state inspection of medical X-ray and radioisotope facilities every six months.

Maintain radiation exposure records on each patient.

"Teach the patient not to fear X-radiation but to have a proper respect for it. Give him confidence that the doctor and/or X-ray technician also has this same respect based on education, training and motivation, not based on claims that may not be substantiated.

Another witness, Prof. Russell H. Morgan of John Hopkins University's department of radiology, supported Karl Morgans estimate of a possible tenfold decrease in exposure as "probably a pretty good figure."

He suggested giving the authority to determine standards to the Federal Radiation Council, instead of HEW, but generally favored the bill, under consideration—which was introduced by Sen. E. L. Bartlett (D-Alaska).

"Any radiation that is unnecessary is undesirable," he told the Committee.

A third witness, Director Hanson Blatz of New York City's Office of Radiation Control, warned that "if restraints are not now placed on these hazards, however slight each one may be, we will eventually be faced with much the same situation we now have in the case of air and water pollution, which crept upon us gradually over a period of many years."

He cited one case in which his office found that radium-dial pocket watches, customarily carried "just a few inches from the reproductive organs," showed radiation in excess of permissible limits.

Manufacturers were warned that the watches could no longer be sold in New York City, Blatz said, and his office got complaints that the makers were "dumping them elsewhere."

A NEW COMMUNITY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, our urban future requires more than philosophical concepts about the nature of life in the 21st century. It also requires imaginative ideas about the present.

Yesterday, President Johnson announced an excellent plan that speaks to our current needs.

He proposed building a new community on Federal land in the District of Columbia. He also named a special committee to conduct a survey of surplus Federal

properties across the Nation and "evaluate the prospects for transforming these lands into vital and useful community resources."

The President's plan is both practical and farsighted, because he seeks to combine within one program many important goals. Chief among these are the involvement of the private sector in building our cities, the provision of low-income housing without unnecessary delay, the best use of available land and facilities and the development of a "new towns" program. In this venture, the President deserves our support as well as our praise.

The new community in the District of Columbia will be built on the site of the National Training School for Boys, which is moving to West Virginia. It will be privately financed and have a population of 25,000. The community will include schools, recreational, shopping, and service facilities, and, hopefully, some light industry. In short, it will be a full and self-sustaining community.

A total of 1,500 of its 4,500 dwelling units will be for low-income persons. The fact that the Government will donate the land on which these low-income units will be built makes it possible to keep costs down so that the private builder can make a profit on this venture.

The low-income housing will be available much sooner than under normal conditions, because the Government will use the turnkey approach that permits it to purchase the finished product from the developer without the delay of red-tape.

But perhaps the most hopeful sign is the use of Federal facilities as the basis for a new town's network.

Our urban population is increasing by some 3 million people each year—the equivalent of 12 cities, each with a population of 250,000. We must find some place for our population growth. New cities and new communities are one part of the answer.

Using Federal facilities as a starting point for new towns makes good sense. And bringing private enterprise into this venture is the type of public and private cooperation that is essential to building our urban future.

President Johnson has shown good judgment and acted wisely in proposing this program. He deserves our support and commendation.

FIREARMS CONTROL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on August 24, 1967, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] appeared before the New York City Council to plead articulately and, I believe, most convincingly, for the adoption of an effective gun control ordinance. As a former mayor of the city which has what is probably the best gun control ordinance in the Nation—the city of Philadelphia—I commend Senator KENNEDY for this excellent statement, and I enthusiastically endorse his plea for the adoption of an adequate Federal gun control law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator KENNEDY'S remarks may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY ON FIREARMS CONTROL BEFORE THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL, AUGUST 24, 1967

This summer a wave of violence has engulfed the cities of our nation. In Newark and Detroit alone 76 people have been killed; among these were six law enforcement officers. These Americans black and white, were virtually all killed by firearms in the hands of people who were for the most part unfit to use them.

We know there are underlying causes of riots—just as there are root causes of crime—the despair and poverty, the nights in rat-infested homes and the days without jobs fill empty lives with frustration and fury. But the death and destruction wrought by riots are caused by firearms—too many guns and guns that are too available. Firearms were used to kill children and policemen in dozens of cities this summer. And the fear of guns kept firemen away as flames swept over homes and businesses.

We know that until we act to cure the ills of our society, the seeds of further violence will remain. But if we pass laws to control guns that kill, we can save lives. If we do not pass these laws, we sign the death warrant of more policemen and more children who will be caught in tomorrow's crossfire. It is firearms which turn the streets into battlegrounds; it is guns that change a demonstration into a war.

The riots in Newark and Detroit and elsewhere have made it plain that the basic weapons of those who participate in mass disorder are rifles and shotguns. Yet in Detroit, although there is a law regulating pistols and revolvers, there was no law governing rifles and shotguns. New Jersey has a recent state law which is one of the most stringent in the country, but the rifles and shotguns which kept Newark ablaze were smuggled in from outside the State—purchased legally elsewhere when they could not have been legally acquired in New Jersey. Some 80% of the firearms confiscated in Newark were bought in other States. After the riots, the Treasury Department made a spot check of 56 gun dealers in four states bordering on New Jersey. Those 56 dealers alone had sold some 690 firearms to New Jersey residents in recent months.

So we can deplore the violence—and we must. We can deplore the lawlessness—and we must. But we can act to prevent it, too, by developing a system of gun regulation which keeps deadly weapons out of the hands of those who misuse them.

The case for stronger regulation of the sale of firearms is proven, too, by sheer numbers—every year, thousands of Americans are killed by firearms—17,700 in 1965 alone. There were 5,600 murders, 9,900 suicides, and 2,200 fatal accidents involving firearms. Of the 5,600 murders, 1,690 were committed with rifles or shotguns. In addition, 34,700 aggravated assaults were committed with firearms.

The great majority of these deaths and crimes would not have occurred if firearms had not been readily available. For example, one out of every 20 assaults with a weapon in the United States in 1965 resulted in death. But where firearms were used, almost one out of every five assaults resulted in the death of the victim.

Of the 278 law-enforcement officers who were killed by criminals from 1960 through 1965, 268—96%—were killed by firearms. Of the weapon-users responsible for these deaths, 76 percent had been convicted of crimes before acquiring the murder weapon.

All of these figures, plus this summer's senseless killing in our cities, add up to a need for complementary—federal, state and local—system of strong firearms regulation, which deals with both handguns and rifles and shotguns.

At the federal level, Congress is considering a moderate and careful bill which would help to make local law enforcement more effective. Its provisions, for example, would have had a significant impact in reducing the flow of smuggled arms into Newark. The bill would impose carefully drawn restrictions in three areas:

First, it would regulate mail orders. It would restrict the interstate shipments to manufacturers, dealers, and importers, thus eliminating the present flow of one million inexpensive mail-order weapons annually. Many of these guns go to juveniles, persons with criminal records, and emotionally unstable persons.

Second, it would regulate retail sales of all firearms to youths, the sale of handguns to persons not resident in the State of purchase, and the sale of rifles and shotguns to nonresidents where the law of their own state would also prohibit the sale. All of these provisions would help the States to enforce their own firearms regulations.

Third, it would sharply curtail the importation of foreign military surplus weapons, which account for the bulk of the cheap mail-order trade, and the bulk of the large-caliber weapons sold in the United States.

These moderate controls would, in my judgment, make State and local law enforcement more effective—New Jersey is a case in point—without unduly curtailing the use of firearms for legitimate sport shooting or hunting and without curtailing the lawful activity of sport gun clubs.

The federal law we are now considering in Congress, even when enacted, will require a complementary effort at the state and local levels in order to be fully effective. Adequate state and local gun regulation is the other side of the coin and is the reason for your hearing here today.

In New York we start from a good beginning. Indeed, the President's Crime Commission called our Sullivan Law "the most stringent firearms control regulation in the United States." And President Johnson, in his Message to Congress on Crime earlier this year, said that any new federal legislation on guns "will gain added strength as states pass firearms legislation and licensing laws similar to the Sullivan Law."

Yet, even though we can be proud of the foundation on which we build, there are great weaknesses in our present structure. The Sullivan Law governs only concealable weapons—pistols and revolvers. We have no requirement that there be a permit to own a rifle or a shotgun, or even that rifles and shotguns be registered. We do not regulate dealers in rifles and shotguns as we do dealers in handguns. But as I have indicated, it is these weapons which are the tools of the urban rioter, the machinery of senseless killing.

So I believe the legislation which you consider today is directed at the heart of the matter, for the bills before you would establish new controls over the use of rifles and shotguns. Let me offer a few comments about these proposals.

I believe that the idea behind Intro. No. 31 is sound. Its point is to ensure that dealers will record certain information about purchases of firearms and report it to the Police Department. Insofar as the bill affects handguns, this procedure, in my judgment, would be a useful complement to the Sullivan Law. A person must obtain a permit before he can purchase a handgun, and this proposal would complete the circle. The Police Department would be told where the pistol or revolver had been purchased, so the bill would provide a check on the activities of dealers in these weapons. The information required constitutes no invasion of privacy—it would merely place on record data necessary to spot persons potentially unfit to use firearms; diagnosed psychotics, convicted felons, drug

addicts, and juvenile delinquents. I know that the Police Department has some reservations about the efficiency of having police officers handle the clerical functions necessary under Intro. No. 31. However, I believe the principle involved in this bill is sensible, and I trust that the details regarding its administration can be worded out.

Insofar as this bill affects rifles and shotguns, I believe it will be especially helpful since sales of these weapons are not now regulated. I note that technical objections have been raised about whether the specific language of Intro. No. 31 is sufficient to subject dealers in rifles and shotguns to the obligation to report, and I trust that the Committee will study those objections and revise the bill accordingly.

Two other bills, Intro. Nos. 303 and 304, would require that owners and prospective purchasers of all firearms—pistols, revolvers, rifles and shotguns—register the fact of their ownership or their intention to purchase with the Police Department. This, too, is constructive legislation, and I support it.

By including rifles and shotguns in the required notice, the ordinance would complement existing State and federal law, and provide New York City a more effective system of tracing ownership and possession of all firearms.

Finally, the proposed Resolution 647 would urge the State legislature to expand the Sullivan Law to require a license or permit for the ownership or possession of rifles and shotguns similar to what is now required for concealable weapons and small arms. I support this resolution. I believe expansion of the Sullivan Law is in fact the single most effective action we can take now to control guns in our state.

Indeed, the question has been raised whether it would be more appropriate to leave all of the proposed bills to be considered by the State legislature. The laws it enacts have statewide application, which in relation to firearms, would facilitate adoption of a computerized operation that would be more efficient.

No doubt this is true, but we have been awaiting action in the State legislature for many years, and I believe we can wait no longer.

New York City should take the lead. If the State follows, so much the better. But we must not wait. We must act now to prevent the wanton death and destruction which our immediate action could prevent.

You have heard and will hear again arguments that these laws should not be enacted because they will be too costly or too burdensome to administer. On that point I would like to place in the record if I may, a letter from New Jersey State Attorney General Arthur Sills, which shows from New Jersey's experience that legislation like that which you are considering is indeed workable. And the burden of simple administrative record-keeping is scant justification for permitting psychotics, felons, delinquents and drug addicts to buy rifles and ammunition without registration or permit.

You have heard and will hear again arguments that the legislation before you will either be ineffective or too effective—the latter in the sense of discouraging legitimate sportsmen. I believe neither of these arguments is valid. Indeed, it is interesting that some of the witnesses before you represent the same organizations which argued to Congress that federal legislation is inappropriate because this is a matter for State and local action. Now they come before this body and oppose local action. The inconsistency of their approach is manifest.

The legislation before you would enable the police to trace the ownership and possession of rifles and shotguns. It will institute some control over dealers in such weapon, so that police are able to spot those who deal habitually with persons who use these weapons in criminal activity. This new legislation is necessary—at present anyone may store rifles, or buy shotguns without any record of the transaction. If the gun is used in a crime, law enforcement officers are powerless to track it down to the owner. And the legislation is moderate and fair—a five dollar fee is hardly prohibitive for the reputable sportsman; and it may discourage the potential sniper.

This legislation is a beginning—it indicates our concern that weapons of death be kept out of irresponsible hands. But we must not stop here—we ought to consider other measures that will provide additional safeguards without inhibiting the use of firearms for legitimate purposes. I would urge that we consider the following: a provision requiring dealers in rifles and shotguns to be licensed by the city, or the state, if that is more appropriate; regulations requiring special identification cards to purchase ammunition; a provision giving the Mayor or other appropriate official power to suspend sales of firearms and ammunition for a specified period in a time of emergency.

We have a responsibility to the victims of crime and violence. It is a responsibility to think not only of our own convenience but of the tragedy of sudden death. It is a responsibility to put away childish things—to make the possession and use of firearms a matter undertaken only by serious people who will use them with the restraint and maturity that their dangerous nature deserves—and demands.

For too long, we have dealt with these deadly weapons as if they were harmless toys. Yet their very presence, the ease of their acquisition, and the familiarity of their appearance have led to thousands of deaths each year—and to countless other crimes of violence as well.

With the passage of these bills, and the enactment of federal legislation, we will begin to meet these responsibilities.

If we act now, we can save hundreds of lives in this country and spare thousands of families all across this land the grief and heartbreak that may come from the loss of a husband, a son, a brother, or a friend.

It is past time that we wipe this stain of violence from our land.

REPUBLICANS ARE ON THE MOVE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is no secret that the Grand Old Party is making tremendous strides toward achieving an electoral majority in 1968. Only last fall, the party captured half of the Nation's governorships, won over new seats in the House of Representatives, picked up three new seats in the Senate, and won scores of legislative and local government posts.

The opposition party, as the complacent guardian of the status quo, has failed to satisfy the vitality and newness of the 1960's. On the other hand, the GOP is moving forward with new programs, new ideas, and new philosophies geared to problem solving. Senator PERCY's homeownership bill, Senator JAVITS' public-private corporation to fight poverty, Senator BROOKE's efforts to remove redtape from public housing applications, and Senator DOMINICK's tax credits for parents with children in college all testify to the undeniable effort of the Republican Party to meet the demands, challenges, and responsibilities of this technological era.

The September issue of Fortune magazine contains an excellent article entitled "Here Come the Republicans," written by A. James Reichley. Mr. Reichley's well-written article details the opportunity of the GOP and the prospects for the country to achieve better government in 1968. 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:

THE VOTERS, THE POLLS, EVEN A GOOD MANY DEMOCRATS ARE IN AGREEMENT: THE POLITICAL WINDS HAVE SHIFTED, AND HERE COME THE REPUBLICANS

(By A. James Reichley)

The hour of opportunity for the Republican party seems to be at hand. After more than a third of a century in the electoral wilderness, culminating in the disastrous campaign of 1964, the G.O.P. has recovered the capacity to become again the majority party in the U.S.

This new Republican liveliness is, in part, the reflection of advanced senescence in the governing Democratic coalition. Thirty-five years is a long time for a political combination to endure, and the Democrats today show clear evidence of tired leadership, disheveled party organization, and poverty of ideas. At the same time, Republicans have taken vigorous steps to strengthen their national, state, and local organizations. They have produced a new generation of officeholders and candidates who not only are good-looking and articulate, but who also offer an approach to the problems of government that is fresh in style and emphasis. For the first time in memory, young people with ideas are turning to the Republicans. "People are fed up with the Democrats," says Richard Goodwin, former aide to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Republican chances look awfully good."

That the Republican recovery is deep as well as spectacular began to come clear on Election Night last year. The party workers and dignitaries gathered at the headquarters of the Republican National Committee, only a few blocks from the White House in Washington, will not soon forget the way the news came home. While others were whopping things up on the strength of first returns, the flush-faced man in the rumpled suit, sitting behind the cluttered desk from which the national Republican organization receives its marching orders, maintained a serious expression. Puffing on a chain of cigarettes, Ray C. Bliss, the national chairman, was waiting to see how the bottom of the ticket was doing.

Bliss had lived through the Eisenhower years, when success at the national level was accompanied by steady erosion of party strength in the state and local government offices from which any national political organization must gain most of its sustenance. The glamour wins of the moment—the Rockefellers and the Brookes, the Percys and the Reagans—were fine. But how were the legislatures going? How were Republicans doing in races for control of the courthouses, where jobs and favors can be used to build a grass-roots organization?

Finally, in the wee hours, the chairman got his answer. Republicans were making gains in the legislative halls—winning contests all across the nation for county commissioner, clerk of court, and recorder of deeds—were returning the party banner to the mastheads of courthouses from which it had been absent for a generation. Complete results, available weeks later, showed the extent of the Republican victory: gains of three seats in the U.S. Senate and forty-seven seats in the House of Representatives; a net gain of eight governors, giving the G.O.P. control of half the country's statehouses for the first time in twelve years and governorships representing 56 percent of the U.S. population; total control of seventeen legislatures, compared with only six before the election; capture of more than 800 county offices formerly held by the opposition. The

victory was a party achievement—the first since the election of 1946—and based on more durable substance than the popularity of a few individuals.

One election, of course, does not make a majority party. In 1967 the Republicans command the declared loyalty of only 29 percent of the voters compared with 43 percent for the Democrats (the remaining 28 percent claim to be independents). But the G.O.P. strength since the 1966 election is up 4 percent—the greatest gain since 1940. For the Democrats the trend is in the other direction; their declared support has declined by 2 percent in the same period.

The voting in special elections this year shows that the Republican momentum continues. In Michigan another legislature tipped to Republican control after an election in May. Election of a reapportioned legislature in Florida in March produced smashing Republican gains, to back up the Sunshine State's first Republican governor since Reconstruction, chosen in 1966. In the same month an election to fill a vacancy in a heavily Democratic congressional district in Rhode Island was almost won by the Republican candidate. In Philadelphia, regarded as a Democratic preserve since the early Fifties, the Republican candidate for mayor is given a good chance of being elected this fall.

A NEW CYCLE IN HISTORY

Perhaps most important, public-opinion polls indicate a shift among young voters toward the Republicans, reversing a thirty-year trend. One poll taken for Bliss, and confirmed in general by other surveys, shows that Republicans are now exactly even in party affiliation with the Democrats among college students. The Democrats had a 9 percent advantage only a year ago. Richard Neustadt, director of the Kennedy Institute of Politics at Harvard and an adviser to three Democratic Presidents, views the 1968 election as one that could mark a major change in the loyalties of the intellectual community: "A Rockefeller or perhaps a Percy could draw in cadres of bright young lawyers and economists just out of graduate school. That massive shift, once started, could last a generation."

The wiser Republicans, like Bliss, are looking beyond the presidential election. They, of course, want to win the White House next year. But Bliss and others are also determined to build a Republican organization that could survive defeat next year for the presidency, and still gain additional power at every other elective level. Their sights are on 1968, but also on 1970 and 1972. Nine long years of Lyndon Johnson indeed could be the ingredient that is needed to convert a trend into a Republican avalanche. The presidency retains the highest priority, but the new Republican operating strategy, which Bliss has devised and put into practice, is also aimed at substantial gains in Congress, acquisition of more statehouses, putting added numbers of Republicans in state legislatures and seats of power in city and county government. Once these treasures are secured, Bliss and his warriors are convinced that the basis will be laid to make the Seventies the first Republican decade since the Twenties.

Is this at all realistic? Or is the country simply witnessing one more pause in the general Democratic hegemony that has prevailed with only one minor interruption since the New Deal? There is solid reason to believe that an entirely new cycle in American political history may well be beginning—a political change as profound as those initiated by the Democrats under Jackson, the Republicans under Lincoln, and the Democrats again under Franklin Roosevelt.

A DEFENSIVE COMBINATION

The fundamental Republican problem has always been to gather enduring popular support for a relatively conservative philosophy of government. On this problem the Federalist and Whig parties foundered, and it was solved by the Republicans after the Civil War only by spiking economic conservatism with large doses of Puritan morality, patrician reform, and rural populism. The Republican party provided the broker politicians who, while frequently enriching themselves, at the same time performed the worth-while function of balancing the needs of capitalism against the aspirations of political democracy. The Puritan, patrician, and populist strains departed the G.O.P. to join Theodore Roosevelt's abortive Bull Moose crusade of 1912, and the Republican restoration of the Twenties never really achieved the legitimacy with which to deal with the economic crisis of the depression. Republican victories after 1932 were limited to occasional moments of general reaction or to triumphs for popular figures like President Eisenhower.

During most of these years the G.O.P. retained residual strength in its rural constituencies, which regarded it as a kind of bulwark against the growing power of urbanism, and in the citadels of business enterprise, which used it to buy political protection. These two elements of support composed a force that was by no means impotent. Malapportionment of state legislatures and to some extent of Congress gave the small-town politicians a power of veto over large parts of the programs proposed by Democratic chief executives, and the cash contributed by businessmen kept the party organization afloat. The combination, however, was by its very nature defensive, and may actually have helped to stifle the aspirations of Republican leaders who tried to regain majority status. During the Sixties, legislative reapportionment considerably weakened the G.O.P.'s rural base, and the growing accommodation between Lyndon Johnson and the business community made the latter a less reliable source of funds. Almost of necessity, the Republicans were forced to seek fresh support by striking out in new directions or face the likelihood of extinction. One reaction was the wild plunge into Goldwater conservatism in 1964. Another, more tempered response has been the emergence of the so-called "New Breed" of Republican political leaders who were largely responsible for the victories of 1966.

"Parties do not defeat each other," says Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen, seventy-one, who has seen the comings and the goings of a good many captains and kings. "They defeat themselves. We grow out of parties the same way we grow out of an old suit of clothes." The current national disenchantment with the Democrats is in part, no doubt, the result of public distaste and boredom with the personality of President Johnson. "I've never met anyone who really liked him," says a former White House adviser, "but at least they used to say that he gets things done. Now they just say they don't like him." More than the President's lack of personal popularity—from which he may recover momentarily in reaction to such events as a Middle Eastern war or a Glassboro summit—is involved, however, in his party's decline.

In general, the nation is confronted by four kinds of issues: (1) issues of war and peace; (2) issues of human development, ranging from civil rights to education; (3) issues of environmental improvement, including measures to make the cities more livable and conservation of resources; and (4) issues of economic growth, including the role of the federal government in maintaining a healthy economy. On all of these, Democratic inspiration seems to have run thin, and on some the Republicans are providing fresh initiatives. "Problem solving," the phrase adopted by members of the Republican New Breed to define their common approach, represents the willingness of modern G.O.P. activists to depart from defensive positions and grapple with contemporary conditions.

The international situation, particularly the war in Vietnam, offers the Republicans their most dazzling chance for immediate gains with the electorate, and also their most serious dilemma. "It is natural that the American people have begun to question the conduct of the war," says newly elected Senator Charles Percy of Illinois. "After three years, we still do not see light at the end of the tunnel." But the party's leaders take a wide range of positions on the war. Senator Jacob Javits of New York favors "the gambit of cessation of the bombing of the North to induce negotiations." Former Senator Barry Goldwater proposes "destruction of the supplies in Haiphong Harbor, which would enable us to win and get out." Nevertheless, recent polls show that more people believe the Republicans than the Democrats are "more likely to keep the U.S. out of World War III"—an issue on which the public had favored the Democrats from 1961 to 1966. If the Republicans take *no* position on Vietnam up to Election Day, they may be able to harvest the disaffected on both sides of the issue. One political ploy—and a way out of the Republican dilemma—was proposed by the G.O.P.'s distinguished Orientalist Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania. Regardless of the wisdom of current policies, Scott argues, the war can be settled only by a "new team," with which the North Vietnamese might be able to negotiate without losing face. The idea has been taken up by others, including former Vice President Nixon.

The Johnson Administration has made great legislative progress toward solving problems of human development—perhaps the greatest progress in American history. For this very reason, deprived groups are now demanding improvement at an even more rapid rate. On the issue of civil rights, for instance, Negroes are finding new legal protections little more than invitations to seek the broad social and economic rights that a predominantly white society continues to deny them. "Johnson's programs are just fine and I agree with the need for them," says Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York. "It's too bad he hasn't got around to funding them."

As with the war in Vietnam, Republicans are tempted to seek political advantage on both sides of the civil-rights question. Negro riots in northern cities this summer have increased white fears, and the national Republicans organization has not hesitated to attempt to fix blame for the outbreaks on the Administration. Many Republican leaders, though, recognize that Negroes hold the balance of power in most of the urban states, and are guided by prudence as well as conviction to seek satisfaction for Negro aspirations. Senators Javits and Scott have been in the forefront of the civil-rights movement, and the normally conservative Senator Dirksen supplied the political muscle that led to the adoption of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Even the newly sassy Republican party in the South, which at times has seemed to be trying to be more racist than its Democratic counterpart, is becoming aware that it must have Negro support if it is to develop durable strength. "Negroes will turn increasingly to the Republican party," predicts Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, the first Negro to sit in the upper house of Congress since Reconstruction, "because they are interested not only in what a man stands for but in what he does. The Republicans are prepared to deliver on housing and jobs, which are the real needs for Negroes today."

AN OPENING FOR BUSINESS

Issues of environmental improvement seem currently to offer the most promising opportunity for display of Republican leadership and imagination. These issues can for the most part be dealt with effectively at the

state level, where the G.O.P. now is richest in talent. Besides conservation, an area in which Republican credentials have been good since the days of Gifford Pinchot, they include the raft of problems associated with the crisis in America's cities—housing, mass transit, downtown renewal, open spaces, regional government. These provide a wide-open field for creative Republican solutions, for nowhere are Democratic exhaustion and impotence more apparent. The Democratic machines that have ruled most cities almost continuously during the twentieth century have failed, with a few notable exceptions, to produce either the leaders or the ideas that could reverse the spread of urban rot. "The clubhouse system in the Democratic party in states like New York and Massachusetts has stifled talent and held back the promising young men from coming to the top," says Dick Goodwin. The result is that most of the urban states outside the South now have Republican governors, and Republicans have begun to win control of city administrations.

What Republicans bring to the urban crisis is not so much a partisan solution as verve and a spirit of dynamism. "When you are in a war, you can't afford the luxury of partisanship," says Mayor John Lindsay of New York, speeding across the rutted streets of his decaying city. "You simply try to find the answers and get on with the job."

One Republican advantage in dealing with the crisis of the cities, though Republican politicians are cautious about discussing it, is that Republicans, outside of the South, generally enjoy more confidence from the business community. "The party's close association with business, which in the past has been a liability, is today a great asset," says Senator Percy, himself the product of seventeen years' service as chief executive officer of Bell & Howell. "Businessmen are oriented to problem solving, and many urban problems necessarily require the involvement of the private sector." Senator Javits agrees: "Restoration of the cities requires application of the principles of the free-enterprise system."

To a more limited extent, Republican strength in the suburbs is helpful to the party in coming to grips with transit, pollution, and other problems that require regional solutions. The suburbs are simply too populous and politically powerful to permit the imposition of plans that do not meet their approval. Thus the cooperation of suburban leaders, mostly Republicans, is vital to those who seek to govern the cities. "Suburban people are a bit more confident when dealing with fellow Republicans," says Javits. District Attorney Arlen Specter of Philadelphia, a former liberal Democrat who is now Republican candidate for mayor, is not so sure: "I find that the party label doesn't take me past the opening lunch. The suburban leaders tell me that 'regionalism' is a bad word, so I am careful to speak of 'voluntary intercounty cooperation.'"

Issues relating to the health of the economy probably give the Republicans their most solid source of political capital. Just before last year's election 73 percent of the people felt that they or their families had been hurt by inflation, and only 20 percent felt that the Johnson Administration was doing an effective job at holding down the cost of living. "This is an issue that the President can't do much about," says Representative Melvin Laird of Wisconsin, chairman of the House Republican Conference and one of the ablest political strategists in Washington. "The cost of living is bound to be higher by Election Day, unless he cuts back on spending. If he cuts back on spending, he will lose the support of groups that are important to him." High taxes, too, are widely blamed on the Democrats. The "pocketbook issue" usually has turned out to be less important in the voting booth than in public-opinion surveys, but it does provide a rock of support from which Republicans can depart in search of a national majority.

DEAD MEN WOULD HAVE WON

Potential issues alone, as Chairman Bliss well knows, do not produce political success. While the Republican party has experienced more than three decades of defeat primarily because it has failed to offer an attractive program, there can be no doubt that the weakness of the party's national organization has contributed to its inability to win elections. Bliss, who built an organization in Ohio as Republican state chairman from 1949 to 1965 that has virtually demolished the Democratic opposition, set out to correct this weakness when he came to Washington in April, 1965.

He immedately launched a series of projects, most of which would seem basic to any national organization, but which until recently have received slight attention from either party. As a first step, he vitalized a newly established Republican Coordinating Committee, composed of former President Eisenhower, the G.O.P.'s four living former candidates for President, its House and Senate leadership, and leading governors, to develop national party policy. After streamlining the National Committee administration, he put in motion a series of workshops in all parts of the country for campaigning managers, publicists, and research directors. Realizing that the current generation of students is not deeply committed to either party, he sponsored all-day political seminars on twelve college campuses. After the 1966 election he stepped up the pressure on local organizations to recruit Republican candidates for offices that have been going to Democrats by default. Massachusetts was one of the many states to provide ample reason for the program. "We carried four major statewide offices up for election last year," he says, "but there were 107 legislative districts in which no Republican candidates were even entered. We would have won some of those seats if we had run dead men."

"BUILDING FROM THE BASEMENT UP"

The National Committee's major concentration since 1965 has been on building Republican strength in the big cities, which Bliss has long believed to be the key to the party's future. Preparing for the 1966 election, the committee held four workshops for Republican chairmen and their chief lieutenants in the big cities. Experienced professionals gave training in the fundamentals of running a campaign and getting out the vote. Results were heartening; in the twenty-one largest cities in which state offices were contested last fall major Republican candidates carried six (Baltimore, Boston, San Diego, Cincinnati, Denver, and Atlanta) and did better than in 1962 (a better than average Republican year) in nine more. The chairman proudly explains, "We are building from the basement up, not the roof down."

Republican state organizations, which owe only nominal allegiance to the National Committee, have begun to follow the Bliss lead toward professionalization of the party's political staffs. In California, for example, the state staff has been increased from five full-time professionals in 1964 to eighteen at present, with seven more scheduled to be added by the beginning of next year's campaign. Despite the friendly relationship between the Johnson Administration and business, serious efforts to build state Republican organizations still receive generous financial support from members of the business community. In Illinois, for instance, businessmen are willing to pitch in, according to one major officeholder, "to help Republicans do anything except elect the mayor of Chicago" (Chicago's four-term Mayor Richard Daley perfected the Democrat-business relationship years before Lyndon Johnson), and they are now contributing funds to provide a staff for the decrepit state organization. In some places, predictably, the increase in organization tempo has led to temporary embarrassments. In Massachusetts, the deputy state chairman, charged with recruiting attractive Republican candidates for the legislature, told the press of a plan to have the governor appoint Democratic state senators in marginal districts to state jobs, thereby opening the way for the election of Republican replacements. Governor John Volpe denied knowledge of the scheme, and the deputy chairman was sacked.

Supplementing the activities of the regular Republican organizations are bands of free-lance political technicians who roam the party today like veterans of the Hundred Years' War. Some of these are merely guns for hire, but others are moved by personal or ideological enthusiasms. Most celebrated of the seasoned technicians is F. Clifton White, forty-nine, master of back-room strategy and convention-floor maneuver, who put together the organization that won the presidential nomination for Senator Goldwater in 1964. A favorite current guessing game within the G.O.P. is, "What is Cliff White up to?" According to one view, he is trying to gather a bag of delegates who will follow his lead at the crucial moment at the convention. "Cliff's dream," says one observer, "is to control the balance of power so he can throw the nomination to the candidate of his own choice."

Bands of technicians are gathered under various tents. One staffs the campaign organization set up to capture the presidential nomination for Governor George Romney of Michigan; another operates a similar organization working for the undeclared candidacy of Richard Nixon, the G.O.P.'s unsinkable man; the West Coast campaign-managing firm of Spencer, Roberts & Haffner steered Ronald Reagan to the governorship of California in 1966 and is ambitious to try a national campaign; and Nelson Rockefeller, who is well staffed to run New York State, has a ready-made collection of technicians stored away in unobtrusive places. Once the presidential nomination is decided next summer, the technicians of the successful candidate—plus some of the more talented of those who have tied themselves to losers—will join, or perhaps take over, the national drive against Lyndon Johnson. In the meantime, they act as the indispensable craftsmen needed for modern campaigns.

HOLDING THEIR FEET TO THE FIRE

More permanent bodies within the G.O.P. are the amorphous Republican Governors Association and the independent House and Senate campaign committees. All three operate in conjunction with, but not under the control of, the National Committee. The Governors Association, established in 1963, has recently increased its staff and plans to seek out likely Republican candidates in states that still have Democratic governors. It has not, however, been able to exert the influence on national party policy that some had predicted it might, either in 1964 or following the sharp increase in Republican strength in the statehouses in 1966. The twenty-five Republican governors, most of whom are bright and aggressive, have so far preferred to go their separate ways, rather than to form a single bloc that would have the capacity to dominate the 1968 convention.

Congressional Republicans, though better organized than the governors, show little inclination to run the convention next year as they helped the Goldwater forces to do in 1964. They are, instead, aiming their collective efforts toward control of the House of Representatives—only thirty-one seats away—and sizeable Republican gains in the Senate.

The drive to win control of the House, a reasonable objective for 1968, will be focused

on two groups of seats: those that were lost by Republicans in 1964 but not recaptured in 1966, and those in southern districts that have proved suspectible to state and national Republican candidates. In preparation for broadening the invasion of the South, which already has nineteen House Republicans, House Minority Leader Gerald Ford this year has carefully avoided any reconstitution of the alliance between Republicans and southern Democrats that largely dominated Congress from 1939 to 1965. Ford still welcomes the support of individual Democrats, but declines any negotiation with a single Dixiecrat leader, such as used to take place with Representative Howard Smith of Virginia. When southern Democrats succumb to White House pressure to cast votes that are unpopular in their districts, the Republicans will, according to Ford, "hold their feet to the fire." By such means, he hopes, conservative southern Democrats will be replaced by Republicans. The difficulty this tactic presents for Republicans interested in winning national elections, of course, is that it helps to intensify opposition to social legislation like the model cities program, which presumably is popular in just those urban areas that Bliss considers vital to the party's success.

Republican Senate leaders are necessarily more modest in their hopes for 1968. Though in the contest for thirty-four seats it is theoretically possible for Republicans to pick up the fifteen seats they need for control, only about ten of the seats up next year now held by Democrats are truly marginal. Nevertheless, the Republicans point out, the "class" elected in 1966 included their own most vulnerable seats—which they held without exception. In the next two elections the Democrats will be on the defensive, and a Republican Senate by 1971 is not inconceivable. In one of the contests next year, the seat held by Senator Carl Hayden, eighty-nine, of Arizona, will be sought by Barry Goldwater. Five marginal seats—those in Alaska, Idaho, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and Wisconsin—are held by Democrats who have taken a "dove" position on the Vietnam war. Less marginal, but not wholly secure, seats will be defended by superdoves J. William Fulbright of Arkansas and Wayne Morse of Oregon. Also targets for G.O.P. attack will be Senators Birch Bayh of Indiana and Lister Hill of Alabama, both of whom won by less than 51 percent of the vote in 1962. "Republican prospects just now are pretty good," admits Democratic Senator Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, who faces a tough fight for reelection in 1968, "but I have supreme faith in the ability of the Republican party to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory."

"VICTORY IS IN THE AIR"

The chief immediate peril to the Republican revival is the possibility of another intraparty civil war like that of 1964. While the G.O.P. perhaps does not have to win the presidency next year to continue its forward momentum, it would be seriously damaged by another campaign in which some of its most important leaders felt compelled to remain silent or to appear embarrassed by the national ticket.

There is general agreement at the moment that the lesson of 1964 has been learned. "The smell of victory is in the air," says Hugh Scott, who field-marshaled the anti-Goldwater forces on the floor of the last convention, "and most of our ideological friends have decided that they are prepared to move toward the middle to get a winner." Among the conservatives, there is a general disposition to forget about 1964 and to play down philosophic differences within the party. As Senator John Tower of Texas, a favorite of the right, puts it, "There is nothing about being a conservative that interferes with being at the same time a progressive." Some go even further. Congressman Laird, who chaired the committee that wrote the conservative platform in 1964, now portrays himself as a dedicated champion of advanced causes. Seeking support for this new image, he argues that the platform was so liberal that it "disgusted" Senator Goldwater. "It was the first time in history," Laird contends, "that the party's candidate did not endorse the platform in his acceptance speech."

Barry Goldwater himself has mellowed since the riproaring days when he was prepared to make social-security voluntary and to sell TVA. "The party," he recently told FORTUNE, "must learn to live with the new relationship between the states and the federal government. We resisted these new laws for things like aid to education and urban renewal, but now we must recognize that they are here to stay, and make them work. The federal government is the most efficient tax collector, but once the money is raised at the federal level it should be turned back to the states, which can do a better job of running the programs." Goldwater's taste in candidates remains conservative; he is committed to Nixon for the presidential nomination, though he adds that "Reagan would not have much trouble getting the nomination," if Reagan wanted to try. ("What will Reagan do?" he asks. "Reagan says he doesn't want it, but by not saying, 'No,' he may not be able to get out of it.") But Goldwater will support anyone the party nominates for President except one man—Nelson Rockefeller. "The party doesn't owe Rockefeller a thing," says the 1964 nominee. "Rockefeller fell down on the party. Nixon would be President today if Rockefeller had worked in 1960. These people—Rockefeller and Romney and Javits—represent no more than 10 or 15 percent of the party, but whenever there has been disunity, they have engineered it."

STOP THE POLLUTION AND KEEP THE JOBS

The difficulty with *avoiding* internal ideological warfare in 1968 is that the Republicans may end up standing for nothing at all. Though this may do well enough for a single campaign, in which the shortcomings of the opposition and the improved organization that Bliss is building could by themselves produce victory, it will hardly provide a durable base on which a stable national majority can be built. Restrictive ideology aside, the real question confronting the party is does Republicanism represent anything permanent in American life?

Some of the elements that contributed to the political and moral vitality of the G.O.P. during its post Civil War heyday still preserve substantial significance for the nation. Governor Romney, for instance, has persuasively related Puritan values to such current problems as the impersonality of modern life and the lack of well-defined purpose in foreign policy. More directly in the nineteenth-century tradition, Senator Dirksen—reminiscent of Silas P. Ratcliffe, the fictional Senator from Illinois whom Henry Adams described in *Democracy* as "the high priest of American politics . . . charged with the meaning of the mysteries, the clue to political hieroglyphics"—carries on as the grandest of broker politicians. In Dirksen's beehive office just off the Senate floor, thronged with corporate lobbyists, Protestant ministers, and small-town politicians, is concentrated more real political power than is to be found anywhere in the U.S. short of the White House. The patrician strain, too, has not wholly vanished from the G.O.P.: John Lindsay, charging forth each day with the zest of a cavalier, offers a symbol of swashbuckling romance from which New York's downtrodden citizens can gather amusement and even some hope.

Something more, however, is needed if the Republican party is to build an enduring national majority. One answer is offered by Ronald Reagan and his conservative followers, who argue that growing hostility to the rising cost of government is a common tie with which a winning coalition can be put together. While Reagan has actually increased the cost of government in California, his efforts at economy have won favorable notice from large segments of the press and public. Even Governor Romney, who may face Reagan in the final countdown on the convention floor next year, pays grudging respect to the appeal of the California governor's formula. "If you want to make me politically popular," he recently told a group of Democratic legislators in Michigan who were resisting his request for increased taxes, "force me back on an austerity budget. Cutting the cost of government is the political force that is sweeping this country."

Economy in government is both a laudable and a popular objective. But was it really the main attraction that produced winning margins for Republican candidates in 1966? According to another reading, the voters were seeking a fresh point of departure—"neither the New Deal dogmas of the Thirties," in the words of newly elected Governor Tom McCall of Oregon, "nor the Arizona dogmas of 1964."

This spirit of fresh start is well expressed by the State of Washington's young governor, Daniel J. Evans, who in 1964 beat the Goldwater forces in his own party and then went on to win election over a Democratic incumbent in the face of the Johnson landslide. "It used to be," says Evans, "that people were willing to live with problems that were caused by factors that seemed to be beyond their control. Take pollution. People didn't like pollution very much, but they were willing to put up with it because they believed that if pollution were controlled a lot of industries would close and workers would lose their jobs. Given a choice between having pollution and losing jobs, most people would let the pollution continue. They don't feel that way any more. They say there is no reason why we can't stop the pollution and keep the jobs. We are no longer frightened by what we used to think was inevitable. The same is true in housing and education and medical care and most of the other fields where we have problems."

This, perhaps, is what is really meant by "problem solving." It is not an ideology, not a systematic political philosophy. It is a spirit of determination to change things for the better, whether in the slums of America's cities or in the jungles of Vietnam. Such a spirit should not be foreign to the Republican party. It was, after all, a very similar sentiment that moved the small band of zealots in the 1850's who found Whig apathy and Democratic opportunism equally unsatisfactory responses to the ills of the time. Beginning from the schoolhouse in Ripon, Wisconsin, on a March night in 1854, this group went forth to found a political party that in six years had won the presidency, and for almost three-quarters of a century thereafter remained the dominant political force in the country. The precedent is suggestive. While history does not repeat exactly, there seems no reason why contemporary Republican politicians should not provide a vehicle for the new generation of voters who "are no longer frightened by what we used to think was inevitable."

THIRTY-ONE NATIONS HAVE PROVIDED FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on August 18, in comment in the Senate on U.S. activities in Vietnam and the forthcoming elections, I stated that—

> I am chagrined that our country's efforts in Vietnam are not supported stronger than they appear to be by more allies—especially by those countries and those peoples whom we made great in wars of the past to defend and even liberate.

This is my genuine concern, as I know it is the concern of other Senators and

other persons in our country. In discussions and conferences with informed persons, Members of Congress have been provided with a brief analysis of the free world assistance in our Vietnam effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this material be inserted in the RECORD.

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

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM

Thirty-one nations have assisted Viet-Nam under the Free World Assistance Program. The contributions of six other countries and of the UN are listed.

FAR EAST

Australia

Australia is providing an important range of aid to Viet-Nam under the Colombo Plan and by direct bilateral assistance.

Military aid consists of:

1. Approximately 6,300 combat troops including a brigade and support, a guided missile destroyer, and a squadron of 8 Canberra bombers.

2. 100 combat advisors.

3. A 73-man air force unit at Vung Tau with six Australian caribou planes which fly daily logistical missions in support of the Vietnamese military.

Economic and technical assistance has totaled nearly $10 million including:

1. Three surgical teams (37 personnel) in 3 provincial hospitals. These teams, in addition to performing major operations, have established a blood bank and are giving lessons in nursing.

2. Civil engineers working on water supply and road construction projects.

3. Three experts in dairy and crop practices and radio techniques.

4. Training of 130 Vietnamese in Australia.

5. In goods and materials: 1,250,000 textbooks in Vietnamese for rural schools; 3,300 tons of corrugated roofing for Vietnamese military dependents' housing; 6 large community windmills; 15,750 sets of hand tools; 400 radio sets and 2,400 loud-speakers; 16,000 blankets and 14,000 cases of condensed milk.

6. A 55 kilowatt broadcasting station at Ban Me Thout.

The Australian Government decided on February 1 to increase its non-military aid to Viet-Nam during FY 1967 to $2 million to permit substantial enlargement of current medical and civic action programs and the undertaking of new projects such as providing equipment for refugee resettlement centers.

Republic of China

The Republic of China has provided:

1. An 80-man agricultural team.

2. An 18-man military psychological warfare team.

3. A 34-man electrical power mission under the leadership of Taipower.

4. A 16-man surgical team.

China has also provided training for more than 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. They have provided 26 aluminum prefabricated warehouses, agricultural tools, seeds and fertilizers, 500,000 copies of mathematics textbooks and an electrical power substation.

Japan

Japan has provided over $55 million worth of economic assistance to Viet-Nam. Japan has sent two medical teams, considerable amounts of medical goods (4,544 cases), 20,000 transistor radios and 25 ambulances. It has provided technical personnel and funds for the construction of a large power dam across the Da Nhim River and electrical transmission line and agreed to participate in the construction of a bridge over the Mekong River near Vinh Long.

Korea

Korea has sent approximately 45,000 troops including:

1. 2 combat divisions.

2. A 130-man Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH).

3. 10 military instructors in Korean karate for training Vietnamese military in hand-to-hand combat.

4. A 2,200-man Task Force Unit composed of the following elements: 1 Army engineer battalion, 1 Headquarters group, 1 Army Transportation company, 1 Marine Corps Engineer company, 1 Infantry battalion, 1 LST and 2 LSMs, 1 Composite Support unit (communications, medical supplies, etc.).

Korean military medical personnel are providing some medical care to the local population in areas where ROK troops are stationed. In addition, 7 civilian medical teams totalling 118 doctors, nurses and support personnel are working in provincial health programs.

Laos

One million *kip* ($4,167) for flood relief in 1965 and a small cash donation for refugees in 1966.

Malaysia

Since 1963, Malaysia has trained over 2,000 Vietnamese military and police officers. Groups of 30–60 are regularly sent for about a month's training in counterinsurgency with Malaysian Police Special Constabulary. Malaysia has previously provided substantial amounts of counterinsurgency materials, primarily military and police transport such as armored vehicles. Medicines and relief supplies have also been donated.

New Zealand

New Zealand has sent an artillery battery and an infantry company (approximately 360 men) and provided a 25-man army engineer detachment.

In *non-military aid,* New Zealand has sent a 15-man surgical team, and a professor in English language for the University of Saigon. A second 16-man medical team will be sent to Binh Dinh province. They are presently training 83 Vietnamese in New Zealand and have provided £7,500 ($21,000) for equipment for a technical high school. They are also assisting by providing approximately $600,000 for a science building at the University of Saigon.

Philippines

The Philippine Government has sent a 2,000-man military engineering unit with security support personnel, a station hospital, and rural health and civic action teams.

In *non-military aid,* approximately 60 Philippine civic action personnel including military and civilian medical teams have been working in Viet-Nam for several years.

Thailand

The Thai Government announced in January 1967 that it would send a ground force combat unit to Viet-Nam. It is expected that this will total 2,000–2,500 men. A 200-man Thai naval group manning an LST and PGM patrol craft arrived in Viet-Nam in December 1966. A 35-man air force contingent has been flying operational transport missions for the Vietnamese forces. The Thais have also been providing jet training for Vietnamese pilots in Thailand.

In *non-military aid,* the Thais have provided rice for refugees and cement and zinc roofing materials. At the Manila Conference, the Thais offered the Vietnamese a $20 million rice credit. The Thais have also announced they will send a medical unit to Viet-Nam.

MIDDLE EAST

Greece

Greece has contributed $15,000 worth of medical supplies.

Iran

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Viet-Nam and has dispatched a 20-man medical team to Viet-Nam.

Turkey

Turkey has provided medicines and also offered to provide a substantial amount of cement.

EUROPE

Austria

Austria has offered to supply medical supplies, blankets, tents, through the Austrian Red Cross.

Belgium

Belgium has provided medicines and an ambulance and has given scholarships for 15 Vietnamese to study in Belgium.

Denmark

Denmark has provided medical supplies and has offered to train 12 Vietnamese nurses in Denmark.

Germany

Personnel in Viet-Nam: Seven Germans, a director and six instructors, are teaching at the new Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc near Saigon. At Hue University there are five Germans: three physicians in the Medical School, a professor of music, a professor of German language, and one expert in forestry is working at the Department of Rural Affairs, Saigon.

A 3,000-ton hospital ship, the "Helgoland" with 8 doctors, 30 other medical personnel and 145 beds is on duty in Viet-Nam.

Vietnamese in Germany: Forty Vietnamese are studying in Germany and the Germans have agreed to accept 30 more primarily for training as future instructors in the technical high school. A considerable number have previously been trained.

Goods and materials: The Germans have provided the following credits:

(1) DM 15 million ($3.75 million) for import of German products such as machine tools, fertilizer, etc. The piastre funds generated go to the National Office of Agricultural Credit to aid farmers, particularly with loans;

(2) a credit of DM 50 million ($12.5 million) for development of the major industrial complex at An Hoan-Nong Son;

(3) a credit for DM 20 million ($5 million) for construction of an abattoir at Saigon-Cholon, and three coastal vessels;

(4) a credit of DM 500,000 ($125,000) for equipment at the Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc.

In April 1966, the Germans announced a gift of DM 17.5 million ($4.4 million) worth of pharmaceuticals, the first shipments of which have arrived. Also in the medical field, they have provided two mobile dental clinics and 30 ambulances for the Ministry of Health.

In June 1966, the Cabinet voted DM 25 million (US $6.25 million) for new aid to Viet-Nam including: 1) sending 25 experts to establish a refugee center; 2) building a home for wayward youths; 3) expansion of 8 social centers and construction of a ninth; 4) establishment of a training center for social workers, and 5) the gift of 100 buses and a maintenance and repair facility in Saigon. The Germans have also donated 260 tons of rice for refugee relief programs.

Italy

The Italians provided a 10-man surgical team and have offered science scholarships to 10 Vietnamese to study in Italy.

Luxembourg

Luxembourg has provided plasma and blood transfusion equipment.

The Netherlands

The Dutch have undertaken to build 5 tuberculosis centers in Saigon; sites for 3 have been selected. In August, the Netherlands announced a contribution of $355,000

for a 4-year UN project in social welfare, part of the $1 million they have earmarked for UN projects in Viet-Nam. In 1964, the Dutch gave antibiotics and 4 scholarships for Vietnamese. They previously provided a dredge.

Spain

Spain has provided 800 pounds of medicines, medical equipment and blankets and has sent a 12-man medical team to Viet-Nam.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has provided six civilians for the British Advisory Mission and a Professor of English at Hue University. Twenty-one Vietnamese are receiving training in the United Kingdom. A pediatric team of four British doctors and six nurses went to Viet-Nam in August, 1966.

In 1963–64, the United Kingdom provided the following goods and materials: Laboratory equipment for Saigon University; a typesetting machine for the Government Printing Office, a cobalt deep-ray therapy unit for the National Cancer Institute; various equipment for the faculties of Medicine, Science and Pharmacy at Saigon University, the Meteorological Service and the Agricultural School at Saigon, and Atomic Research Establishment at Dalat and the Faculty of Education at Hue. In 1965–66, British economic aid totaled £81,000 ($226,800) for roadbuilding equipment, diesel fishing boat engines, and portable anesthetic machines. Total aid in British FY 1967 was £184,000 and it is estimated £238,000 will be expended in FY 1968.

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina

Argentina has contributed 5,000 tons of wheat.

Brazil

Brazil has sent a substantial quantity of medical supplies which was carried to Viet-Nam by a Brazilian Air Force plane and has also provided coffee.

Costa Rica

Costa Rica is contributing an ambulance for use in Viet-Nam.

Dominican Republic

Cement has been offered by the Dominican Republic for use in Viet-Nam.

Ecuador

Ecuador has sent medical supplies to Viet-Nam.

Guatemala

Guatemala has sent 15,000 doses of typhoid-paratyphoid serum for use in Viet-Nam.

Honduras

Honduras has contributed drugs and dry goods for refugees in Viet-Nam, flown there on a Honduras Air Force plane.

Uruguay

Uruguay has contributed $21,500 for relief supplies and medicines for Viet-Nam.

Venezuela

Venezuela has provided 500 tons of rice for refugee relief, and two civilian doctors are working in Viet-Nam.

AFRICA

Liberia

A contribution of $50,000 has been made by Liberia for the purchase of hospital equipment and other medical supplies for Viet-Nam.

Tunisia

Tunisia has made available 15 to 20 scholarships for Vietnamese.

NORTH AMERICA

Canada

Almost $6 million of development assistance to Viet-Nam has been provided by Canada.

1. Personnel in Viet-Nam: A Canadian Supervisor has been at Quang Ngai supervising construction of a small TB Clinic which the Canadians are funding. The Canadians have sent two doctors and four nurses to staff the clinic. A professor of orthopedics is working at Cho Ray Hospital, Saigon, and there is a Canadian teacher at the University of Hue.

2. Vietnamese in Canada: 380 Colombo Plan trainees and a total of 463 trainees under all programs, including those sponsored by other agencies and third countries (as well as Colombo Plan), have been trained in Canada. There are currently 231 Vietnamese students in Canada.

3. Since 1958, Canada has provided $850,000 worth of food aid for Viet-Nam. Funds generated by sales are used for capital construction projects in Viet-Nam.

4. A new science building for the medical faculty at the University of Hue is being built costing about $333,000, drawn from counterpart funds generated by sales of food supplied by Canada. Construction has passed the half-way mark.

5. The Canadians have also agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Hue University which will cost about $125,000.

6. Canada has increased its aid to South Viet-Nam allocating $1 million for medical assistance this fiscal year including providing ten 200-bed emergency hospital units. The first two units have arrived and have been installed at Phan Tiet and at Phu Tho near Saigon. A Canadian doctor and technician visited Viet-Nam in the fall to inspect potential sites. Canada has sent 650,000 doses of polio vaccine for Vietnamese school children and offered additional vaccines against polio, TB and smallpox. Consideration is being given to establishment of a children's rehabilitation center in Viet-Nam.

7. Canada is printing half a million copies of a social sciences textbook for Vietnamese grade school children.

OTHER ASSISTANCE

Six other nations whose help does not fall under the Free World Assistance Program have provided valuable assistance to Viet-Nam in economic and humanitarian fields.

France

Since 1956, France has contributed about $115 million in assistance to South Viet-Nam. Present aid is running at a rate of about $4 million per year, largely in the cultural field.

In 1965 France had nearly 500 persons serving in South Viet-Nam. Among them were 65 experts under France's program of economic and technical assistance, including 32 physicians, professors and other medical personnel. Under its cultural programs, 471 professors (350 French and 121 Vietnamese) were teaching at 9 French-teaching institutions, and 30 French professors are at Vietnamese institutions. France provided in 1965 for Vietnamese to study in France, 55 fellowships for technical training and 85 academic fellowships. These programs are continuing on a somewhat reduced scale.

France has provided low-interest credits of 100 million francs (20 million dollars) for financing imports of French equipment for Vietnamese industry, a grant of 500,000 francs ($100,000) for equipment for L'Ecole Nationale d'Ingenieurs des Arts Industriels.

In 1960 France extended a low-interest credit of 70 million francs ($14 million) to aid construction of the major coal and chemical complex at An Hoa Nong Son south of Da Nang which is underway. It also provides a low-interest, five-year credit of 60 million francs ($12 million) for construction of Viet-Nam's largest cement-producing complex with plans at Hatien and Thu Duc. In 1964, France provided a 930,000 francs ($186,000) grant for the installation of a training center for electrical technicans and in 1965 a gift of 1.25 million francs ($250,000) for teaching equipment, primarily in the medical field.

Ireland

The Irish people have contributed 1,000£ ($2,800) for Vietnamese flood victims through their Red Cross.

Israel

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies for flood victims and will train this year five Vietnamese in irrigation and animal husbandry.

Norway

Norway sent a contribution through the International Red Cross for flood victims in February 1965.

Pakistan

Pakistan made a financial contribution for assistance to flood victims and donated clothing for them.

Switzerland

The Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. The Swiss Red Cross has sent an 11-man medical team through the International Committee of the Red Cross to work in a provincial hospital in the Central Highlands of South Viet-Nam.

U.N. aid to Vietnam

The United Nations and its specialized agencies are also making a significant contribution to the social and economic development of Viet-Nam. Under the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance of the UN Development Program, 15 technical assistance projects are scheduled for 1967 and 1968 at a cost of $724,475. These projects range across such varied fields as maternal and child health, labor administration, educational planning, telecommunications, meteorology and civil aviation. Among the participating agencies are ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, ICAO, ITU, WMO, and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the UN. In addition UNICEF has substantially expanded its health and child care programs with the 1967 program totalling $562,000, an increase over the 1966 level of $226,000.

Several major projects financed by the Special Fund of the UN Development Program are about to get underway. A National Technical Center (total international contribution approximately $1.5 million), with UNESCO is becoming operational. The Special Fund in January approved a Fisheries Development Project including exploratory and experimental fishing in the waters of the South China Sea, to be executed by FAO at a cost of $1.3 million. Also being negotiated is a Social Welfare Training Center to be executed by the Bureau of Social Affairs of the UN. ECAFE is pressing ahead with regional projects of benefit to the nations of the Mekong Basin and has undertaken surveys of irrigation, hydroelectric facilities and bridge construction projects in Viet-Nam.

AMERICAN ALLIGATOR FACES EXTINCTION, NEW YORK TIMES WARNS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most seriously endangered species of wild animals in America is our own American alligator. It has long been an object of concern to me, and I would hope that its preservation would be on the agenda of the worldwide wildlife conference proposed by my Senate Concurrent Resolution 41.

This giant reptile is a priceless part of our natural heritage. It is found on the U.S. coast from North Carolina to Texas, and until this year was protected in every State in which it was found except Texas. This year, the Texas Legislature, led by State Representative Otha Birkner, finally passed legislation which protects it in four of the Texas counties in which the alligator is found; but sadly needed is protection in Texas in the

greater part of the alligator's habitat. This is a notable advance in the drive to preserve this animal.

The passage of a law is not enough to save the alligator, however. Heavy poaching for commercial purposes has so depleted the numbers of these reptiles that the Department of the Interior lists it as seriously endangered. A conference of the type I have proposed could recommend further measures to save it by controlling trade in alligator skins, such as the bill, S. 785, proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

One measure which can help, however, is to bring the situation to the attention of the public. An excellent article written by John C. Devlin and published in the New York Times of August 30, 1967, should be helpful in doing so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Devlin's article, entitled "Alligators in United States Face Extinction," be printed in the RECORD.

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

ALLIGATOR IN UNITED STATES FACES EXTINCTION—POACHERS PREY ON REPTILE—SELL HIDES FOR FASHIONS

(By John C. Devlin)

The American alligator may become extinct in this country.

The National Audubon Society reports in its July–August issue of Audubon Magazine that poachers in Florida and elsewhere in the South are slaughtering alligators and selling their hides for the fashion markets. The hides are used to make wallets, shoes, suitcases and women's handbags. Some of the articles retail for $150 to $250.

The magazine author, A. E. Ayotte, says poachers take 50,000 of the reptiles a year, and that bootleg buyers pay $3.75 to $4.25 a linear foot for the hides.

LAW PROTECTS ALLIGATOR

The author says that the alligator, which has a puzzling resemblance to a similar species found in the fresh waters of South China, is protected from hunters by law.

American women, says the author, who is a conservationist and writer living in Miami, "should know of the illegal process which put smartly designed alligator bags into their carefully groomed hands."

He writes that the poachers, "in the tradition of the butchery that killed off the bison and almost wiped out Florida's gracefully plumed birds," are modern night prowlers who poach on wildlife refuges, observe no size limits and follow no rules.

Some poachers, he says, even invaded a tourist attraction in Dania, Fla., and carried off 14 medium-sized alligators used in wrestling exhibitions.

TWO TAKE 44 IN NIGHT

An alligator, he wrote, does not reach breeding age until it is about five feet in length, "but the current demand is for hides four feet and less in length." This, he said, encourages extinction.

He cited Florida, Alabama and Louisiana as the principal areas of poacher activity and said that in Baldwin County, Ala., two poachers were apprehended with a night's "take" of 44 alligators.

If they had not been arrested, he wrote, they would have realized between $800 and $1,000 for one night's work.

The author said that Florida, with the biggest population of the reptiles, granted them full protection in 1961, and that Louisiana, where the species was considered an outlaw until 1960, now opens only a portion of the state to hunters and only for a 60-day period. The minimum-size limit in the latter state is five feet.

Alabama has a closed season but reports that "poaching is definitely a problem within this state, both by individuals and rings."

Part of Georgia is still open for hunting. The authorities have said that hunting was "insignificant." However, Federal wardens in Georgia's Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge, where the alligators are protected, "are constantly battling poachers," according to Mr. Ayotte.

The author felt that the alligator was doomed to become a zoological curiosity "unless quick protective action is taken."

He said that until 60 or 70 years ago the warm swamps of the southeastern states "resounded to the hissing bellows of millions of alligators," which routinely reached a length of 14 or 16 feet. The record was 19 feet 2 inches.

Poachers, he said, use jeeps, boats, swamp buggies and air boats.

THE ELECTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, we have heard and read much criticism in recent days about the election to be held in Vietnam. Much of the criticism has come from people a good many miles away from Vietnam who have never been there or have had an opportunity to visit the country during the campaign now taking place.

Not only has this criticism played into the hands of the Communists, who are doing everything in their power to discredit the election and as a last resort are trying to thwart it by force; it also could influence the outcome of the voting by giving the Vietnamese people the impression that Americans are trying to interfere in their election.

I have read another point of view about the Vietnam election that I should like to recommend to the Senate. It comes from a Nebraskan who worked and lived with the Vietnamese people for the past year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the August 28 issue of the Omaha World-Herald. The article reports the details of an interview with Wayne "Jerry" Tannahill, a former University of Omaha football star, who has just returned from duty as a Navy lieutenant in Vietnam. On the basis of this firsthand report, I would strongly urge that Senators and all other Americans, as well, let the Vietnamese people vote, and not prejudge the fairness or results of their election.

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

VIET ADVISER SEES STABILITY—SEPTEMBER ELECTION TO AID PROGRAM

A former University of Omaha football star who worked closely with the Vietnamese for a year, said he is confident the September election in that country will aid the stabilization program.

He is Wayne Gerald (Jerry) Tannahill, who was a star on O.U.'s Tangerine Bowl team in 1954. Mr. Tannahill, who resigned his lieutenant's commission after nearly 12 years in the Navy, is visiting his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wayne F. Tannahill, 6747 North Twenty-fourth Street.

"I was in a unique position as the only American on a Vietnamese ship on river patrol in the Mekong Delta," he said. "We stopped and searched small craft.

"AMERICAN ADVISER

"My ship, called a Landing Ship Support (Light), was about 100 feet long, had 60 enlisted men and seven officers. I was the American adviser to the commander.

"I went on liberty with the Vietnamese and was welcomed into their homes. I found them good people, intelligent, earnest and patriotic," Mr. Tannahill said.

"They are stirred up about the election, a lot more than most people are in this country in a Presidential election year. From what I heard from shipmates, the election will put the stamp of authority on the new government and bolster the military leadership."

The former officer, who was commissioned in 1954 after being drafted, said he noticed an improved attitude in the Vietnamese Navy last fall.

CHANGE SEEMED WISE

"There were two landmarks. They put down an uprising in the north, and then General Ky put through a 25-per cent pay raise November 1," he said.

The change putting Nguyen Van Thieu as No. 1 man on the ticket with General Ky as vice-presidential candidate, Mr. Tannahill said "seemed wise, since Thieu is more mature."

Mr. Tannahill was awarded the Bronze Star with the combat V. He will go into private industry. Mrs. Tannahill is the former Joyce Johnson whose parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edwin B. Johnson have moved from Omaha to Anaheim, Cal.

RANKS OF POOR SHRINKING, CENSUS SAYS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an Associated Press story which appeared in the August 15, 1967, edition of the Washington Post. The story carries the headline "Ranks of Poor Shrinking, Census Says."

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

RANKS OF POOR SHRINKING, CENSUS SAYS

The Census Bureau yesterday reported a sharp decline since 1959 in the number of poor Americans.

But it indicated the climb from poverty has been much more rapid for white citizens than for Negroes.

The report also showed there are twice as many poor whites as poor Negroes.

The number of Americans with poverty incomes, the bureau said, declined from 39 million in 1959 to 30 million last year—a decrease from 22 to 15 per cent of the population.

But the bureau said the number of white persons below the poverty level decreased from 28 million to 20 million, or from 18 to 12 per cent of all white Americans.

The number of poor nonwhites, mostly Negro, dropped from 11 million in 1959 to 10 million last year—or from 55 per cent to 41 per cent of the nonwhite population.

The 1966 poverty level for nonfarm citizens ranged from $1559 for a woman 65 or older living alone to $5440 for a family of seven or more persons.

A VOTE FOR JOBS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, earlier this week the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported to the Senate the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, in which the bill originated, I was particularly gratified to note in

this morning's New York Times an editorial commending the bill and calling particular attention to the provisions which set up a new emergency public service employment program to alleviate mass unemployment in the Nation's urban and rural ghettos.

Mr. President, I ask consent that the New York Times editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

A VOTE FOR JOBS

Jobs are a necessity for transforming the slums and restoring peace to the nation's cities. A regular, decently paid job is the foundation for self-respect. A job for every father would help stabilize families now disintegrating. A job for every unemployed youth would diminish the impulse to violence that idleness now nourishes.

The antipoverty bill reported by the Senate Labor Committee is a welcome recognition of these simple truths. It would continue the existing programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, many of which are designed either to create jobs or to help people to prepare themselves for finding work. In addition, the bill authorizes a program drafted by Senator Clark of Pennsylvania for spending $2.5 billion over the next two years for "labor intensive" projects in neighborhoods with severe unemployment.

Public institutions, starved for funds for decades, could readily devise such projects. The unemployed could usefully be put to work in the maintenance of parks, hospitals, libraries and day-care centers. The expenditure of $1 billion in the current fiscal year would generate an estimated 200,000 jobs. Such an expansion of work opportunities would ease the present unrest in slum neighborhoods.

The nine Northern Democrats on the committee and Senator Javits, New York Republican, deserve approbation for defying the Johnson Administration's opposition and taking the initiative in voting for the Clark amendment. President Johnson's rigidity in clinging to his own inadequate proposals is based on a topsy-turvy set of priorities, in which military needs alone have no ceiling. The case for a tax increase would be stronger if part of its purpose was to make more Federal funds available for underfinanced urban programs of the type envisaged in the Clark amendment.

Clearly, this concept has not yet penetrated the war-obsessed White House. In his message yesterday to the Midwestern Governors' Conference, President Johnson declared: "None know better than you that money alone will not solve the basic problems of our states and cities." This is a sentiment worthy of Calvin Coolidge. Money alone will not solve the urban problems, but unless money is forthcoming, no solution is possible. If the Senate follows the lead of its Labor Committee, even the President may yet follow.

GIVING STATUS TO RABBLE-ROUSERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virgina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert an editorial entitled "Giving Status to Rabble-Rousers," in the RECORD, the editorial having appeared in the August 29, 1967, edition of the Wheeling, W. Va., News Register.

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

GIVING STATUS TO RABBLE-ROUSERS

In the glittering Regency Room of Washington's Shoreham Hotel last week a gathering of some of the most powerful and important people in the United States sat and listened to a 20-year-old Negro, named Rufus "Catfish" Mayfield tell them what he thought should be done about the problems of the cities.

We are somewhat at a loss to know just how "Catfish" Mayfield was qualified to discuss this topic, since at his youthful age, it is found that most the past eight years he has spent in prison for various offenses, including petty and grand larceny. But this is the way U.S. leadership has responded to the anarchists, the rabble-rousers and the rioters today. Our leaders have elevated the status of the "riff-raff" by according them just such recognition as that given "Catfish" Mayfield at a meeting of a group called the "Urban Coalition." It is no wonder we are in trouble today.

THE ELECTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, my hometown newspaper, the Laramie Daily Boomerang, has published an eminently sensible editorial about the soon-to-be-held elections in Vietnam, pointing out that we cannot expect stable democracy overnight, merely because an election is held, any more than we in this country produced one following the events which shook our shores in the latter part of the 18th century.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "Don't Write Off Viet Election," and a column by Frank Getlein from last night's Washington Star. Mr. Getlein takes a look at our national need to observe the rituals of democracy and self-determination.

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

[From the Laramie (Wyo.) Boomerang, Aug. 26, 1967]

DON'T WRITE OFF VIET ELECTION

No one expects stable democracy, domestic tranquility and social progress to ensue the day after the South Vietnamese presidential election.

But it would be just as foolish to write it off as a meaningless fraud before it even takes place, as some Americans seem eager to do—looking, consciously or unconsciously, for just such an excuse to justify American withdrawal from a costly, endless war.

There is plenty to criticize about the election. Only those Vietnamese living in areas more or less under government control will be able to vote. Communist candidates have been banned, as have "neutralists" whom the ruling junta disapproves of, which can mean almost anybody.

Charges of campaign chicanery and harassment of civilian candidates by the military have embittered the contest. The election of General Thieu and Marshal Ky, who already run the county, seem a certainty.

The whole affair will not be without blemish, as President Johnson admitted the other day. But, as he also pointed out, our own early days as an infant nation were not without struggle.

The Revolutionary War was not fought to establish popular democracy, though that is what eventually came about. Washington, it will be remembered, was offered a kingship by his fellow officers.

The people—the whole body of citizens, as we understand that term today—had little to do with the writing of the Constitution or its ratification by the states, or with the first national election.

To begin with, more than half a million people—one-fifth the population—were slaves, with no rights whatsoever. Tens of thousands of others were disfranchised by property qualification in nearly every state.

The parallel should not be carried too far, however. South Vietnam in 1967 is hardly the United States in 1787, nor is it even remotely as experienced in self-government as the colonies were two centuries ago.

But as the President also said, in North Vietnam today there are no candidates, no elections, no criticism of the government.

That there can be such things in South Vietnam, imperfect as they may be, is supposedly the reason we are over there.

And even if it is not the defense of democracy but mere national self-interest that has sent so many of America's sons to South Vietnam, the growth of democracy there offers the only real hope that they will ever be able to come home.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 30, 1967]

A SMALL MIRACLE OF WISH-FULFILLMENT

(By Frank Getlein)

It used to be said that American politicians—such as Edward Kennedy and Richard Nixon—were "campaigning" in Vietnam. No doubt they were. At any rate, it has rubbed off and on Sunday the South Vietnamese will have an election to choose a government. There is overwhelming agreement that the election will confirm the government already in power, that of Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu and Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky.

A number of senators and other thinkers have decried this result in advance and have even implied that if it happens that way, and if there is any reason to suspect skullduggery at the ballot box, the United States ought to pull out of the war.

There may indeed be good reasons for the United States at least to rethink its position in Vietnam, but Sunday's election isn't one of them. Whatever happens at the polls four days from now, it will not be the fault of the South Vietnamese but our own.

That the election is being held at all is a small miracle of successful American wish-fulfillment. That's fine, but we really shouldn't treat this projection as if it were an independent phenomenon in the real world. The election has its primary existence in our national—or at least in our presidential and State Department—mind. It's a figment of our imagination which happens to have taken viable form halfway around the globe.

The basic reason for the election is the simple fact that we Americans cannot face up to the realities of our position in the world.

Paramount among those realities is our simple power. Our power is confronted in many places by that of the Soviet Union and that of China, both hostile. To prevent their power from spreading into areas in which we consider that we have important interests, we engage in whatever acts seem appropriate, up to and including war.

This is the entire reason for our presence in Vietnam. Unfortunately we are strangely unable to face the fact that we behave in that way, the same way that all other great powers have always behaved and still do behave.

To disguise this reality from ourselves, we have invented a couple of other realities and have convinced ourselves that it is for the sake of those other realities that we do all those things up to and including war.

Chief of these invented realities are two: Something called "democracy" and something called "self-determination." These are considered to be great values to all nations everywhere, so great as to justify our fighting for their sake.

This form of self-deception began with the beginning of American world-power, when

we convinced ourselves we were bringing democracy and self-determination to Cuba and the Philippines. Actually, we were simply driving the foreign Spanish out of their last holdings in "our" hemisphere and at the same time picking up some of the far-flung real estate without which a great power, in those days, wouldn't have known it was a great power.

In World War I we completed the canonization of democracy and self-determination as the mystical values animating our worldwide activities of managing things for other people. Significantly, one of our principal allies in that war against Germany and Austria was Imperial Russia.

The alliance in the first place cast a somewhat strange light on the principles we were presumably fighting for, but it did more than that. It started the new, revolutionary government of Russia off in the firm belief that Western Europe and the United States were out to eliminate the revolution.

The Bolsheviks acquired their curious paranoia about us because for the sake of our imperialist allies, American, British and French troops invaded Russian territory.

In spite of our detestation of the Soviet system, we had no trouble allying ourselves with the USSR in World War II. At the conclusion of that war we demonstrated our faith in self-determination by allowing the Baltic States to become a part of Russia—as they had been under the czars. Our faith in democracy we showed by allowing all of Eastern Europe to choose communism under the encouraging tutelage of Stalin's armies.

But the war did accomplish its real goal, the destruction of Hitler. He had to be destroyed because he presented a clear and present danger to our power in Europe and elsewhere. His general beastliness had little to do with our reasons for his destruction. He had both the capacity and the announced intention to do us serious harm and therefore had to be destroyed.

Following that destruction, our ritual observance of democracy and self-determination ensured our standing by idly while in many parts of the world all order vanished completely before the chaos of the emerging nations. It is only after the chaos is complete that we feel entitled to pick up pieces.

And so there we are, on Sunday in Vietnam, picking up pieces, defending our interests and insisting that these needful acts be dressed up prettily with campaign speeches and ballot boxes.

THE QUALITIES NEEDED TO SUCCEED IN BUSINESS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a "Monday Memo" item published in the August 28 issue of Broadcasting magazine. It was written by Don P. Nathanson of North Advertising Agency in Chicago. Mr. Nathanson has written about the qualities needed for a young man who wants to succeed in business today. I would apply what he says as well to Government or to most human endeavor.

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

MONDAY MEMO—WANTED: MORE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO AIM FOR THE TOP

(NOTE.—Broadcaster-agency president Don P. Nathanson, head of North Advertising, Chicago, feels giving his time and counsel to young people is one of his most important jobs in building the business of advertising. Often a college lecturer, he also serves on many civic and industry boards and is a director of the American Association of Advertising Agencies and chairman of the 4A board's committee on improving advertising. He is part owner of the Harriscope TV-radio station group.)

(From Don P. Nathanson)

Just because you succeeded in making the top 10 of your college class is no guarantee you will succeed in the business of advertising or broadcasting.

The successful student, however, does have three advantages, the least of which is the knowledge he has accumulated in the four years of his studies. You'll be surprised how little square root and Gresham's law find their place in most offices today. Parkinson's law might be more suited. But of course knowledge does help.

The second advantage that the good student has is a pattern of succeeding. The one who perpetually failed to make it in school may get into the habit and that habit could stay with him.

The third and most important advantage is intelligence. Intelligence is not what you have learned but your ability to learn.

The examples of the college men who will never make it may be instructive by comparison. Follow their example and you may wind up with a nice wife, a home in the country and a realization that someone else made all the decisions for you all through your career.

YES MAN

The first college man who won't succeed I call Mr. Gutless. I've worked with many successful buinessmen in the past three decades and I'm convinced of one simple fact: The men who really build businesses are the men with courage. The failures are the gutless ones, the ones who won't take a chance. You must take chances in business every step of your career.

It takes courage to stand up for what you believe. The great advertising agencies of this country are the ones who do give the client a different point of view, are courageous enough to differ when it is necessary.

There are two more who won't make it. They both have guts, but at the wrong time. Mr. Right, for example, has a mental block that keeps him from admitting that anyone else can have an idea. If he is an account man he fights so hard with the client on a point that he can't absorb or listen to criticism that might be profitable.

The other man is Mr. Restless. He jumps around from job to job and never stays in the same organization long enough to do an assignment with real depth or perception. The advertising business seems to have a lot of them.

In this day of high income taxes, salary alone is not the complete answer. You must build an equity in the business and become part of the management. You must have a loyalty to the business and help it grow. I have seldom heard of an outsider in advertising moving in to head the business. It is usually someone from within who has worked his way up who becomes the head of the business.

TEAM LEADER

Mr. Caterer is still another college man who won't make the grade. His motives are too obvious. He always seems to be deferring to those who will help him up the ladder and ignoring all the people below. Whenever I interview a prospective executive I have found it more profitable to talk to those who have worked for him rather than his former bosses. His ex-employes are often better judges of his leadership potential in my book.

Obviously I disagree with Leo Durocher. I believe nice guys can reach the top. The old golden rule still applies to business too. But it's not patronizing.

Now let's look at two men who will get to the top. The first is called Mr. Make-A-Decision, the very opposite of the gutless one mentioned earlier. You can go a long way in business without making a decision just by following orders, working hard and carrying out policies.

But you'll never be a manager, a president or an owner unless sometime in your career you start making decisions. Obviously some are going to turn out wrong. But you can take consolation in the fact that if you had procrastinated and didn't make any decisions you would be much worse off.

Business, like horse racing, is a gamble and the prizes go to the men who make decisions and make the right decisions. The losers are the men who make no decisions or the wrong decisions too often.

The second kind of successful man is the classical Mr. Self-Starter. You've read about him. He's the one with initiative, who perks with an idea. But let me tell you it takes more than ideas and more than self-starting to succeed.

I had one young man who worked for me who was filled with ideas. However he didn't have the guts to tell anyone about them. He is still working in the production department of some agency—not mine.

I had another young man who would come up with 20 or 30 different ideas for every assignment. But he had no judgment. He couldn't tell the good ones from the bad.

SELF-RELIANT

I like the guy who takes an idea—whether it's his own or somebody else's—and runs with it. He shows enough initiative all along the way that he gets the job done without calling on you for help.

Advertising, broadcasting, every big business today, is looking for talented and creative young people. They are not looking for the order-takers and memo-writers though, in spite of all the jokes about the organization man. You may be sure they are not looking for the guy who thinks success is trading in his college security blanket for a giant corporation.

The man they are looking for is going to reach the top. His chances are mighty good, considering his basics of knowledge, intelligence and persistence. Mixed well with courage, open mindedness and the ability to work with people, plus initiative and follow-through, these qualities will see him to the head of the agency, station or network.

If all these qualities sound familiar, they are. They haven't changed much over the generations. Times have changed, but the people haven't.

FRONT-RUNNERS FOR REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the observations of Max Lerner on the 1968 presidential race, specifically among the front-runners for the Republican nomination. The article was published in the Evening Star of April 30, 1967.

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

THE GOP CONTEST: THREE SALESMEN AT WORK

(By Max Lerner)

Three things have happened in the Republican race for the presidency. George Romney has shifted his Vietnam war stand and is now making noises like a dove. Richard Nixon has lost his campaign manager. Ronald Reagan has taken his first big overt step as candidate by moving to detach Florida and Texas from Nixon's preconvention commitments.

The strategies of each are clear enough. Nixon's strategy is to go into the basic primaries—New Hampshire, Nebraska, Oregon,

Massachusetts, Wisconsin—with an open win-or-die resolve. The odds are that it will be die, not win.

Romney's is to use his primary victories (if he gets them) to go into the convention as the man who can beat President Johnson both on the war-and-peace issue and on the riots.

Reagan's is to face a surviving but battered Romney in the convention and stampede it. Only if Romney and Reagan get into a convention deadlock will the other two major figures, Nelson Rockefeller and Charles Percy, get a chance to break the deadlock.

Each of the three prime contenders has been polishing his political image. Romney is the political saint—going forth to war against the wickedness of the big corporate and labor units—for morality, for God's hand in human affairs.

Nixon is the political sinner who has been everywhere twice, who is quite candid about wanting Lady Power and hoping that Lady Luck will be with him this time and who is less concerned with issues or morality than with techniques, which obsess him.

Reagan is the actor playing a political scenario with undoubted and growing audience enthusiasms, but dependent—like every actor—on the maintenance of the illusion.

Each of them, in any way or another, is a salesman. Romney used to sell Rambler, Nixon used to sell the Hiss case, Reagan used to sell General Electric as a "good will ambassador." Now Romney sells purity, Nixon sells his durability, Reagan sells his political sex appeal.

Romney is at his best when he can drop in at a church get-together or a breakfast meeting of businessmen and convince them of his earnestness and dynamism—although the newspapermen who have to listen to him describe him as a "dynamic bore," and one of them assured his colleagues, "Way down deep—he's shallow."

Nixon is at his best with county and state party professionals who respect him as a political technician ready to help them in any local election chore, but in public he is like a school debater, hammering his points home without wit or lightness—and he is death on TV.

Reagan is ill-at-ease except when he is on the platform peeling off his homilies spiced with canned humor; he is at his best on TV. In fact, he is the consummate electronic candidate of our time.

My strong hunch about campaigns and elections is that neither the personality of the candidate nor the issue is decisive, but the mood of the nation. Given that mood, what counts is how the candidate and his positions interlock with it.

The mood in 1968 is likely to be compounded of war weariness, dismay over the inner city riots and the black power threats and disenchantment with Lyndon Johnson. The closest parallel is not with 1964, but with 1952, when the Republicans hammered on the triple theme—"corruption, communism, Korea." The theme this year, whoever the Republican candidate, is likely to be something like "war, riots and the credibility gap."

If I am right, I fear that neither Romney's purity nor Nixon's durability is relevant as political appeal. Romney had an impossible position on the war for a Republican candidate, too close to Johnson's for comfort, and he has now shifted to an "only a Republican President can make peace" position. Nixon is stuck with his bigger-war-to-get-peace position.

Presumably, that is Reagan's, too, but he isn't saying publicly. In 1952 the Republicans had a hero candidate, and his positions didn't count. Reagan doubtless hopes that the 1968 mood will call, if not for a hero, at least for someone who can look on TV like a strong and credible man, capable of handling wars and riots and racial threats.

The trouble is that this time it won't be as easy as it was in the governorship race, with the "sex orgies" at Berkeley and with the Rumford open-housing tangle as his good-luck charms. This time he will be measured against Hanoi and Newark and Detroit—and the illusion may come apart.

RETRAINING OF UNEMPLOYED IN PROVIDENCE, R.I.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate and the administration to the efforts being made by a group of public-spirited citizens in the capital city of Rhode Island, which is Providence, to train and retrain the unemployed and idle in the Providence area. This group has incorporated themselves under the name of Opportunities Industrialization Center of Rhode Island, Inc.

The genesis of this association began in about June 1966 when the Ministers' Alliance of Greater Providence sent a telegram and a series of petitions to my office concerning their desires to set up a project which both would be one of self-help and in the main operated for and by the Negro community that would provide vocational education, training, and job placement. At my request, a member of my staff and a counsel of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee went to Providence and met with the Ministers' Alliance and discussed their proposals in June of last year. Since that time, considerable progress had been made during the months of September through December 1966. The Rhode Island State Council of Churches and the South Providence Ministers' Association sent out their field workers and made an intensive survey of the employment needs of South Providence.

In January of 1967 Rev. Carl Banks of the South Providence Ministers' Association and Mr. Clifford Montiero, community contact officer of the State Council of Churches, attended the First National OIC Institute in Philadelphia to review their program so that the Rhode Island OIC could be modeled after it.

In February of this year it became apparent that the Federal Government had a role to play in the development of this program, both in financing and in counseling. At this point, preliminary information meetings were held by the members of the local OIC with Mr. Charles Beaubien, equal employment officer; Mr. Arthur Doyle, acting regional director; and Mr. James Christian, Rhode Island field coordinator, all of the Economical Development Administration of the Department of Commerce. This agency, EDA, is usually represented as, namely, one involved in public works projects; however, under the direction of Arthur Doyle regionally, and Ross Davis nationally, it has maintained a sense of involvement in the social problems concerned with the unemployed. Moreover, it has adopted a more sophisticated and effective approach than the usual Public Works or WPA-type measure to which we, in the Congress, are accustomed.

This agency, which will celebrate its first birthday this month, is to be commended for not only its aid and assistance to the Providence OIC project but also to its progressive attitude in its attempts to solve the continual problems that beset our cities.

Last March a further meeting was held at the Second Free-Will Baptist Church in Providence. Arthur Doyle, who at this time headed up a task force for EDA, whose purpose was to assist the Providence OIC program, brought together not only the directors of OIC, but representatives of the city, State, and private agencies which are both responsible and committed to assist the underprivileged and deprived. A member of my staff, at my request, attended this meeting and reported back to me that considerable progress had been made, and that all who attended, and there were approximately 40 people representing divergent groups or agencies, were in agreement that OIC should be implemented in the south Providence area as soon as possible.

By May of this year the Rhode Island OIC had developed a proposal and submitted it for review to EDA officials. The sparkplugs behind this proposal were in the main, the Reverend Clifford Banks; Rev. Arthur Hardge, present chairman of the Rhode Island OIC, who is also executive secretary for the Rhode Island State Commission Against Discrimination; Clifford R. Montiero; Michael S. Van Leesten, secretary of OIC; James N. Williams, a board member and executive secretary of the Urban League; and Irving J. Fain, a prominent businessman in the community, to mention just a few of the many public-spirited citizens who are committed to this proposal.

Most recently, Mr. Van Leesten and Mr. Montiero visited Washington and discussed their proposal with EDA, OEO and Department of Labor officials at meetings which were set up by my office to explore the possibility of Federal aid and assistance. Since that time, a meeting was held in the past few weeks which a member of my staff attended in Providence at which the Economical Development Administration, represented by Arthur Doyle and others, brought a member of their technical assistance funds which would give impetus to this community-spirited proposal. In this regard, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I addressed to the Honorable Ross Davis, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Commerce.

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

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1967.

Hon. ROSS DAVIS,
Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, Economic Development Administration, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: I am greatly interested in expediting an application for technical assistance funds for the Rhode Island Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc. I have been trying to assist in this matter since May of 1966, when the Ministers Alliance of Greater Providence notified me that they were desirous of having an O.I.C. program undertaken in the Providence area.

As a matter of fact, I had a member of my staff, and a counsel of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, meet with them and discuss this proposal in depth in June

of 1966. Since that time, both my staff and myself have followed the progress of O.I.C. very closely. Your agency is to be especially commended for the help and assistance it has given to the R.I.O.I.C. under the direction of Arthur Doyle, the Acting Regional Director of E.D.A.

At this time, a formal application is being prepared and I would expect that it will be in the hands of your agency within a matter of days. I hope you will make a special effort to expedite this application as rapidly as possible. There is no question in my mind that this project deserves the utmost priority. The target area where R.I.O.I.C. will be located in Providence is one in which if it were not for the efforts of Progress for Providence an especially tragic situation might well have developed this summer.

In order to cure the frustrations of poverty, every possible effort must be expended. I know you are aware that President Johnson visited the Philadelphia O.I.C. on June 29th and spoke in glowing terms of its results. It is my hope that Providence may soon have its own O.I.C. to aid its disadvantaged people. I chaired a poverty subcommittee hearing in Providence and know firsthand the problems.

I intend to pursue this matter and will most likely be talking to you on the telephone about it in the near future.

Sincerely,

CLAIBORNE PELL.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the spirit of the OIC program, founded in 1964 by the Reverend Leon H. Sullivan in Philadelphia, is such that it has swept across this land and has given motivation and skills to thousands of Americans who were previously regarded as unemployable. The OIC program impressed the President of the United States to the extent that on June 29 he visited the first Opportunities Industrialization Center in Philadelphia. I ask unanimous consent to have President Johnson's remarks printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE OPPORTUNITIES INDUSTRIALIZATION CENTER, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Judge Higginbotham, Reverend Sullivan, Senator Scott, Congressman Barrett, Congressman Nix, Congressman Byrne, Congressman Eilberg, Congressman Green, our own Sargent Shriver, Mr. Jones, Mr. Rosen, Mr. Toohey, Mr. Potts, Cliff Alexander—our new Chairman of the Equal Opportunities Commission, ladies and gentlemen:

I am sorry that Mayor Tate and Senator Clark, both of whom support our program, could not be with us today, but I knew only late last night that I could be here myself.

What I have seen this morning has moved me more than I can tell you.

Mr. Coleman, who honors us with his presence, was asked to come to Washington to head our Civil Rights Conference last year. Later I asked him to come into one of the most important jobs in this Nation.

He said to me, "I will come and serve my country wherever I am needed, but I think I am needed more at home in Philadelphia right now."

I can see that a lot of people are needed at home. I see what a lot of people are doing at home. What Reverend Sullivan has shown me this morning opens my eyes and I hope will open the eyes of all of the nation to the opportunity that lies here.

Sargent Shriver asked me earlier in the week to go and speak to 10,000 of the young business leaders of this country. We went to Baltimore to meet with the Junior Chamber of Commerce from all over the nation—from the 50 States.

We talked to them about what was right. We pointed out some of the things that were wrong—our slums and our poverty, our health needs and our educational needs. We then pointed out some of the things that we are doing about them.

When you really talk about what is right, you don't appear to be nearly as interesting as you are when you talk about what is wrong. But I have seen so many things that are right here this morning that I wish everyone in America could not only see them, but emulate them—and follow them.

If somebody falls down the step—that will get a lot of attention. But the poor lady that lifts him up goes unnoticed.

So if I had to sum up my feelings in a single phrase this morning, I would say to all of you: "I believe we are going to make it."

What I have seen here with Reverend Sullivan is not just an institution—it is a unique training program. I have seen men and women whose self-respect is beginning to burn inside them like a flame—like a furnace that will fire them all their lives.

I had heard about this Center for many months. Some of my White House employees have come here to visit it incognito. I don't know whether they are afraid to admit they are from the White House or not.

Friends and associates of mine have come back to tell me about it and to bring me the good news—of how a movement born of protest has taken the next logical step—to preparation.

They told me how men, stirred to righteous anger by the conditions of poverty that surrounded them on every side, had first fought to break down the doors of discrimination;

Then found that those they fought for were not prepared to even seize the opportunities that had been opened before them;

And so they had begun to build—simply, just using whatever tools they owned, or could borrow, or they could obtain by gift—a place where the men and women could find themselves.

That is what you have done. That is what these Centers are all about. It is a place where people find the power that they have always had—power that was always within them—but that had been obscured because of lack of confidence, because of feelings of insecurity, because of self-doubt and trapped by the conviction of failure.

Now I have seen this place this morning myself. I have seen the old jail where it started. I have opened that jailhouse door—it had been opened before I came—the jail that Reverend Sullivan wanted because, as he said:

"It is the most dank, most dismal place in town, a symbol of tragedy. If I could transform that building, I could transform men."

That building had further to go than most human beings have to go and it has arrived.

I have seen some of those who are just beginning the transformation of their lives, learning the basic skills of reading and writing. I have seen some of those who are about to become metal workers, beauticians, draftsmen, computer operators, welders, electronics specialists, or refrigeration specialists, or textile workers.

And now I see those who are already on their way—providing brighter lives for their families, contributing to their country's economy, and holding their heads high in the deep pride of real accomplishment.

I don't know whether I saw a Supreme Court Justice or not this morning. I don't know whether I saw a Member of the President's Cabinet or not this morning. I don't know whether I saw a Federal Judge or not this morning. But I know I looked into the eyes of men and women this morning and saw people who are going to keep our flag flying and keep this nation moving forward in the line of progress for the world.

I saw human beings who had pride in their eyes instead of fear. I saw human beings who carried their shoulders straight and high and their chins up and their chests out—instead of doubt and hate.

The Federal Government did not do this. The Federal Government did not build this Center. Mr. Shriver has testified for years and he has fought day and night to help. But the Government or the Members of Congress who are here who supported him did not do it.

Neither business nor labor, who honor us with their presence, nor philanthropy, nor the city officials built it. All of us, it is true, are helping it now, and I am proud of the part, the small part, that some of us down in Washington are playing.

But what built this Center is the spirit that is in the breast of every human who is a part of it—the spirit that wants to say "yes" to life itself, that wants to affirm the dignity of man, whatever his origins, whatever his race, whatever his religion.

That same spirit has given power and direction to all that we have tried to do in our years of leadership with the Great Society in this nation.

That spirit is what created Head Start. That spirit was there when Head Start was born. That spirit inspired the Manpower Training program. It is that spirit that lies behind the Job Corps.

I have a boy on my farm, where I am going to be tonight, who came from a broken family in California. After seven months in the Job Corps, he went to work for the President of the United States as a skilled bulldozer operator running a big caterpillar tractor. Now he is going into the Service in a few months to serve his country—much more competent, much more determined, and loving his country a great deal more, I think, than when he went into the Job Corps.

That spirit is what built the Neighborhood Youth Corps. That same spirit passed the broadest civil rights acts this nation has ever known. That spirit passed the first medical care bill in the history of this nation. That spirit passed the first elementary education bill.

That spirit is spending three times as much today on education in the Federal Government as we were spending three years ago. You can look into the twinkle of their eyes and the smile on their faces, and you can see that that education is getting results.

That spirit has spent three times as much in the last three years on medical health problems in this country as it did three years ago—$12 billion compared to $4 billion for health; $12 billion compared to $4 billion for education. $24 billion compared to $8 billion three years ago.

Then they try to tell us about how we can cut out all of these programs. When I came to Washington under Mr. Hoover's Administration, the whole Budget was just five and a half billion dollars.

Now we are spending five times that much for health and education. Every dime we spend is getting value received because the best investment you can make in this country is in the mind of the human being and in the bodies of its citizens.

Some of the blood of that same spirit is on that bill this morning. It wrote the Teacher Corps Program and that bill that I am going to sign into law right here in your presence. It will bring the best instruction that America can produce to the children who need it most.

We are going to have the best teachers come to where they are needed most, under the Teacher Corps—come and work with the children of poverty. It is only a very small program now. It has been difficult enough to even get it passed. But with the help

of that same spirit, I promise you—it is going to grow—and how.

All that we have done so far will count for little—except for your spirit and except for your help. If you help, there is not anything that we cannot do—together.

The problems of poverty, the consequences of discrimination, the ignorance and the helplessness that are passed on from one generation to the other, are almost too great for us to comprehend or master. Almost, I said, almost too great—for they were all created by the failures of men. There is nothing pre-ordained about them.

Being created by men, though, they can be overcome by men. They can be overcome by the restless spirit that speaks to all of us in the darkest hours, and that spirit says, "Have faith in yourself. Believe in yourself. Have pride in yourself. Prepare yourself for the work you must do in the days ahead."

I think that you have heard that spirit. I think that you have faith in yourself. I think you are preparing yourself.

I know that you have inspired your President. I know you have made me feel, as I said in the beginning, that we—all 200 million of us in this country—are going to make it.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the motto of the OIC is "We help ourselves"; but as Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., said on a nationwide TV show recently, "Before a man can pull himself up by his bootstraps, he first must have the boots." Therefore, it is vitally important that this program be funded in part by the Federal Government as rapidly as possible. I say funded in part by the Federal Government, because already this self-help program has raised funds in the local community, and this even before undertaking a full-fledged fundraising campaign.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief descriptive brochure of the Rhode Island OIC program.

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

THE KEY TO A BETTER TOMORROW

What do the letters O.I.C. stand for?—Opportunities Industrialization Center.

What is the purpose of O.I.C.?—The Center proposes to train and retrain the underemployed and idle, with undiscovered talents, on a qualitative and massive scale in preparation for employment in industry.

Is there any cost for training?—O.I.C. is a free institute of training. The only requirement to join O.I.C. is a real desire to help yourself.

Where did O.I.C. begin?—In 1964 the first O.I.C. was founded by the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan of Philadelphia. The program was so successful that it triggered a chain reaction throughout the country for people who want and need to help themselves.

O.I.C. is based on the following principles:

(1) Self-help on the part of all trainees; no weekly or monthly subsistence payments to those undergoing the training.

(2) Building a favorable self-image for the trainees.

(3) Psychological conditioning and motivation of trainees through a "feeder" program as a preparation for entrance into skills training courses.

(4) Training only for real jobs—positions that exist in the world of work and that are actually available locally.

(5) Training according to the latest knowledge and techniques of industry. "Yesterday skills cannot prepare one for today's jobs."

(6) Wide community interest and support of O.I.C. as an operation that is managed by the indigenous people themselves, with highly-trained personnel as consultants. We seek a balance between "science" and "the spirit of the people."

The wheels are rolling for Rhode Island O.I.C., but the success of this program is simply a matter of your time, interest, and participation. Look around you—are there jobs that interest you out of your reach because you lack the money to pay for the training that is required? Are there training programs that offer training but no jobs? Most of us know that the above two questions can be answered very quickly with a truthful yes.

At Rhode Island O.I.C. the training will be geared toward jobs that really exist and there will be no financial cost. The only price you will have to pay, is once again, your time, interest to help yourself, and participation.

This flyer is meant to serve as a basic introduction of the O.I.C. program. There will be more information spread throughout the community about the program in the very near future letting you know how you will be able to participate in the program as either a trainee or a volunteer worker.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the reasons why I believe the administration should move quickly in this matter are evident, for on August 10 I spoke here on the floor of the Senate regarding the contribution of the OEO employees to the prevention of what could have been a grave disturbance in Providence; in fact, in the very area where the OIC program will be located. This area is one in which there is aura of pessimism and fatalism amongst the impoverished inhabitants that tend to see life as a fate, an endless cycle from which there is no deliverance; and thereby, they contain the seeds of frustration and depression which can explode into violence unless the chains of poverty which bind them are not finally broken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of newspaper articles concerning the disturbances which took place in this target area during the past month. The articles point up the need for Federal action today and not tomorrow.

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

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Aug. 2, 1967]

RHODE ISLAND CALLS TROOPERS, GUARD IN PROVIDENCE OUTBREAK

(By Patrick Gilbo)

PROVIDENCE, R.I.—Police and snipers traded gunfire in the second consecutive night of violence Tuesday while more than 100 youths crying "white power" tried to attack gangs of Negroes hurling rocks and bottles.

Heavily-armed police invaded the Willard Avenue shopping center and fought from behind fire trucks and cruisers as they simultaneously fought the snipers and tried to keep a wedge between threatening whites and Negroes.

The state's Air National Guard and four units of the Army National Guard—three engineer outfits and a military police company—were ordered on alert at about midnight. They formed at their armories awaiting further orders from State Adj. Gen. Leonard Holland.

Some 100 riot-trained and heavily-armed state troopers were sent to central police headquarters but were not sent to the scene of violence.

One liquor store was looted but there were no other major reports of looting.

About 75 whites attacked an automobile they thought was driven by a Negro, smashing its front and rear windows before they discovered the man, Ernest Pistocco, 34, of Providence, was white.

"I was just driving along when they started throwing stones and rocks at my car. I slammed on my brakes and jumped out—that's when they saw I was white and stopped," Pistocco said. He was unhurt.

At least 13 persons were arrested and 22 others injured, including a Negro youth, Eugene Sawyers, 15, of Providence, who was shot in the stomach. He was taken to Rhode Island Hospital. One other youth was shot in the foot but treated and released.

The other injured, all treated and released at the same hospital, included five policemen, a fireman and 13 civilians. The fireman was stoned as he fought a blaze in an occupied house not far from the shopping center where the violence erupted at 8:30 p.m.

Police, who exchanged gunfire for the first time since the violence first flared Monday night, were firing from a command post position in one corner of the shopping center.

Many store windows in the center were smashed and there were unconfirmed reports of Molotov cocktails being hurled at buildings. Fire officials reported numerous false alarms.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 2, 1967]

SOUTH PROVIDENCE ROUTS NEGRO GANGS

PROVIDENCE, R.I., August 1.—Some 200 Negro youths in dozens of gangs prowled the streets of predominantly Negro South Providence last night and early today, hurling rocks, bricks and bottles before 350 heavily armed policemen restored calm.

The police said that the trouble started when the owner of a lemonade stand at the Willard Street Shopping Center, a hangout for Negro youths, began defending his stand with a gun. The stand was destroyed by rock-hurling youths.

Two Negro youths were shot. Neither was injured seriously.

At least four persons were stabbed, and three policemen were injured.

There were reports of sporadic sniper activity and looting. Several minor fires were started.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 3, 1967]

CURFEW IMPOSED IN PROVIDENCE, R.I.—MAYOR ACTS TO STEM STRIFE—NEGRO AREA AFFECTED

(By Douglas Robinson)

PROVIDENCE, R.I., August 2.—Sporadic acts of violence were reported tonight in South Providence after two successive nights of clashes between the police and angry bands of Negro youths.

The relative quiet was attributed to a loose curfew ordered for the section tonight by Mayor Joseph A. Doorley.

The order, issued after a special session of the City Council, imposed a 9 P.M. to 6 A.M. curfew designed to keep both Negro and white youths off the street.

Those with legitimate reasons for being out were allowed to continue after showing identification.

Some 40 state policemen were still in the city out of an original force of 100 sent here last night to help the Providence police force maintain order.

About 1,000 National Guardsmen were called into Providence and Pawtucket armories last night, but were released this morning at 2 A.M.

By 11 o'clock tonight, most residents were off the streets of the predominantly Negro section.

The police were aided by a group of 50 antipoverty workers, most of them Negroes, who patrolled the streets on foot and in cars urging people to obey the curfew. The volunteers wore white helmets so that the police could recognize them.

Several small fires were set during the evening at various points in the city but the police said they were not sure that the incidents were connected with racial unrest.

A police sergeant said that a white woman and her year-old baby had been cut by flying glass when a rock was thrown through their car window as they were driving through South Providence.

For the most part, however, the streets were quiet. "I haven't seen a summer night this peaceful in 20 years," a resident said. "usually there are people strolling or sitting in chairs on the sidewalk."

EMERGENCY POWERS

At the special council session, the 24-member body gave Mayor Doorley almost unlimited emergency powers to handle the disturbances, which have included sniper fire directed again both policemen and firemen.

The ordinance, which was passed unanimously, gave the Mayor authority to establish a curfew, ban the sale of firearms and ammunition, forbid the sale or delivery of alcoholic beverages, ban the sale of gasoline, and prohibit the gathering of six or more persons.

The ordinance directed the Mayor to take "any and all steps necessary to preserve the public peace, property, health and safety of the inhabitants of the City of Providence" and provided a $200 fine for violations.

Mayor Doorley, however, only invoked the curfew over an area bounded by Broad Street on the west, Interstate Route 95 on the east, the juncture of these two highways on the north, and Byfield Street on the south.

Most of Providence's 15,000 Negroes live within the teardrop-shaped curfew area. The city has a population of some 187,000 persons.

Late last night 20 persons were injured when sniper fire was directed at a large group of policemen at the Willard Avenue Shopping Center. The police responded with a fusillade of about 50 shots. None of the policemen or the snipers were hit.

One liquor store was looted and many store windows were shattered in the melee.

Three persons were wounded in random incidents several blocks away from the shopping center. The most seriously wounded was 15-year-old Eugene Sawyers, a Negro, who was shot in the abdomen. He was listed in fair condition at Rhode Island State Hospital.

At least 72 persons were arrested during the early morning hours. Nineteen were referred to the juvenile authorities, 11 went to court on charges of disorderly conduct and for carrying weapons, and the rest were released. Many of those arrested were white.

[From the Providence Journal, Aug. 2, 1967] 1967]

POLICE, YOUTHS EXCHANGE SHOTS—TWO ARE WOUNDED IN SOUTH PROVIDENCE

Gunfire between police and youths broke out in South Providence last night, wounding two persons sending 100 state troopers to the area and 1,000 National Guardsmen to their armories.

A Negro youth was wounded in a fierce gunbattle about midnight. Another man was injured, not seriously, as sporadic gunfire and sniping continued for more than an hour. By 2 a.m. today nearly 50 persons had been taken into custody.

The sudden worsening of the situation brought Governor Chafee back to the state from a vacation. He went to the Providence police station for an emergency meeting with city officials. The alert for the National Guard was rescinded at 2 a.m. At the same time Providence police began returning to their stations, state police were released a half hour later.

The shooting began on Prairie Avenue between Dudley and Blackstone Streets. The injured youth, Eugene Sawyers, 15, of 330 Friendship St., was in the area and was shot in the abdomen.

About 1,000 Rhode Island National Guardsmen were assembling early today at armories in Providence and Pawtucket. Governor Chafee returned from a vacation and went to the police station.

Police said the firing began when five or six Negro youths in a house at the corner of Prairie Avenue and Dudley Street fired on a police squad moving up Prairie Avenue.

Police took up positions behind their cars a block away at Prairie Avenue and Blackstone Street. Some fired shotguns at the house.

A fusillade of about 50 shots followed, most of them from police revolvers in about 10 minutes.

Police flushed out the youths from the house and chased them up Blackstone Street. Four Negro youths with a rifle in a car were picked up at 12:20 a.m. It was not known if they were involved in the shooting.

Between 12:05 and 1 a.m. scattered gunfire was reported by police in the area near the Willard Avenue Shopping Center.

The Sawyers youth was taken to Rhode Island Hospital with a spleen wound. He was rolled into the operating room and his name was placed on the danger list.

Another person who was wounded by gunfire shortly after midnight was identified at St. Joseph's Hospital as Melvin Collins, 27, of 58 Gay St., who was treated at the hospital for a gunshot wound in the right leg.

Hospital authorities said the wound pierced the leg and did not strike any bones. They said the man was in satisfactory condition.

A woman who said she was Mr. Collins' wife, said her husband was shot as they were walking on Robinson Street and that the shot came from a group of police at the street corner.

At about 12:30 a.m. Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr. asked for state police reinforcements and 100 troopers were sent to the police station.

Mayor Doorley said he asked the state police to help because some Providence policemen had been on duty since 4 p.m. Monday.

The mayor said the city council will hold an emergency meeting at 11 a.m. today and that he may ask for curfew and other emergency powers.

Early today, police wagons began arriving at police headquarters every five or 10 minutes unloading groups of prisoners. Most of those arrested were white. Police could not estimate how many people they had in the cells by one o'clock this morning although the arrests apparently numbered more than two dozen.

Like the disturbances Monday night, most of the rock-throwing, window-smashing and other violence was in the area of the shopping center at Prairie Avenue.

According to rumors that have swept the community, last night was to have been the night for a severe riot resulting in death and destruction, including the burning of Crescent Park in East Providence.

A prayer march through South Providence that had been anticipated did not materialize either.

At least six policemen and a fireman were hurt, none seriously.

At least a dozen civilians were injured.

The police department sent between 175 and 200 men into South Providence. Some carried rifles and shields and wore helmets.

Some persons from other areas of the city drove through the part of the area that was not blocked off by police. Often their cars were pelted with a barrage of missiles.

A few fires, none of them major, were fought by firemen operating under special emergency orders. A few firebombs were thrown.

Rumors of disturbances had spread throughout the city and state yesterday as they had last weekend and Monday and police authorities had prepared for trouble.

Yesterday was the day Emancipation Day is usually celebrated here and the first anniversary of similar disturbances in the same area. Last year's incidents were the first disturbances involving large number of Negroes in Providence in many years.

One of the rumors was that large numbers of Negroes would go to Crescent Park in East Providence, as usually happens on Emancipation Day.

However, fewer than a dozen Negroes were seen at the park at any one time last night. About 70 policemen patrolled the area. Sometime policemen outnumbered patrons.

Because of the widespread rumors of violence, police had asked stores not to sell guns. Harry Goldstein, public safety commissioner, said most complied.

The commissioner said some stores downtown had closed early yesterday. He said police had not asked them to close and they did so for "lack of business."

He said he also had asked gas stations not to sell small quantities of gas in order to curb fire bombing.

Mayor Doorley remained in the center of the city to keep in close touch with the situation.

Earlier in the day, John Reynolds, 21, who came to Rhode Island recently to set up a chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said he was asking ministers to go to South Providence to pray for peace. There were no reports of any widespread movement of the kind he called for.

THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY FIREMEN ON DUTY

At 7:30 p.m. the fire department began a plan that put about 380 men, almost the entire firefighting division, on duty. In addition to the normal men and equipment, five task forces were set up. This added 15 pieces of equipment to the force.

Under the plan, six firemen rode on each ladder truck or engine. The trucks used main streets.

Firemen were told to use heavy 2½-inch lines instead of the usual 1½-inch lines. They were ordered to leave a fire if stoned or shot at.

The South Providence area was quiet about 8 p.m. About 30 young persons were standing and talking in the shopping center as on a normal summer night. Small groups were on porches.

Few police were in the shopping center area. One patrol car and an unmarked car occasionally passed through the area. The police displayed no helmets or guns at this time.

More persons began to gather in the shopping center. About 9 p.m. someone threw a stone through the window of a laundromat at the center and the alarm bell began to ring. A few other windows in the area were broken.

Fannie M. Carpenter, 44, of 287½ Willard Ave., suffered a cut on the left arm at the center and was treated at Rhode Island Hospital. It was not known how she suffered the cut.

About 20 policemen wearing blue helmets went to the center as between 50 and 75 young persons gathered across Prairie Avenue from the center.

At 9:15 p.m., police ordered Prairie Avenue blocked off at Public Street to prevent persons from going into the area.

At about 9:30 p.m. two patrolmen, Frank Cotioa and Thomas Brandenburg, were hit by flying rocks and treated at Rhode Island Hospital.

DETECTIVES ON ROOF

Col. Howard A. Franklin, chief of police, ordered a half dozen detectives to the roof of the buildings in the shopping center.

Someone in a group of about 40 Negro youths at Prairie Avenue and Dudley Street near the shopping center threw a bottle filled with gas at a car containing white persons.

The firebomb flared up but no injuries were reported.

About 20 helmeted policemen moved from the shopping center to disperse the group and were showered with bottles and rocks. Another firebomb was thrown at them.

Across Prairie Avenue from the shopping center, about 40 or 50 youths had gathered. Kenneth Delves, assistant director for the Progress for Providence drop-in center nearby persuaded most of them to go inside.

Mr. Delves used a bullhorn to talk to the youngsters. He said later that a sailor from Quonset Point Naval Air Station, who had been in the Watts riots, had been yelling profanities over the bullhorn.

At about 9:40 p.m. Colonel Franklin told one of his captains, "I want some arrests made tonight."

Throughout the night groups of young men gathered in front of Beery's Cafe across Prairie Avenue from the center and hurled stones, bottles and other objects at policemen in the shopping center parking lot in front of the stores.

About 100 policemen worked out of a command post behind the shopping center, but usually there were no more than 30 policemen in the center at one time.

At about 10 p.m. Gerald Coreia, 18, of 302½ Willard Ave. was shot in the left ankle on Dudley Street and treated at Rhode Island Hospital. He told police he did not know who fired the shot.

Paul Coffey, 29, of 231 Burnside St. said he was hit in the face by a stone as he rode in a truck driven by John T. Keegan, 45, of 164 Massachusetts Ave. He said the incident occurred at Point Street. He was treated at the hospital.

About the same time, Joseph Garrity Jr., a city fireman, and Patrolman John T. Brady were treated for minor injuries. The fireman cut his hand at a small fire on Sayles Street and the policeman was hit by a brick.

At about 10:30 p.m. Patrolman Richard Fishburn went to investigate a broken window at Tony's Spa, Prairie Avenue and Pearl Street, and a wine bottle crashed through the windshield of his car. He was treated for glass in the eye and did not return to duty.

Others treated at Rhode Island Hospital were:

Grace Kay, 16, of 28 Bridgham St., who was injured in the back by an unknown object on Prairie Avenue about 9:50 p.m.

Joseph Perreault, 34, of 295 Manton Ave., who suffered face cuts when the windshield of his car was smashed while he was driving down Prairie Avenue. He was picked up by a city rescue truck at Dorrance and Westminster Streets and brought to the hospital shortly before 10 p.m.

Joan Rocchio, 7, and her sister, Constance, 4, of 260 Sayles St., who suffered from smoke inhalation from a fire next door to their home.

Louis Correia, 42, of 15 Providence St., who received a nose cut when hit by an unknown object in front of his home about 10:55 p.m.

FOUR-HOUR PERIOD

Most of the disturbances late Monday and early yesterday came within a four-hour period and most were in South Providence near the shopping center.

Ten policemen and eight civilians were injured in the incidents. Most of the injured policemen were cut and bruised by flying glass, bricks or bottles. None was hospitalized.

Five of the injured citizens were cut or bruised in apparently separate incidents and were not hurt seriously.

Three men, all of whom were stabbed in apparently separate incidents, were admitted to Rhode Island Hospital and were reported in satisfactory or fair condition last night.

They are Christos Leakopoukos, 37, of 28 Frank St., fair, Thomas Downey, 65, of 67 Linden St., satisfactory and Curtis A. Gatlin, 24, of 67 Wendell St., fair, and in the extensive care unit with multiple wounds.

[From the Providence Journal, Aug. 3, 1967]

SOUTH PROVIDENCE IS CALM AS CURFEW GOES INTO EFFECT

South Providence, where street violence erupted Monday and Tuesday, was calm last night as a curfew was imposed in the entire area.

The Willard Avenue Shopping Center and nearby streets, where police and Negro youths exchanged gunfire Tuesday night, virtually were deserted.

Few people were outside. Traffic was light.

The curfew ordered by Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr. for 9 p.m. last night to 6 a.m. today apparently was the chief reason for the quiet in the area.

The mayor said late last night the curfew will be imposed again at 9 o'clock tonight. After that, he said, a decision whether to continue it will be made daily.

Two square miles of the city fell within the boundaries of the curfew, Route 95 on the east and Broad Street on the West.

A small force of policemen stopped some persons to ask where they were going.

About 30 young Negro volunteers for Progress for Providence, the city antipoverty agency, walked through the streets telling residents about the curfew.

No police blockades were used. A large force of policemen was ready at the police station but stayed out of South Providence.

Five state police cars, each containing four troopers, patrolled the city.

The mayor was empowered to impose the curfew in an ordinance passed by the city council in an emergency session yesterday.

The ordinance also gave the mayor extensive other powers, including regulation of firearms and alcoholic beverages, but he used none of them.

Three firebombs were thrown into buildings on the East Side, not included by the curfew, but little damage and no injuries were reported.

Only one incident was reported that caused injury to persons in the South Providence area. Shortly after 9 p.m., a rock was thrown at the windshield of a car being driven on Public Street near Plain Street and broken glass cut two front seat passengers.

They are Mrs. Eileen Kohler, 20, of 717 Providence St., West Warwick, and her one-year-old son, Thomas J. Kohler. They were treated at Rhode Island Hospital. Police said the incident occurred as Mrs. Kohler's husband, Thomas, 23, was driving.

Monday and Tuesday night were vastly different than last night. Nearly 40 persons were injured, most not seriously, those nights and more than 75 taken to the police station.

Heavily armed police were pelted with rocks, bottles and other objects. More than 75 shots were fired Tuesday.

Authorities were hopeful yesterday that last night would be quiet, but made preparations for trouble anyway.

By early evening, about 250 Providence policemen were on duty. This was about 50 fewer than on Monday and Tuesday nights. Col. Howard A. Franklin, police chief, said he wanted to give his men as much rest as possible.

About 45 state troopers with riot equipment assembled at the police station and an additional 60 troopers were on alert at barracks throughout the state.

Fire officials said no extra firemen were on duty.

No National Guardsmen had been alerted, Maj. Gen. Leonard Holland, state adjutant general, said early last night.

At 7:30 p.m. South Providence was quiet and only one police car was in the shopping center.

An hour later, no more than two dozen persons were in the shopping center parking lot next to Prairie Avenue.

The 20 volunteer workers for Progress for Providence met in a store front in the shopping center and began walking through the residential streets about 9 p.m.

They told residents of the curfew, urged some to stay off the street and escorted some home. The volunteers wore white helmets with the letters PC on them. The helmets had been borrowed from Providence College.

The police broadcast a radio message that policemen were to be courteous to the volunteers and that they were working for the police department.

The firebombs were thrown on the East Side about 9:45 p.m. and did little damage.

A brick and two soda bottles with wicks and filled with fuel were tossed through two windows at the Hung-Up Associates Inc. clothing store at 357 Hope St. Two boys were seen running from the store.

The firebombs ignited and burned a chair and rug in the store, which was closed for the night, and police stamped out the flames before firemen arrived.

A firebomb was tossed into a building on Grand View Street near North Main Street. The bomb did not activate. Police searched the area for youngsters reportedly dressed in black but caught no one.

In South Providence about 10:30 p.m., windows at Prairie Avenue and Elma Street were broken by rocks.

The shopping center was quiet and few persons were on the streets in the area. A half dozen policemen were in the parking lot of the center.

Two youths, 17 and 13 years old, were apprehended by police as they allegedly tried to kick in the door of Sock's Liquor Store, 312 Point St. They will be referred to Family Court for violating the curfew, police said.

PROVISIONS OF ORDINANCE

The city council passed the emergency ordinance shortly before 1 p.m.

It includes specific authority to establish the curfew, ban the sale of firearms and ammunition, ban the sale or delivery of alcoholic beverages and the sale of gasoline and prohibit the gathering of six or more persons.

A $200 fine for violations was stipulated.

According to the ordinance, the mayor can take "any and all steps necessary to preserve the public peace, property, health and safety of the inhabitants" of the city.

The council session was preceded by a closed bipartisan caucus, the first ever held, in which councilmen agreed to give Mayor Doorley the power he requested.

The ordinance says the mayor shall act by executive order to control disturbances. It became effective by passage and will be canceled either by executive order or by a council resolution declaring the emergency is over.

In the disturbances Monday night, 10 policemen and eight civilians were injured. Three of the civilians were hospitalized with stab wounds.

Tuesday night police were met with gunfire, first at Prairie Avenue near Blackstone Street about midnight, and then in about a dozen sporadic incidents.

FIRST OUTBREAK

The first outbreak of firing was the most severe. Police and Negro youths in a vacant house exchanged about 50 shots. The youths were not apprehended.

Police said part of the trouble was caused by white youths in cars cruising through the area and arousing resentment.

In the violence, three persons were shot, one seriously, and 22 others suffered minor cuts and bruises. Nine of the 27 were policemen.

A total of 72, most of them young white adults, were taken to the police station. Nineteen juveniles were referred to juvenile authorities, and 11 of the adults were sent to court, most of them on disorderly conduct or weapons charges. The rest were released.

At about 12:30 a.m. yesterday Mayor Doorley asked for state police assistance. About

100 troopers went to the police station and 40 of them to the shopping center.

About 1,000 state National Guardsmen were told to report to their armories, but they were sent home at 2 a.m., when most of the area had become quiet.

"SOUL PATROL" CHECKS ON CURFEW: QUIET WAS UNBELIEVABLE

(By C. Fraser Smith)

Teams of Progress for Providence workers strolled through a hushed South Providence last night unable to believe the quiet of the section in which most of them grew up.

Organized into teams of four, the "Soul Patrol" moved out of the Willard Avenue Shopping Center shortly after nine. With them was a woman who was not aware of the curfew set by city officials yesterday.

Escorting her home, they walked by the vacant house on Prairie Avenue between Dudley and Blackstone Streets where snipers exchanged fire with police Tuesday night.

Robert Young, 19, of 109 Chester Ave., stopped at the corner house on the north side of the street. He pointed at several bullet holes in the peeling white columns of the house. The night before the street had been filled with the sound of gunfire.

Last night, the entire area was calm. Four young people walked quickly by the white helmeted patrol. They said they would get off the street.

"We are operating on the theory that many people don't know about the curfew," one of the workers said. They turned left on Dudley Street, where firemen had been pelted by bottles and bricks two nights before. For the first 100 yards along the unlighted street they met no one. Barking dogs offered the only break in the stillnes.

"I've never seen it this quiet here and I've been living in this area for 12 years," Young said.

"It's almost too quiet," said Felix Donaiwa, 27, who is working with the antipoverty agency to develop a rehabilitation program for drug addicts.

From the end of Dudley Street, they turned down West Clifford at about 9:10 p.m., after speaking to people in a car. The driver had pulled away immediately.

At West Clifford and Pearl Street they corralled three youngsters walking down from Broad Street. These three were escorted home also.

At Pearl Street and Prairie Avenue, a spot where a brick smashed the windshield of a police car on the first night of the disturbances, they turned back toward the center. The first police car they had seen passed slowly at 9:45 p.m.

Coming again to the corner of Dudley Street, they turned left and moved toward Rhode Island Hospital.

A younger boy in a white tee shirt passed going swiftly the other way. "The man's going to grab you. It's going to cost you if you get caught," he was told.

Another youth taunted them gently. "Why don't you guys have billy clubs?" he asked.

"Hey, I forgot where my house is," he added. They kept walking as he left the street.

"Any trouble up there yet, Robert," someone yelled from the shadows referring to the center. "Not yet," he answered.

At Dudley and Gay they met the only group who refused to listen. "They knew about the curfew, but they're going to stay out," said Lester Fairweather, 22, a detached worker.

They turned down Gay to Blackstone, turned right and moved past the Flynn School. Half way up the block they stopped to talk to Walter Steele, 58, of 239 Blackstone St.

"I just put my wife on the bus for Delaware," he said. "She's got a heart condition." Mr. Steele, who has a grocery store at the corner of Blackstone and Gay Streets, said he hoped he'd get some sleep.

"I CAN'T FIGHT"

"I haven't been to sleep in two days," he said. He had been up watching the turmoil in the center from his porch, while keeping an eye on his store, he said.

"I can't fight," he said. "I'm 58 years old. I'll fight for my rights, but I can't go up there with those guys."

By then it was 10. A car passed and was stopped by Mr. Fairweather's whistle.

"He was coming in from New Bedford. Didn't know about the curfew," he reported.

Later, while checking out reports of fire bombs on the East Side, the workers said they had hoped the curfew would be extended to that area.

"What I'm worried about," said Lonnie Wilkinson, 22, of 105 Rugby St., "is what will happen at 1 a.m. when all those joints close down." He was afraid that a lot of people would begin to move back into the South Providence with trouble in mind.

FAINTLY IN RED

They drove beyond Cypress Street and stopped in front of a boarded store front with the letters "K.K.K." painted faintly in red. Someone reported trouble on Pleasant Street. They turned around.

As their car came to the intersection of Pleasant and Camp Street, they stopped. The macadam disappeared down a black cavern. There were no street lights.

"Boy, I'm not driving down there," the driver said, "Soul Brother or not."

But they would walk, they decided. "If we can see them we can talk to them," they reasoned.

More than 10 of the 29 Progress for Providence workers were in the Camp Street area by then. They stopped each police car they passed.

"Can we help you?" they asked. The police briefed them each time. There was teamwork.

[From the Providence Journal, Aug. 5, 1967]

MISTAKES AIRED IN SOUTH PROVIDENCE

(By Douglas C. Wilson)

Youngsters were back to playing pool again at the South Providence Drop-In Center yesterday. It was almost a normal day.

There were still a few reminders of the violence that erupted in the neighborhood four nights earlier. Police and city officials were meeting with a group of young Negroes who sat with helmets at the far end of the room.

Across the street, at the Willard Avenue Shopping Center, the boards were still covering shattered windows. And right next to one of the pool tables was a new sign in red and black letters:

"Are you willing to donate blood for Eugene Sawyers?" it asked. The sign covered an earlier poster with a happier question—"Would you like to be queen of the South Providence Drop-In Center?"

Eugene Sawyers, 15, of 330 Friendship St., was shot in the Tuesday night violence. He remained in fair condition last night in Rhode Island Hospital. His name is on the danger list.

One other name, a volunteer blood donor's, was written on the poster when the officials and the men with the helmets began their meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Cleveland Kurtz, a group worker for Progress for Providence, Inc., and one of 22 volunteers who aided police in the recent crisis, said he called the meeting to discuss "the things that we did wrong and the things that we did right."

About 25 persons attended the informal session, which was marked by some earnest discussion—and also a touch of Monday morning quarterbacking.

The workers of the volunteer group which calls itself the "Soul Patrol" carried their helmets and flashlights because they were facing another stint of enforcing the city's curfew, beginning early this morning.

But in the hour they talked to Capt. Walter A. McQueeney, of the city's police department, John Cicilline, administrative assistant to Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr., and state police representatives, they were looking back.

The police came in for a little verbal sniping as Errol Hunt, director of the center, told Captain McQueeney: "Your tactics were poor. One of the worst things you did was to surround the drop-in center, when the kids inside weren't doing anything wrong. You scared the kids."

Later, the captain said, "We make mistakes. It's very hard to keep track of 400 people." He blamed "a breakdown of communications" on Tuesday night, but he said the workers had to agree that relationships were excellent during disturbances the night before. "There was no swinging of clubs and everything was done with restraint," he said. "More good has come out of this than bad. We've learned to know people, and people have learned to know us."

Mr. Kurtz said a primary purpose for the meeting was to help the volunteers and neighborhood workers get to know individual policemen "on a very human and personal basis," and Captain McQueeney agreed that officials "would like to have you get to know all of the policemen in the community." He called for more meetings like yesterday's session, to be held on a regular basis.

Another worker, Isadore Ramos Jr., was critical of Mayor Doorley and other city officials, saying they should "take time to come down to the community and talk to the people instead of talking just to the so-called leaders. I didn't see any of the so-called Negro leaders in the situation of the last few nights," he said. "The mayor finally realizes that now he has to talk to the people."

Mr. Cicilline disagreed. "You know that most of you people were consulted this morning by the mayor before he issued the new curfew," he said. Of course the city talked to certain leaders quite frequently, because "in some cases," he said, "there are people who always walk forward."

The mayor's spokesman added, however, that different leaders appear during different crises: "In the last three years we've found that almost every crisis creates its own leadership," he said.

Another man complained that police were slow to accept credentials of the "Soul Patrol" on Tuesday night and did not always work smoothly with them. Captain McQueeney said he knew of this, but on Wednesday night, he said, "We went back and we gave a pretty strong talk to all our people. In fact, we put it on the police radio."

At the end of the meeting, the captain suggested that the volunteers and police agree sometime soon to arrange a "formal swearing-in ceremony" for the "Soul Patrol" in an effort to perpetuate the organization.

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Aug. 3, 1967]

SOUTH PROVIDENCE "QUIET" UNDER CURFEW

(By Paul Giguere)

PROVIDENCE, R.I.—A curfew imposed on a 1½-mile section of South Providence, scene of two nights of racial violence, was termed "very successful" late Wednesday night by Mayor Joseph A. Doorley. "There have been no bad incidents this evening and we hope that everything is under control now," the mayor said.

The curfew, however, will continue on a day-to-day basis "until there is every assurance the streets are safe for everyone," Doorley said at an 11:30 p.m. press conference in police headquarters.

The mayor blamed the violence on "a bunch of hoodlums" and said about half those arrested were "from outside the Providence area."

A heavily-armed force of 300 local and state police stood ready to enforce the 9 p.m. to 6 a.m. curfew. They remained outside the

trouble area, however, and as of early Thursday morning had not been called into action.

Doorley ordered a selective curfew after the City Council earlier in the day gave him broad emergency powers in the wake of rioting and gun battles between police and snipers late Tuesday night.

However, there was a widespread impression the curfew applied to the entire city, and, as a consequence, streets of Providence generally were deserted Wednesday night.

Mayor Doorley also was empowered to halt the sales of liquor, gasoline and firearms, but he found no need to use these powers up to a late hour Wednesday night.

Gov. John H. Chafee sped here from Maine, where he had been vacationing. He praised police for their earlier efforts, and stressed that the situation had been kept in check to the extent that local authorities had not indicated a need for calling out National Guard detachments.

As of late Wednesday night, the situation was being handled entirely by local police. Forty-five state troopers were in the city, but only standing by with local reserves at police headquarters.

Working in the restricted area during Wednesday evening were 21 workers of the Progress for Providence Anti-Poverty Program. Wearing white helmets bearing the initials P.C., for Poverty Corps the 21 appealed to residents of the area to remain indoors.

"We are not stopping anyone going into the area who has legitimate business there," reported Capt. McQueeney. "But we are not letting in any strangers or trouble makers."

In obtaining his emergency powers from the City Council, Mayor Doorley told the membership that "young, unorganized hoodlums" were behind the violence.

About 12,000 persons live in the curfew area, which is predominantly Negro.

Ten policemen were among 30 persons injured in Tuesday night's violence, and 57 persons, many of them white, were taken into custody by police. Most of them were released later, except for a juvenile captured with a .22 calibre rifle.

[From the Boston Globe, Aug. 3, 1967]

CURFEW, POLICE CALM PROVIDENCE

(By Robert J. Anglin)

PROVIDENCE.—This city was quiet early today as police enforced a 9 p.m. curfew in an effort to prevent a third night of racial violence.

Prior to the curfew, 21 Negro youths, all wearing white helmets, patrolled the troubled neighborhood in an effort to reduce tension.

Only isolated incidents were reported in the Willard Ave. section of South Province, a predominantly Negro area, and the scene of gun battles Tuesday night between police and snipers.

Earlier Wednesday, after an emergency meeting with the City Council, Mayor Joseph A. Doorley, Jr. set the curfew for a 1½ square mile section.

The patrolling Negro youths, members of Progress for Providence, an antipoverty program, had volunteered for duty after trouble began Tuesday night.

Doorley said Wednesday night that disturbances Monday and Tuesday had "no racial overtones." He said they were "the work of 100 to 150 hoodlums, some of them from outside the city."

Late Wednesday, Doorley said a Molotov cocktail had been thrown into an empty drugstore, but he said the incident occurred outside the area where disturbances had occurred previously.

Doorley said he hoped Wednesday's quiet was the work of the White Hat Patrol, the group of young volunteers.

He said the White Hats "have told us, after talking to the youths in the area of the disturbances, that they had 'enough.' "

Capt. Walter A. McQueeney, head of the Police Dept.'s community relations program, praised the youths, saying "they have done a wonderful job for us."

McQueeney said: "our main problem is with the young hoodlums, and I mean hoodlums. They have no regard for anyone, themselves, their family or their neighborhood."

[From the Providence Journal, Aug. 4, 1967]

SOUTH PROVIDENCE QUIET AGAIN

For the second night in a row, South Providence was quiet last night as a curfew kept most persons out of the streets.

Although isolated incidents were reported, there was none of the violence that swept the center of the area Monday and Tuesday nights, injuring nearly 50 persons, damaging property and resulting in about 75 arrests.

About 20 volunteer workers for Progress for Providence, the city antipoverty agency, went through the streets talking to residents and trying to keep the area quiet. They had done so Wednesday.

The staff of the city human relations commission also was there.

The police had only a normal force in the area.

The curfew was in force from 9 p.m. to 6 a.m. today, as it had been Wednesday night, when the streets virtually were empty.

Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr., who was empowered by the city council in an emergency meeting Wednesday to impose the curfew, is expected to meet with police and antipoverty officials today to decide whether to continue it.

Last night and Wednesday night, many persons apparently accepted the spirit of the curfew without having to be told to stay off the streets. No police blockades were used.

The most seriously injured of the victims of the violence earlier in the week, Eugene Sawyers, 15, of 330 Friendship St., remained in fair condition last night at Rhode Island Hospital. His name was on the danger list.

Col. Howard A. Franklin, police chief, said the bullet that hit the boy in the abdomen has not been removed and its caliber is not known. How and where he was shot also are not known.

On the city's East Side last night, streets mostly were quiet. Antone M. Perry, 24, of 159 Camp St., was arrested and charged with throwing a rock at a police car on Pleasant Street at Bugbee Court about 5:30 p.m.

Police said a crowd had gathered at that intersection when police chased four youths who reportedly fled a stolen car. One of the boys, 14 years old, was caught and released for further questioning later.

In South Providence, five of the Progress for Providence volunteer workers asked Steven Riffkin, owner of a liquor store at 99 Prairie Ave., to close his store. Mr. Riffkin, who had slept in the store for three nights this week, locked up and went home.

At the corner of Lockwood Street and Prairie Avenue, the volunteer workers ran into a group of men shooting dice. One of them said to one of the volunteers, "They're using you, boy."

One of the volunteers said, "Don't let them spoil what we're trying to do." Later, the dice game had disappeared from the corner.

The El Rio Bar on Broad Street near Trinity Square which officials said was the last open bar in the area, was closed after police requested that it be closed.

Mayor Doorley, in commenting on the violence earlier this week, said yesterday, "I don't think it's a racial problem. I haven't seen any racial overtones."

He blamed the trouble on hoodlums, many of them white and many of them from outside the city. He said they knew there was tension and took advantage of it.

The mayor had high praise yesterday for the antipoverty workers and for the police in trying to head off and quell the disturbances.

The police, he said, showed "remarkable restraint" and thus prevented greater violence than occurred. The antipoverty workers were invaluable, he added.

Some of the antipoverty workers involved, who are Negroes, could have been battling police but instead were working with them, the mayor said.

Colonel Franklin said yesterday that the disturbances appeared to be spontaneous. Rumors that had swept the city and state before the trouble erupted showed that many persons believed Negroes were planning deliberate violence.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, we who are not deprived have a responsibility to look through the wall of affluence that surrounds the underprivileged and shields them from us. We know the problem; we believe that through the program that I previously outlined, we have the solution. I believe we can tarry no longer. I urge the administration to implement this program with the utmost speed.

A SHOCKER IN NEW HAVEN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column written by John G. McCullough in the August 25, 1967, edition of the Philadelphia Bulletin, entitled "A Shocker in New Haven."

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

A SHOCKER IN NEW HAVEN—SOMETHING NEEDED BESIDES DOLLARS

(By John G. McCullough)

For the past five years the federal government has been channeling $15 billion a year into programs hopefully designed to cure the physical and personal woes of the nation's cities.

If other federal aid programs of national scope, but with special meaning to the cities, are included, the overall federal spending on city problems probably reaches $30 billion a year.

Yet there seems to be little disagreement that the cities appear to be in more trouble than ever before.

"None of it," said New Haven's Mayor Richard C. Lee last Monday night, "makes sense."

Lee was dealing in specifics and not in generalities. He was, in fact, speaking of his own city and the rioting and property destruction seen there this week.

ENVY OF OTHER MAYORS

What makes Lee's remark significant is that his New Haven has for years been regarded as THE model city in terms of progressive government, community commitment and enlightened renewal.

Lee and his city have been the envy of other mayors. Planners, social scientists and government officials from all over the world have made pilgrimages to New Haven to observe at first hand what Lee has often described as "the reclaiming of a lost city."

Lee was to have been nominated by acclamation last Monday night as the Democratic Party's candidate for an unprecedented eighth term. Instead, he was in a basement control center supervising the efforts of his police and fire departments to cope with the same raw violence that has to our dream of a slumless city."

This summer's plague of street violence and destruction in Newark, Detroit and elsewhere has shocked a nation. But the outbreaks in New Haven brought even greater consternation to governmental officials in Washington and across the nation. For New

Haven has been viewed as the one city where there could be no possible cause for a riot.

New Haven has been regarded, as Dr. Robert C. Weaver, secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, said not long ago, as "coming closest to our dream of a slumless city.'

THIRD RENEWED

Federal, state and local funds, as well as massive amounts of private investment, have been devoted to New Haven for a renewal program that has already covered more than a third of the city. Grants from the Ford Foundation gave New Haven an antipoverty program long before the federal program was originated. The New Haven plan, in fact, was the model and the pilot for the federal effort headed by Sargent Shriver.

In testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Tuesday, John A. McCone, who headed the panel that investigated the 1965 riots in the Los Angeles Watts section, observed sadly that he and his staff had found New Haven to have one of the most progressive and concerned city administrations in the nation.

McCone said, too, that he felt "sick" when he learned of the rioting in New Haven because "a great deal" had been done for Negroes there.

After emphasizing the need for a continued search for the solution to urban unrest, McCone told the senators that massive injections of money and aid are not enough.

"The Negro," McCone said, "must help himself. We are a competitive society and equality means he has to compete. Unless he does, unless he is motivated . . . then no amount of money will be successful."

WRONG STRESS

There have been warnings in the past that far too much attention has been paid to physical programs in the cities and that the Negro has in many cases been led to believe, as have members of some other minority groups, that they are to be treated as a subsidized group through an assortment of socially engineered programs.

Such warnings, and they have come from many Negro residents of slums, have for the most part been ignored in the general clamor of social scientists who insist the federal government has the responsibility for creating an urban society and for telling each person how he is to live in such a society.

Lewis Mumford, the author and student of urban affairs, told the U. S. Senate in April that there is no hope for the cities "unless human needs and human interactions and human responses are the first consideration."

In response to those advocating clinical and technological approaches to urban needs Mumford cautioned that "you will bring about even more villainous conditions than those you are trying to correct; for you will wipe out what is left of neighborly life, social cooperation, and human identity in our already depressed and congested urban areas."

There was a warning from Mumford, too, that those who see the cities as a vast sociological laboratory and their people as specimens should move with great caution and "experiment with small measures and small units."

RESENT "EXPERIMENTS"

One New Haven Negro, discussing the riots there, declared that "our people don't want to be treated like something in a scientist's experiment."

Another suggested that governments at all levels have been too expansive in their promises of what can be done for those living in slums.

"You can't go around promising us champagne and then give us beer," he said.

In government offices, New Haven's disturbances are certain to draw even greater attention than the far more serious ones in Detroit, Newark and elsewhere.

For the lesson of New Haven may well be that the failure of government has not been one of dollars—as many are still suggesting—but rather the multiplicity of urban programs with billion dollar price tags and no real meaning to the people who need and want help in terms of housing, jobs and education to enable them to make their own way.

HOME FROM VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks a letter addressed to the Members of the U.S. Senate from Mr. M. Edward Clark, 1405 North 64th Street, Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. Clark, who lost a son in Vietnam on June 8, 1967, has addressed a letter through me to the Senate. His letters contains criticisms of our country's involvement in the Vietnam war. His letter states in part:

The time has come for the Senate to call a halt to the authorization, which the President now assumes was given to him in the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, to conduct a war of obliteration on both North and South Vietnam. Each day of postponement leads us closer to chaos.

Your most strategic efforts, apart from partisan politics, are urgently requested in order to bring the war to a negotiated settlement and thus stop the carnage.

Mr. Clark also enclosed a copy of a letter which he has written to the President, which I also ask unanimous consent to be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Home From Vietnam: June 14, 1967," which Mr. Clark wrote for the August 23, 1967, issue of the Christian Century, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SENATE.

DEAR SENATOR: Let me add my strongest protest over the continuing tragic involvement of the United States in Viet-Nam. I speak not only because of the death of my son in Viet-Nam on June 8, 1967, but on behalf of the whole moral standing of the United States as a people.

We have made the terrible mistake of concluding that because America has fought for just causes in the past, that now because we are fighting our cause is just. It is no exaggeration to say that our position in Viet-Nam has created more Communists in Asia, South America, and many other parts of the world than we can possibly imagine.

May I call your attention to the two items enclosed: (1) An open letter to the President. The original letter (slightly different) was answered by the Public Affairs Office of the State Department in a most unsatisfactory manner. (2) A copy of the August 23 issue of *The Christian Century* which contains some reflections upon the death of my son.

The time has come for the Senate to call a halt to the authorization, which the President now assumes was given him in the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, to conduct a war of obliteration on both North and South Viet-Nam. Each day of postponement leads us closer to chaos.

Your most strategic efforts, apart from partisan politics, are urgently requested in order to bring the war to a negotiated settlement and thus stop the carnage.

Sincerely yours,

M. EDWARD CLARK.

KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
July 31, 1967.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: After writing innumerable letters to you over the past eighteen months relative to my deep concern about American involvement in Viet-Nam, I have finally received a letter from you. It begins as follows:

"Please accept my deepest sympathy in the death of your son, Private First Class Timothy R. Clark . . ."

The death of my son in Viet-Nam has increased my concern. With due appreciation for the dilemma in which you find yourself, it must now be abundantly clear to all but the willfully blind that our strategy in Viet-Nam is wrong, and that the whole basis for our presence in Viet-Nam not only needs to be called into question but has been called into question by practically all the rest of the world.

After two years of active involvement of American troops can you or your advisors believe that we are any nearer to peace now than we were two years ago? Indeed, are we not farther away?

After more than 12,000 war dead, can you or your advisors believe that after the sacrifice of another 12,000 we will be any closer to peace than we are now?

After the tremendous build up in arms and men, can you believe that militarism in America is less of a threat than it was before the build up began?

After the countless demonstrations in every part of the world, can you honestly believe that American prestige and influence in the world is on the gain?

After countless attempts at the "pacification of the countryside" in South Viet-Nam, can you or your advisors honestly believe that the South Vietnamese are the supporters of Premier Ky or of American intervention?

After the riots in Detroit and Newark is it not increasingly clear that the deliberate increase of violence in Viet-Nam has brought a corresponding rise in violence at home?

The solution of the tragedy in Viet-Nam will not come about by the courage of our fighting men, great though that is. The solution will come only when you and those who advise you have the courage to face the reality of the situation, to realize that our present strategy in Viet-Nam is a tragic error from every point of view, and to have the courage to admit the errors of the past, going back to Eisenhower, and to devise a radical change of strategy. I pray that you may have that kind of courage.

The heritage of hate which even now we, and the French before us, have built up in Southeast Asia will haunt us for generations. It is time for a reversal of policy, otherwise the generation now being born will pay with their lives, even as my son had to pay with his, for the mistakes now being made.

Sincerely yours,

M. EDWARD CLARK.

HOME FROM VIETNAM: JUNE 14, 1967

(By M. Edward Clark)

On the night of June 14, 1967, I sat on the running board of a United Air Lines jeep waiting for the flight from San Francisco to come in. The arrival, scheduled for 11:13 p.m., was already a half-hour late.

As I waited I thought about my son, Tim. He was returning home from Vietnam on that flight. Little more than a month before, on May 2, I had waited at that same airport after Tim had said good-by and boarded a T.W.A. jet for San Francisco. That evening, at sundown, my wife and I, my daughter, my grandson, and Tim's girl of a few short days stood on the observation deck while his plane was delayed, first for late passengers

and then for the landing of an incoming plane. Then the jet pushed its nose into the sky and dipped away toward the west, finally becoming a dark speck against the pale glow of the evening sky.

I

Now my son was coming home. The minutes dragged on. At last, shortly after midnight, a string of baggage carts came into sight and I knew that Tim had arrived. The jeep pulling the wagon train came to a stop at the freight office of United and a young man in uniform stepped out and shook hands first with the undertaker and then with me. "I am Lieutenant Campbell," he said. "I have been assigned as an escort for your son. May I extend my sympathy."

My son was in an oblong gray plywood box with two bronze handles on either side. Stenciled across one end of the box were the words Pfc. Timothy R. Clark US 55 881 629. On the top of the box at one end was the word Head, and on the upper corner of one side were the words flag inside.

So now my son was home. Home from the scraggly brush-covered hill where, the Thursday before, he had written us a letter, his last letter. He had said that in his idle moments of waiting he let his mind roam the streets of Kansas City, visualizing each corner, each building, the lights at night; the memory took away some of the loneliness of Vietnam. The next day at 2300 hours (11:00 p.m.) Tim took the brunt of a hand grenade thrown by a "hostile" soldier. Up to the time he wrote his last letter, Tim had not seen a hostile soldier, neither a Vietcong or a North Vietnamese. But he had seen some of the results of their activity. A couple of weeks before, while his battalion was out on perimeter defense, the bunker that was serving as their headquarters had been mortored and machine gunned, and six of his buddies had been killed and eight wounded. Later, he heard, one of the wounded had died.

The probability is that Tim never did see a Vietcong or a North Vietnamese soldier. If so, at least one of his wishes was fulfilled, for in several of his letters he expressed the hope that he would never see any of the "enemy."

So now his last flight had touched down, and he was home never to fly again, never to sing or sigh again, never to wish or hope again; his only task now to wait out the long slow hours of eternity, where the hatreds of men cannot enter.

The freight clerk opened the freighthouse door and the baggage cart was backed up to the waiting hearse. The four of us—the escort, the undertaker, the freight man and I—shoved the gray box from the cart into the hearse. This done the escort said: "Mr. Clark, the army has declared your son to be nonviewable. If you would like we, the undertaker and I, can open the casket in the morning and see if he can be made viewable, but we don't know." I answered that the viewability of the body was not important, and that we did not plan on an open casket during the funeral ceremonies.

With that the three of us got into the hearse and began the drive to the funeral home. On the way to the airfield I had expressed to the funeral director the wish that after we had picked up the body we might take a sentimental journey and drive down the streets Tim had seen in his mind's eye so shortly before the grenade found him.

So as we crossed the Broadway bridge the undertaker steered the car south into Main street, past the theaters, the bars, the stores, down to Fourteenth street, where we turned left to Grand, then north on Grand past the Midland Camera store where Tim had bought some of his camera equipment, past the bus station where, just a year ago, he had arrived one midnight from Fort Leonard Wood on his first weekend pass. Then across the viaduct and on to the intercity expressway to Kansas City, Kansas, and the funeral home.

All that was four days ago. The last of the ceremonies is over. Relatives who arrived before the body of my son will leave in the morning. Only a small plot of broken sod and a few wilted flowers mark the spot where one who once dreamed dreams great and small, one who dared to walk the earth as a friend to all men, who scorned the ordinary and fought desperately within himself to be what every man ought to be: a unique human being—only the broken sod and the fading flowers mark the spot where one, once so full of hope, now lies distorted and nonviewable.

II

Who killed my son?

The telegram sent by the army said he was killed by a detonated grenade thrown by hostile forces—by the communists of the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong. There is at least a half-truth here, but, alas, only a half-truth. A hostile force was, to be sure, the immediate cause of his death. But that fact is really but the final detail. The ultimate cause of the death of Timothy R. Clark, of the other 175 who were killed that week, of the more than 11,000 Americans who thus far have lost their lives in Vietnam and of the many who are yet to die—the cause of all these tragic deaths ultimately can be traced to three things: Pride, Greed and Indifference.

Why do the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese fight so stubbornly against the most powerful nation in the world? Because to admit defeat would be to surrender all pride, pride which long ago the French took from them and which they finally received by defeating the French at Dien Bien Phu.

Why does the American high command sacrifice life after life when admittedly the land it holds is beside the point? Again the answer is pride—the pride of a proud man who has the support not only of other proud men but of greedy men as well. For is it not true that there is much more room for promotion and advancement when a war is on than when peace prevails? Perhaps they are not conscious pride and greed; they can always be rationalized as patriotism. But they are pride and greed nonetheless. And will anyone pretend that there is no greed in the companies that fight for the war contracts?

What of indifference? Since World War II conscription—something many of our ancestors came to America to escape—has become the accepted thing. So indifferent are we that hardly a murmur is raised when the Congress proposes a law that will draft 19-year-olds as first choice; for 19-year-olds make better soldiers! Do they indeed? Or is it rather than 19-year-olds can more easily be led to believe what the army wants them to believe? Is it that they will go simply because they are told to go? Escort Campbell told me that the only reason he had for being in Vietnam was "orders."

III

The fact is, as a recent editorial in the *Boston Globe* indicates, that the industrial-military-scientific-political complex finds this war a convenient way of satisfying its selfish purposes. The casualty lists are getting a bit longer now, but they have not yet reached the danger point. A few more waves of the flag will keep the war going at least for a while yet.

Besides, most of the casualties are high school or college dropouts and their parents aren't apt to be in positions of power. The wealthy and the prestigious can keep their sons in school (the proposed new law makes it even easier) until the danger of the draft is over. Hopefully there will be plenty of 19-year-olds so that those who are older will not be called. Indifference and the cultic religion of Americanism will take care of most of the problems.

Who then killed my son? The Vietcong? The North Vietnamese? No, not they alone. I killed him. You killed him. False and greedy patriots killed him. Prideful and ambitious politicians killed him. The armed forces of his own nation killed him. The guilt of his death is upon us all. His blood and the blood of 11,000 is on our heads. Each new day brings more oblong gray boxes to rest on our doorstep.

But the madness continues. Last week 176 Americans were killed, and who knows how many Vietnamese, South and North, soldier or civilian. This week there will be more. And each week the slaughter continues, pride and greed increase and we edge nearer to the point of no return, a nuclear holocaust that will devastate the earth and make us all nonviewable.

Madness, madness, madness!

CONGRESS NEEDS AN OFFICIAL LAWYER

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Congress is becoming ever more aware of the need for protecting its constitutional mandate more carefully. As the other branches of government change with the times, so also must Congress change. But Congress intends to change within the guidelines laid down in the Constitution. Part of this change should be to provide ourselves with an official advocate, a congressional counsel general.

Paul Janensch, of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., has written an article about S. 1384, my bill to provide Congress with this official advocate. I commend the author for his understanding of this vital issue: the gradual erosion of the separation of powers doctrine. I further recommend his words to my colleagues as an accurate description of the problem and my proposed remedy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Janensch's article of August 27, appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

HARTKE ASKS CHIEF LAWYER FOR CONGRESS

(By Paul Janensch)

WASHINGTON.—Does Congress, which is full of lawyers, need its own attorney?

U.S. Sen. Vance Hartke (Indiana University Law School, Class of '48) thinks so, and he has introduced a bill calling for the creation of a "congressional counsel general" who would speak with authority on the intent and constitutionality of legislative matters—a sort of legislative attorney general.

So far, the Indiana Democrat's proposal has received scant public attention, but behind the scenes it is attracting the interest of two Senate groups that hardly ever agree on anything.

Southern conservatives are studying Hartke's bill because they believe the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and other federal agencies are pressing harder for civil-rights compliance than Congress intended.

The Senate's "doves" are receptive to the idea because they see a congressional counsel general as an official who might be able to delve into the legal aspects of the Vietnam conflict. For example, can a president commit half a million troops and billions of dollars to a war that has never been declared?

HARTKE'S REASONING

The problem, as Hartke sees it, is this: Congress has no single voice to explain what it intended when it passed certain laws. As a

result, the executive branch of the government and its burgeoning agencies often interpret, or even ignore, the laws as they see fit.

When the agencies want legal advice, or when they go to court, they don't turn to Congress for help; they go to the attorney general. Personalities aside, Hartke asks, is a member of the president's cabinet the most qualified spokesman for the legislative branch?

What the Senate and the House need, Hartke insists, is "a voice speaking clearly to the executive, to the administrative agencies and to the courts, in declaring the collective will of the people through their Congress."

Under Hartke's proposal, the counsel general would advise Congress on constitutional questions, help the lawmakers in their traditional role as the watchdogs of the executive branch, and represent congressional views in court actions.

EXAMPLES CITED

These are some examples which the senator cites to illustrate the need for a congressional counsel general:

The last federal wiretapping law was passed by Congress in the 1930s, before the development of sophisticated eavesdropping devices. Since no one can authoritatively apply the old law to the new situation, the attorney general is doing the "legislating" himself. The result, says Hartke, is a morass of conflicting memoranda and regulations.

Congress, Hartke says, never intended that the broadcasting "fairness doctrine" should be extended to radio and television advertising. Nevertheless, the Federal Communications Commission has ruled that stations carrying cigarette commercials must furnish free time to groups who say smoking is a health hazard.

The last Congress told the Defense Department unequivocably to "proceed with the design, engineering and construction of two nuclear-powered frigates as soon as possible." Hartke says he sees no "speedy proceeding to have these two nuclear frigates constructed."

A week after Hartke first unveiled his congressional-counsel-general plan, Adam Clayton Powell asked a federal court to seat him over the objections of the House of Representatives. The House, having no lawyer of its own, was forced to hire an outside attorney to argue its case.

MORE AT STAKE

Hartke says there is more at stake than unconstructed frigates and the control of bugging devices. He views the sometimes-arrogant posture of the executive branch as a threat to a vital constitutional principle—the doctrine of separation of powers.

At the Constitutional Convention, the proceedings of which the senator says he has read and reread, the founding fathers decided that neither the Congress nor the president should be subservient to the other.

But today, contends Hartke and many of his colleagues, the balance of power is shifting steadily toward the executive branch, with its vast powers—both authorized and assumed.

"The power pendulum has swung too far," Hartke warns. If we don't block the trend, he says, the legislative branch may someday be regarded as a quaint and impotent relic.

"I shudder to see the Congress become a veritable House of Lords, where we can sit in meaningless splendor, surrounded by the trappings of power without substance," he declares.

First elected in 1958, Hartke started out in the Senate as a conventional moderate-liberal who was quite friendly with the Democratic leader at that time, Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas.

Since then, however, Hartke has become more and more of a maverick. He is a persistent critic of the President's Vietnam policy, and has called repeatedly for a negotiated settlement of the war. He strongly opposes the administration's proposed surtax on income taxes, and he has denounced aspects of the foreign-aid program, notably the shipment of arms to "unfriendly" nations.

The chances that Congress will authorize the creation of a legislative attorney general this year are nil, Hartke concedes.

For one thing, both houses have a huge backlog of unfinished, and more-pressing, business.

Furthermore, several influential senators are cool to Hartke's proposal. Sen. Mike Monroney, D-Okla., has said such a "Frankenstein monster" would become a "boss" of Congress. Sen. Sam J. Ervin, D-N.C., has argued that a counsel general would suffer "schizophrenia" trying to reflect all the many congressional views on constitutional matters.

But Hartke is confident that his colleagues will come around to his point of view in a year or two. And when they do, he will have another bill up his sleeve: Because he thinks Congress must assert itself in the field of world affairs, Hartke is ready to propose that a congressional "ambassador" be assigned to every U.S. embassy.

PRAISE FOR TESTIMONY OF GENERAL GELSTON

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, for some years, now, I have considered that my home State of Maryland is very fortunate to have as its Adjutant General my good friend Maj. Gen. George Gelston.

So, naturally, I was gratified to open the Washington Post this morning and read an editorial expressing exactly the same admiration that I have had for General Gelston during all the time I have known him.

General Gelston testified recently before the Committee on the Judiciary on the antiriot bill before the committee. As the Post has stated, his testimony stands out above all others for its reasonableness and its calm, incisive analysis of the developments leading to an urban riot like the one that took place in Cambridge, Md., last month.

General Gelston, who as leader of the Maryland National Guard has had considerable experience with riots, also presented the Judiciary Committee with a formula for preventing rioting that should serve as an example for both city governments and other Guard units.

Political action to solve problems, a show of force to head off trouble, and a discriminating reaction when violence occurs—General Gelston has used this formula with such success that in the 23 months the National Guard has been in Cambridge during the last 4 years, not one citizen has been injured by Guard action.

I believe firmly that General Gelston has saved my State from agony and possible disgrace. He deserves widespread recognition as a devoted and intelligent public servant, one who has worked tirelessly to bring order and calm to a deeply troubled population.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that the thoughtful editorial in the Washington Post of August 31, 1967, entitled "Gelston on Cambridge," be printed in the RECORD.

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

GELSTON ON CAMBRIDGE

Of all the statements that have been made recently about the prevention and control of riots, the testimony of Maryland's Adjutant General, George M. Gelston, before the Senate Judiciary Committee stands out. Testifying primarily to oppose the anti-riot bill now before that Committee, General Gelston spoke some vital truths about riots and race relations.

He argued, quite rightly we believe, that the proposed bill would be of little help in preventing riots. Pointing out that locally led civil rights groups often call in outsiders to dramatize and call attention to themselves and their problem, General Gelston said, "Were there no problem, there would be no need for an invitation." In Cambridge, he explained, the speech by H. Rap Brown was not the sole cause of the riot. The fact that there had been "numerous" cases of arson in the preceding three weeks, he said, was "evidence of some unrest."

How much unrest there actually was in Cambridge is in dispute. General Gelston believes there was plenty. "Perhaps had the local administration given some recognition to the group and heard their complaints, the group would not have sent for Brown and Cambridge would have been spared a disaster," he testified. But Cambridge Police Chief Brice G. Kinnamon told the same committee earlier this month that Negroes and whites were living in perfect harmony in Cambridge until Rap Brown arrived on the scene.

It is on this very point that General Gelston's testimony is most enlightening. Noting that police departments have an intelligence network that extends into the ghettos, he suggested that a police chief ought to be able to sniff out troubles before they become inflamed and bring them to the attention of political leaders whose responsibility it is to deal with them. We suspect that it is here that Cambridge went astray—because the police refused to recognize that trouble was brewing or because city officials refused to deal with it. The testimony of Chief Kinnamon that all was fine pre-Brown is in direct conflict with the reports brought back by newspaper reporters from Cambridge before the riot.

While arguing that only political leaders who solve problems can prevent riots, General Gelston said that when violence seems imminent the police must react calmly, appearing in force but without agitating the situation by parading police dogs or carrying shotguns. If violence does occur, he said, police action must be swift and decisive but not indiscriminate. He noted that in the 23 months the National Guard has been in Cambridge in the last four years, not a single shot has been fired by a Guardsman and not a single citizen has been injured by Guard action.

General Gelston has offered a sensible formula for preventing riots—political action to solve problems, a show of force to head off trouble, and a discriminating reaction when violence occurs. His successful record in coping with racial trouble as Commander of Maryland's National Guard and as Baltimore's Police Commissioner underlines the value of his views.

DETROIT HOLDS ONLY 150 of 7,207 TAKEN IN RIOT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in tht RECORD an August 28, 1967, Asso-

ciated Press story emanating from Detroit, entitled "Detroit Holds Only 150 of 7,207 Taken in Riot."

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

DETROIT HOLDS ONLY 150 OF 7,207 TAKEN IN RIOT

(By Bill Simmons)

DETROIT, August 28.—The vast majority of persons arrested in the Detroit riot are back on the streets, mostly on bail. But about 150 remain in jail, held to face charges filed against them before the riot.

Some are held for parole violation, some for probation violation, some for failing to appear for trial on charges that existed prior to the riot, said Judge Donald S. Leonard of Recorder's Court.

The Records Bureau of the Detroit Police Department reports that of 7,207 adults arrested in the riot, about half—3,595—had records of previous criminal offenses.

Authorities also say more than 90 per cent of those arrested in the riot are from Detroit, with no evidence of any significant number from outside Detroit.

According to police statistics, a composite picture of the "average rioter" would show a man, a Negro, age 20 to 28, arrested in the riot on a charge of looting, with a 50–50 chance that he had a previous criminal record.

As in the riot in Newark last month, nearly 50 per cent of those arrested in Detroit's riot were over 25 years of age.

In Detroit, as in Newark, about 75 per cent of the felony indictments stemmed from stealing or receiving stolen property.

But another reflection of the severity of the Detroit riot is that 255 persons were arrested in Detroit on charges involving weapons or explosives, compared to only 91 in Newark, where 27 were killed, compared to 43 riot deaths in Detroit.

Although 3,595 of those arrested in Detroit had previous criminal records, some of these were on offenses as minor as traffic law violations.

Of the 7,207 detained by police during the riot, 3,365 were charged with felonies, including seven charges of murder, one of which has been dismissed for lack of evidence. This charge was against Patrolman Robert Paille in the death of a Negro youth at a motel.

In 95 other cases, the charge is assault with intent to commit murder, 26 of which police list as snipers, five of whom are women.

FIFTY YEARS OF AID FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article published in the May 1967, issue of American Education, a publication of the Office of Education. It is entitled "50 Years of Aid for Vocational Education."

Since the information contained in the article, and the tables which are a part of it, will be of interest not only to the Education Subcommittee but to each of the senatorial offices, I ask unanimous consent that the article and table be printed in the RECORD.

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

FIFTY YEARS OF AID FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The year 1967 marks not only the centennial of the Office of Education but also the golden anniversary of the first national vocational education act. On February 23, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson signed into law the Smith-Hughes Act. The act thus became the first to provide Federal funds for local schools, and in doing so, established a cooperative relationship between the State and the Office of Education that, over the years, has led to harmonious administration of later vocational education acts.

Many States plan to hold observances to celebrate the fiftieth year of vocational education. In addition, several new area vocational schools, built with the aid of Federal funds, will be dedicated this year to stress the significance of this date in the history of American education.

During the past 50 years approximately $1.7 billion has been made available to the States, the District of Columbia, and outlying areas, under the Smith-Hughes and other vocational education acts for vocational and technical education.

Allotments to States under the Smith-Hughes Act total over $7.1 million for education in agriculture, trades and industry and home economics, and training of teachers in these subjects.

Under the George-Barden and supplemental acts more than $29.6 million has been allocated for education in agriculture, distributive occupations, home economics, trade and industry, fishery trades and industry (title I), practical nurse training (title II), and technical education (title III).

For the current fiscal year $198.2 million has been allotted under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 for general vocational activities (section 4) and $10 million for the vocational work-study program (section 13). Allotments range from less than $1,500 for American Samoa to more than $14.5 million for California. States provide funds on a matching basis except in the work-study program where the Federal-State ratio is three to one.

During this fiscal year alone, allocations totaling $265.4 million—$23.5 million more than last year—will help 6.5 million students obtain vocational and technical training; $10 million is being provided for the work-study program under the 1963 act. This program will finance part-time jobs for 35,000 students who would not otherwise be able to continue vocational training.

Rising costs of vocational and technical education, however, keep thousands of young men and women from continuing their studies. College-bound students receive financial help from several Federal programs authorized by the National Defense Education Act and the Higher Education Act. Now, vocational students receive similar help through the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

Under the vocational student loan program, students in good standing in eligible vocational, business, trade or technical schools, or students who have been accepted in such schools, may apply for loans from banks, saving and loan associations, credit unions, or other eligible lending institutions (usually a maximum of $1,000 a year). There is no age limit nor is a high school diploma required. If an application is approved, and if the applicant's adjusted family income is less than $15,000 a year, the Federal Government will pay interest charges up to 6 percent on the loan while the student is in school and 3 percent after he has completed his course. A student whose family has an adjusted annual income of $15,000 or more may also receive a loan, but he is not eligible for interest benefits. Repayment begins 9 to 12 months after the student leaves school and may be extended over a period of 3 to 6 years.

The 1965 act authorizes the Office of Education to advance "seed money" to create or strengthen reserve funds of a State or private nonprofit agency designated to guarantee lenders against loss.

ALLOTMENTS UNDER VOCATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ACT OF 1963, FISCAL YEAR 1967

State	Sec. 4 activities	Sec. 13 work-study
Total	$198,225,000	$10,000,000
Alabama	4,610,512	200,270
Alaska	245,236	14,983
Arizona	1,805,218	83,404
Arkansas	2,519,605	108,875
California	14,665,140	902,462
Colorado	1,946,059	100,385
Connecticut	2,171,198	132,847
Delaware	390,298	24,472
District of Columbia	546,495	30,964
Florida	6,199,468	273,186
Georgia	5,810,089	248,714
Hawaii	797,792	42,451
Idaho	890,996	39,455
Illinois	8,216,394	497,428
Indiana	4,907,895	246,716
Iowa	2,883,076	140,339
Kansas	2,391,526	113,370
Kentucky	4,131,417	178,295
Louisiana	4,537,243	196,774
Maine	1,189,505	52,440
Maryland	3,202,493	181,791
Massachusetts	4,351,359	253,209
Michigan	7,856,956	421,515
Minnesota	3,720,844	180,792
Mississippi	3,132,779	138,840
Missouri	4,274,571	215,252
Montana	796,156	37,956
Nebraska	1,508,981	72,916
Nevada	337,727	19,977
New Hampshire	722,359	33,462
New Jersey	5,340,073	318,634
New Mexico	1,302,460	58,932
New York	13,630,868	827,049
North Carolina	6,711,898	287,669
North Dakota	794,770	36,458
Ohio	9,793,732	510,413
Oklahoma	3,005,524	127,853
Oregon	1,965,985	100,884
Pennsylvania	11,185,718	558,857
Rhode Island	888,672	43,450
South Carolina	3,614,447	158,318
South Dakota	833,066	36,957
Tennessee	4,954,951	209,259
Texas	12,595,165	559,357
Utah	1,200,597	54,937
Vermont	482,651	20,976
Virginia	5,507,219	242,721
Washington	2,942,267	159,816
West Virginia	2,403,411	106,378
Wisconsin	4,173,147	207,761
Wyoming	340,700	17,979
American Samoa	35,423	1,498
Guam	107,156	4,994
Puerto Rico	3,599,103	162,813
Virgin Islands	56,610	2,497

ALLOTMENTS UNDER GEORGE-BARDEN AND SUPPLEMENTAL ACTS, FISCAL YEAR 1967

State	Title I	Title II	Title III
Total	$29,685,823	$5,000,000	$15,000,000
Alabama	681,872	114,744	344,233
Alaska	157,500	25,519	76,557
Arizona	167,549	27,975	83,926
Arkansas	476,738	80,263	240,789
California	1,518,605	257,601	772,802
Colorado	260,066	43,597	130,792
Connecticut	276,134	46,405	139,214
Delaware	138,470	23,540	70,621
District of Columbia	136,875	22,796	68,387
Florida	582,731	96,104	288,311
Georgia	772,847	129,556	388,668
Hawaii	138,137	23,015	69,044
Idaho	200,854	33,599	100,797
Illinois	1,271,961	214,594	643,781
Indiana	860,256	144,944	434,831
Iowa	792,837	133,760	401,281
Kansas	468,857	78,853	236,560
Kentucky	791,436	133,323	399,969
Louisiana	548,639	90,857	272,572
Maine	189,729	30,165	90,494
Maryland	401,578	66,309	198,928
Massachusetts	499,852	83,309	249,928
Michigan	1,073,878	181,189	543,567
Minnesota	783,718	132,129	396,388
Mississippi	697,603	116,425	349,277
Missouri	830,775	139,966	419,897
Montana	179,744	30,034	90,103
Nebraska	384,376	64,588	193,764
Nevada	136,875	22,796	68,387
New Hampshire	136,875	22,796	68,387
New Jersey	525,922	87,634	262,901
New Mexico	147,401	24,573	73,719
New York	1,615,680	271,176	813,528
North Carolina	1,212,984	204,880	614,641
North Dakota	259,845	43,560	130,680
Ohio	1,315,225	221,586	664,757
Oklahoma	439,679	73,926	221,779

ALLOTMENTS UNDER GEORGE-BARDEN AND SUPPLEMENTAL ACTS, FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued

State	Title I	Title II	Title III
Oregon	$306,707	$50,560	$151,679
Pennsylvania	1,400,058	235,752	707,256
Rhode Island	138,253	23,274	69,823
South Carolina	581,229	98,033	294,100
South Dakota	261,271	43,801	131,403
Tennessee	852,004	143,648	430,943
Texas	1,412,938	236,120	708,359
Utah	137,350	22,876	68,628
Vermont	136,875	22,796	68,387
Virginia	774,600	129,923	389,769
Washington	436,578	71,735	215,204
West Virginia	361,713	60,761	182,284
Wisconsin	814,720	137,449	412,348
Wyoming	136,875	22,796	68,387
American Samoa	1,875	----------	----------
Guam	1,875	13,509	40,526
Puerto Rico	854,924	142,127	426,381
Virgin Islands	1,875	6,754	20,263

Smith-Hughes funds for agriculture, trades and industry, home economics, teacher training

	Allotment
Total	$7,161,455
Alabama	143,330
Alaska	30,000
Arizona	51,789
Arkansas	85,107
California	534,067
Colorado	66,744
Connecticut	92,547
Delaware	30,000
District of Columbia	----------
Florida	187,558
Georgia	172,456
Hawaii	31,661
Idaho	39,430
Illinois	360,319
Indiana	193,488
Iowa	122,556
Kansas	91,385
Kentucky	143,135
Louisiana	134,293
Maine	48,182
Maryland	118,672
Massachusetts	179,461
Michigan	297,765
Minnesota	141,929
Mississippi	107,308
Missouri	173,605
Montana	38,665
Nebraska	64,271
Nevada	30,000
New Hampshire	34,050
New Jersey	201,903
New Mexico	43,107
New York	575,316
North Carolina	221,793
North Dakota	42,740
Ohio	369,365
Oklahoma	96,258
Oregon	73,613
Pennsylvania	437,176
Rhode Island	37,901
South Carolina	114,757
South Dakota	42,940
Tennessee	159,386
Texas	359,602
Utah	38,478
Vermont	33,318
Virginia	173,136
Washington	113,306
West Virginia	91,340
Wisconsin	162,247
Wyoming	30,000
Outlying areas	----------

National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Program: advances for reserve funds, fiscal year 1967

	Allotment
Total	$1,875,000
Alabama	34,558
Alaska	10,000
Arizona	13,759
Arkansas	17,607
California	155,099
Colorado	18,275

National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Program: advances for reserve funds, fiscal year 1967—Continued

	Allotment
Connecticut	$21,099
Delaware	10,000
District of Columbia	10,000
Florida	46,750
Georgia	43,996
Hawaii	10,000
Idaho	10,000
Illinois	92,355
Indiana	46,651
Iowa	25,899
Kansas	21,157
Kentucky	32,727
Louisiana	34,263
Maine	10,000
Maryland	30,119
Massachusetts	48,155
Michigan	72,229
Minnesota	32,179
Mississippi	24,124
Missouri	41,211
Montana	10,000
Nebraska	13,178
Nevada	10,000
New Hampshire	10,000
New Jersey	49,664
New Mexico	10,681
New York	145,220
North Carolina	54,024
North Dakota	10,000
Ohio	91,837
Oklahoma	23,910
Oregon	16,034
Pennsylvania	100,654
Rhode Island	10,000
South Carolina	29,498
South Dakota	10,000
Tennessee	38,922
Texas	101,424
Utah	10,086
Vermont	10,000
Virginia	46,307
Washington	27,476
West Virginia	18,129
Wisconsin	36,173
Wyoming	10,000
Outlying areas	69,571

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." All programs cited in this article, like every other program or activity receiving financial assistance from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, operate in compliance with this law.

GHOST OF JEFFERSON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a thought-provoking column appeared in the Madison (W. Va.) Coal Valley News on August 24, 1967.

I ask unanimous consent to insert that column, entitled "Ghost of Jefferson," in the RECORD.

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

GHOST OF JEFFERSON

Last night I dreamed that several thousand chief officeholders, Party faithfuls, financial angels, and people called "dignitaries" attended a fabulous fund-raising dinner for the Democrat Party, honoring Thomas Jefferson who is claimed as founder of that political organization. The master of ceremonies was banging his gavel for quiet before introducing the final speaker when strangely the lights in the great hall grew very dim, and after a few long and sobering seconds came on bright again, revealing a dignified man of commanding presence, walking slowly toward the speaker's table.

The chairman and the guests at the head table looked on in surprise as the stranger proceeded to the microphone. The crowd sat hushed, expectant, as the courtly white-haired gentleman began to speak:

"The first object of my heart is my own country . . . If once (the people) become inattentive to the public affairs, you and I, and Congress, and assemblies, judges and governors, shall all become wolves."

"Wolves! He's talking about Republicans!" chuckled an exuberant guest to his wife.

"The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time; the hand of force may destroy, but cannot disjoin them."

The audience was silent.

"The great principles of right and wrong are legible to every reader . . . The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest. Only aim to do your duty, and mankind will give you credit where you fail."

"Who let that crackpot in here?" muttered a public servant.

"Had the doctrines of Jesus been preached always as they came from His lips, the whole civilized world would now have been Christian."

"Now he's quit meddlin' and started preachin'!" a wardheeler cracked.

"When a man assumes a public trust, he should consider himself as public property. . . . Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just."

"But God is dead," shouted a nut on the aisle, "and even if He's not, the Republican Party is!" The audience laughed heartily, but the speaker only seemed to become more serious, more stern, more intense.

"What has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every government which has ever existed under the sun?" the old gentleman asked. And then he answered his own question: "The generalizing and concentrating of all cares and powers into one body."

"Who is this, somebody making the scene for Governor Wallace's husband!" yelled an inebriate.

Ignoring the laughter and the taunts the speaker again continued with great dignity: "An elective despotism was not the government we fought for, but one which should not only be founded on free principles, but in which the powers of government should be so divided and balanced among several bodies of magistracy as that no one could transcend their legal limits without being effectually checked and restrained by the others. For this reason, that convention which passed the ordinance of government laid its foundation on this basis: that the Legislative, Executive, and Judiciary Departments should be separate and distinct, so that no person should exercise the powers of more than one of them at the same time . . . Our peculiar security is in the possession of a written constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper construction. I say the same as to the opinion of those who consider the grant of treaty-making power as boundless. If it is, then we have no Constitution."

"Now he's sounding like one of those superpatriots," grumbled an internationalist to no one in particular. "What would we do without Executive Orders and our treaties which build 'bridges of friendship' to our Communist brothers?" he shouted.

Tension and indignation were now mounting as the old man went on: "Our judges are as honest as other men and not more so . . . It is characteristic of a good judge to expand his jurisdiction—and their power (is) the more dangerous as they are in office for life and not responsible, as the other functionaries are, to the elective control . . . Do not talk to me about the integrity of public officials. I say chain the politicians to the limitations of the Constitution itself . . . I am for preserving to the states the powers not

yielded by them to the Union, and to the Legislature of the Union its constitutional share in the division of powers, and I am not for transferring all the powers of the states to the general government and all those of that government to the Executive Branch. I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt."

"He's Ronald Reagan in a wig!" a drunk exclaimed. Everybody laughed but the old gentleman.

"(I am) not for a multiplication of offices and salaries merely to make partisans, (nor) for increasing by every device, the public debt on the principle of its being a public blessing."

"The old fool doesn't realize that debt has no meaning," explained a young Keynesian to his fluttering date. "We owe it to ourselves! Eventually, we can cancel all debt, create a world money system, and start over. All the same real estate will remain intact, but it will have different owners. All the people will own it!" The girl giggled and referred to the somber gentleman at the microphone as "Pops".

"Our country is too large to have all its affairs directed by a single government," continued the speaker . . . I do verily believe that if the principle were to prevail of a common law being in force in the United States (which principle possesses the general government at once of all the powers of the state government and reduces us to a single consolidated government) it would become the most corrupt government on earth . . ."

The shock that had gripped the room now gave way to pandemonium as the audience screamed: "Kook! Reactionary! Traitor! Bircher! Throw him out!" Some even began to throw napkins and bang the table and clank their silver against their goblets.

The speaker stopped, and for a long moment looked pityingly at the stunned and angry faces. Those close by heard him murmur, "Oh, God, forgive them," as two policemen rushed to the stage and took the old man gingerly by the arms. And to the tune of boos, catcalls, and whistles, Thomas Jefferson, lawyer, architect, writer, true liberal, gentleman, educator, author of the Declaration of Independence and chief architect of the Constitution of the United States of America was escorted to the nearest exit.

TOM ANDERSON.

FEDERAL MEDIATORS PERFORM EXCELLENT SERVICES TO PUBLIC

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the business and finance section of the Washington Post for Sunday, August 27, carried a thoughtful and accurate story about the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, entitled "Independent Mediator Service Earns Applause."

The story discussed the high esteem in which FMCS is held by both management and labor, and mentioned a few examples of how the Service earned its repute.

I would like to add to the applause for the Service and its Director, Hon. William E. Simkin. Recently, my home city of Laconia, N.H., faced a crisis as a result of a labor-management dispute which threatened to permanently close Laconia's largest employer. I had occasion to contact the principals involved and was pleased to find the high respect they held for Mr. Simkin and his organization.

It is unusual for a Federal agency to so consistently receive tributes from both labor and management. So that my colleagues may better understand this situation I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

INDEPENDENT MEDIATOR SERVICE EARNS APPLAUSE

(By Frank C. Porter)

Company and union negotiators had been bargaining all day and tempers were frayed.

One man got to his feet and announced he had a gun. Federal mediator Nathan S. Kazin reported later he could see it under the man's coat.

The negotiators' adversary told him where he could go, in violent language.

"I heard chairs scrape as everybody braced for an old Wild West shootout," Kazin recalled later to the Florida Times-Union of Jacksonville.

"I jumped up and shouted, 'I'm a coward; I'm leaving your company, gentlemen,' and started for the door. This bit of comedy broke the tension. They guffawed, sat back down and worked toward agreement."

"THE SILENT SERVICE"

Life in the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service rarely reaches this melodramatic pitch. In fact, this unprepossessing little agency with barely 400 employees and a modest $6 million budget, practically unknown to the public, is regarded as "the silent service."

Kazin's experience, although unusual, suggests the scope of its mission and the ingenuity of the FMCS's 260-odd mediators must call upon in the more than 7000 labor-management disputes they directly settle in a year.

William E. Simkin, a gentle, rumpled big bear of a man who has headed the independent FMCS since 1961, once suggested these attributes for the ideal mediator:

"The patience of Job, the sincerity and bulldog characteristics of the English, the wit of the Irish, the physical endurance of a marathon runner, the brokenfield dodging abilities of a halfback, the guile of a Machiavelli, the confidence-retaining characteristics of a mute, the hide of a rhinoceros and the wisdom of Solomon."

ROUGH BARGAINING YEAR

Never have Simkin and his fellow mediators needed these qualities more than in 1967. It has been a rough year at the bargaining table. There have been strikes or lockouts in railroads, trucking, rubber, copper and a number of smaller industries. Trouble looms in autos, where the present United Auto Workers contract expires Sept. 6.

With corporate profits only slightly below their all-time peak, with the accelerated rise in the cost of living cutting badly into the purchasing power of paychecks, and with rank-and-file unions showing an increasing disposition to vote down settlements recommended by their leaders, labor has been steadily escalating its demands on management. At the same time, management resistance to these demands is stiffening.

How much wilder and woolier the bargaining picture would have been without the FMCS is anyone's guess. There is no way of totting up the savings in wages, profits and convenience to the public as the result of the strikes or lockouts that were averted or cut short by the expertise and persuasiveness of Federal mediators.

KEYSTONE OF FREEDOM

To Simkin, the considerable economic losses that the Service has helped to avoid is only part of the story. An earnest Quaker who feels that relations between labor and management need not necessarily be adversary, Simkin regards unfettered collective bargaining as the keystone of economic freedom.

He regards it the primary task of his agency to help make collective bargaining work. If it doesn't work he reasons, an angry public beset by crippling strikes, will demand governmental intervention to force settlements on management and labor alike.

The United States had an unpleasant experience with this alternative last month when, for the only second time in history, the Congress passed a law providing for a compulsory labor settlement in peacetime. This was the railroad shopcraft dispute.

CONTRAST TO RAIL DISPUTE

This dispute was covered by the Railway Labor Act and didn't come under FMCS jurisdiction. But there has been considerable speculation that it might have had an entirely different outcome if it had.

A vivid contrast to the railroad imbroglio was FCMS's adept mediation of the dispute between a majority of the Nation's leading trucking firms and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters earlier this year. This was a touch-and-go situation that could have had nearly as nasty repercussions as the two-day railroad strike.

Earlier this month, the acting president of the Teamsters, Frank E. Fitzsimmons, threw Simkin and the FMCS an unexpected bouquet. The Teamsters are notoriously stingy in their praise of any Federal agency, but Fitzsimmons gave the Service full credit for settling the dispute.

"It was through the efforts of this agency's director, William E. Simkin, and the agency's disputes director, Walter A. Maggiolo, that reluctant employers were brought to the bargaining table, and kept there until our contract in freight was successfully worked out," Fitzsimmons wrote in the monthly Teamster.

"I am not so sure that the politicians are sincerely interested in preserving free collective bargaining," he continued. "But if they are, they would do well to encourage the kind of government assistance in collective bargaining as represented by the efforts of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"Because this is one agency which dispels the need for anti-strike legislation, for compulsory arbitration. It is the one agency of government which encourages free collective bargaining because it acts as the proper catalyst to properly mix labor and management in good faith bargaining."

THE NATIONAL GUARD AND THE NATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, page A7 of the August 28, 1967, edition of the Washington Evening Star carried a statement by the National Guard Association of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to insert that statement in the RECORD.

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

THE NATIONAL GUARD AND THE NATION

(NOTE.—Lately you have been reading much about the National Guard. But ask yourself, how much do you know of the National Guard? Who belongs? What does it do? How does it function? Here are the true facts concerning the Guard and how it responds in troubled times to restore order and maintain our safety.)

The men of the National Guard are citizens first, soldiers second. They are farmers, clerks, executives, teachers, professional men and businessmen who share a common responsibility: to respond when they are needed. The need may be flood, fire, war, riot, insurrection—any natural or man-made disaster which threatens the lives or well-being of their countrymen.

The National Guard is a vital part of our nation's military forces.

Are fighting men needed in some remote corner of the world? The Guard can be called. And it responds.

The Mississippi River roars over its banks. The Guard is called. And it responds.

There are riots in the streets of our cities. The Guard is called. And it responds.

Wherever and whenever, the Guard responds.

Quickly.

Efficiently.

Unquestioningly.

No one can measure the suffering the National Guard has relieved.

No one can assess the tragedy the National Guard has averted.

No one can count the number of lives the National Guard has saved.

Recently, Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, wrote of the Air National Guard's contribution to the success of military objectives in Viet Nam:

". . . *I want to express my personal appreciation for their splendid performance. They have demonstrated once again, that our nation can always count on the National Guard.*"

We live in a changing world. Each day brings new advances in technology. New countries emerge and declare independence. New voices are heard in social protest. New challenges to the nation arise in sometimes unprecedented and unpredictable ways.

The National Guard keeps pace with the changing times. Training is modern and total. Leadership qualities are sought out and developed. In accordance with the Constitution of the United States, which provides for a citizen's militia (the National Guard) "to execute the laws of the nation, suppress insurrections and repel invasion," the National Guard is maintained at the highest possible level of efficiency.

Today, tomorrow, twenty years from now, there is comfort in the knowledge that, when the need arises, the National Guard will respond.

As it always has.

THE NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

ADJOURNMENT TO SEPTEMBER 11, 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move, in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 497, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon, Monday, September 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under authority of House Concurrent Resolution 497, agreed to on August 29, the Senate will stand adjourned until noon, Monday, September 11, 1967.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, September 11, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
August 31, 1967.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ALBERT assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

PRAYER

The Reverend Thomas A. Hinson, First Baptist Church, West Memphis, Ark., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, make America worthy to be loved by a God like Thee. Show us, this day, the right way; make us willing followers of Thee, realizing that even the foolishness of God is wiser than the wisdom of men. In this desperate hour remind America that *The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all Nations that forget God.*—Psalm 9: 17.

Grant our President, his Cabinet, and Congress wisdom and courage to do right, and abiding dedication to put service above self.

Bless our servicemen with salvation of body and soul, and bring home safely as many as possible. O Thou Prince of Peace, intervene in world affairs, and bring peace to Vietnam.

In Jesus' name, who promised loving consideration for all our prayers. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 19, 1967:

H.R. 743. An act to amend the act of September 26, 1950, authorizing the Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands.

On August 21, 1967:

H.R. 4496. An act for the relief of the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.;

H.R. 4833. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Pennsylvania; and

H.R. 7043. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Department under which the U.S. Coast Guard is operating to cause the vessel *Northwind*, owned by Wallace P. Smith, Jr., of Centreville, Md., to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges.

On August 25, 1967:

H.R. 1619. An act for the relief of Rene Hugo Heimann;

H.R. 2036. An act for the relief of Carlos Rogelio Flores-Vasquez;

H.R. 2668. An act for the relief of Sevasti Diakides;

H.R. 3195. An act for the relief of Eli Eleonora Bianchi;

H.R. 3881. An act for the relief of Christina Hatzisavvas; and

H.R. 7516. An act for the relief of Song Sin Taik and Song Kyung Ho.

On August 28, 1967:

H.R. 2470. An act to provide for the free entry of certain scientific instruments and apparatus for the use of Tufts University, Mount Holyoke College, and the Massachusetts division of the American Cancer Society.

On August 29, 1967:

H.R. 1282. An act to provide for the withdrawal of wine from bonded wine cellars without payment of tax when rendered unfit for beverage use, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2531. An act to provide for the disposition of the unclaimed and unpaid share of the Loyal Creek judgment fund, and to provide for disposition of estates of interstate members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma or estates of members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma dying without heirs;

H.R. 4809. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley;

H.R. 5967. An act for the relief of Albert P. Morell;

H.R. 6452. An act for the relief of John E. Coplin;

H.R. 7362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain properties within the Colonial National Historical Park, in Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 804. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 510. An act providing for full disclosure of corporate equity ownership of securities under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; and

S. 1763. An act to promote the economic development of Guam.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 906. An act for the relief of Luis Tapia Davila; and

S. 1448. An act for the relief of Roy A. Parker.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 90–70, appointed Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. BENNETT to be members, on the part of the Senate, of the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 80–816, appointed Mr. FANNIN as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy in lieu of Mr. MORTON, resigned.

The message also announced that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 974) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the city of Glendale, Ariz."

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select

Committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 68.3.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 11, 1967

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the week beginning subsequent to the Labor Day recess.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the program for the week of September 11, 1967, is as follows:

On Monday, Consent Calendar and Private Calendar; District day, but there are no District bills; and there are five suspensions:

H.R. 206, authorizing the settlement of claims of the Coast Guard while operating as a service in the Department of Transportation;

H.R. 11816, providing benefits for law enforcement officers killed or injured while apprehending violators of Federal law;

H.R. 8654, providing for an appeal by the United States from decisions sustaining motions to suppress evidence;

H.R. 3810, providing training opportunities for Federal legislative employees; and

H.R. 8775, increasing the authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

On Tuesday, H.R. 10738, Department of Defense appropriation bill, fiscal year 1968, conference report; and

H.R. 10409, Small Business Act Amendments of 1967—open rule, 2 hours of debate.

On Wednesday and balance of week, S. 602, Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967—open rule, 3 hours of debate, waiving points of order and making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for purpose of amendment; and

House Resolution 838, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct certain studies and investigations.

This announcement is made, of course, subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON SEPTEMBER 13, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday, September 13, 1967, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTEND THE MIGRANT FARMWORKER'S HEALTH ACT

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, few programs have achieved the success of the Migrant Health Act in such a short time. Few programs have been undertaken with as little criticism, or as few administrative difficulties. This program will soon be up for renewal, and I have today introduced legislation t extend the authorization for another 3 years.

Having worked closely with all concerned with this legislation in seeking the initial authorization in 1962, and having followed its progress during these intervening years, I know it to be one of exceptional merit. The need is so obvious it hardly seems necessary to reinstate it, but in these days of tight money and priorities, it would be well to review the program. Before looking at the picture nationwide, however, I would like to relate to you how the program operates in just one county in Florida.

The migrant health project provides health services to the 20,000 migrant agricultural workers who work on the Palm Beach County farms annually. This is a group which consists of southern Negroes, Puerto Ricans, natives of the West Indies, Texas Mexican Americans, Cuban refugees, and Eastern seaboard caucasians. The project gives these people family health service clinics, nursing and sanitation services in the camps and other areas where they live and work.

Migrant workers reside in some 136 camps in the county. A group of nine full-time and 16 part-time employees work in the migrant camp areas to improve sanitary conditions. Over 1,958 health problems were corrected, often with the help of the migrant workers themselves. Several camps were closed, and many more were improved.

Nationwide, accomplishments under the Migrant Health Act have been noteworthy. Projections for the future require additional effort.

In September 1962, the Congress first authorized the Public Health Service to make grants to help communities extend health services to the migrants who help them produce and harvest their crops each year. Fifty-eight applications had been received by the Public Health Service from community sponsors before the first funds were appropriated to carry out the act in May 1963. In that first year, and in each year since that time, requests for funds have exceeded the funds available.

As of June 1967, 106 migrant health projects—each serving one or more counties—were receiving grant assistance. During the year, migrant workers and family dependents made 215,000 visits to physicians and 24,000 visits to dentists under project auspices. By late June, 55 projects in 25 States had added hospital care to their services. The projects had signed agreements with 162 short-term general hospitals to provide care for migrant patients, and an intensified program of early casefinding, medical care outside the hospital, and predischarge planning had developed in each of the 55 project areas.

Migrant health projects provide not only greatly needed remedial care for workers and dependents, but also immunizations, family planning services, nutrition counseling, and referral of patients for followup services after they return to their home base, or go to other work areas. In addition, the projects work with growers and other community groups to improve housing and environmental conditions, and to develop better understanding and acceptance of migrants. Finally they work with migrants, themselves, to develop understanding and application of good homemaking and safety practices to prevent as much illness and disability as possible.

In spite of the progress made, project services fall far short of making accessible to migrants the same services the rest of the Nation enjoys. As an example, if the 300,000 migrants estimated to be in one or more project areas for part of last year had used health resources at the average per capita rate for the Nation as a whole—4.5 medical and 1.6 dental visits per person per year—they would have made more than 1 million visits to physicians and nearly one-half million visits to dentists last year. This is in contrast to the 215,000 medical and 24,000 dental visits reported by the projects.

The services of existing projects are heavily utilized. However, the level of service in these existing projects is deficient in relation to the need. Moreover, more than 400—55 percent—of the Nation's counties where migrants live and work in counties still have no project services.

A further handicap to the migrant health program as it now operates is the continuing hardship to local participating hospitals resulting from the payment, on the average, of only 60 percent of total hospital costs. Making up the deficiency is extremely difficult for some communities in view of the high costs of hospital care.

PROJECTION

To meet the continuing needs of the Nation's migrants at a level more commensurate with their health problems requires continuation of the Migrant Health Act for another 3-year period. The number of counties in which migrants have access to project services should be increased with the expansion of geographic coverage concentrated on home-base and important "upstream" areas.

More physicians and dentists should be employed for longer periods, to reduce the gap between the medical and dental services received by migrants and those received by others in our Nation. Case-

finding and followup care as migrants move from one county to another should be strengthened. The employment and training of aides as intermediaries between the migrant and the professional health worker should be expanded, in order that the migrant will learn to accept responsibility for appropriate health action on his own behalf.

The investment in the health of migrant workers and their families will benefit migrants by improving their health and their earning power. It will benefit their employers, their temporary communities, and the Nation as a whole by assuring a healthy, productive farm labor force, alleviating costly health emergencies, and reducing the present economic drain created by unnecessary illness and disability.

Approved projects around the country include:

Arizona: Arizona State Department of Health, Maricopa County Health Department, Pima County Health Department, Pinal County Health Department, Yuma County Health Department.

Arkansas: Northwest Arkansas Migrant Committee, Fayetteville Calif., State department of public health, San Joaquin County Medical Society, Kern County Medical Society, Santa Clara County Medical Society.

Colorado: Colorado Department of Public Health.

Connecticut: State Department of Health.

Delaware: Delaware State Council of Churches.

Florida: Florida State Board of Health, Dade County Health Department, Palm Beach County Health Department.

Idaho: Idaho Department of Health.

Illinois: Illinois Department of Public Health, Northwest Church Council for Migrant Aid, Inc., Migrant Ministry Committee of the Council of Churches of Scott and Rock Island Counties.

Indiana: Indiana State Board of Health.

Iowa: Migrant Action Program, Inc., Muscatine Neighborhood Health Center for Migrants.

Kansas: Kansas City-Wyandotte County Health Department, Migrant Health Project Office.

Kentucky: Kentucky State Department of Health.

Louisiana: Tangipahoa Migrant Committee.

Maryland: Worcester County Community Action Committee, Inc.

Massachusetts: Massachusetts Health Research Institute, Inc.

Michigan: Michigan Department of Health, Ottowa County Health Department, Manistee-Mason District Health Department, Monroe County Health Department, Tri-County Associated Health Departments, Grand Traverse-Leelanau-Benzie County Health Department in cooperation with the Grand Traverse Migrant Labor Council, District Health Department No. 4, Benzie Migrant Ministry Committee.

Minnesota: Minnesota Department of Health.

Missouri: Family health education services for home based migrants.

Nebraska: Migrant Health Project Office.

Nevada: Clark County District Health Department.

New Jersey: New Jersey State Department of Health, Board of Chosen Freeholders of Cumberland County.

New Mexico: New Mexico Department of Public Health, Las Cruces Committee on Migrant Ministry.

New York: New York State Department of Health, New York State Health Department, Cayuga County Health Department, Migrant Committee of the Warwick Valley Council of Churches, Ulster County Department of Health, Suffolk County Department of Health, Monroe County Migrant Project, University of Rochester.

North Carolina: North Carolina State Board of Health, Sampson County Health Department, District Health Department, Henderson County Migrant Council, Inc., Carteret County Migrant Committee.

Ohio: Ohio Department of Health, Hartville Migrant Council, Inc., Sandusky County-Fremont City General Health District, Darke County General Health District, Ottawa County Ministry to Migrants, Putnam County General Health District, Lucas County Health Department.

Oklahoma: Oklahoma State Department of Health.

Oregon: Oregon State Board of Health, Yamhill County Health Department.

Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Health.

Puerto Rico: Health needs of migrant Workers Project, University of Puerto Rico.

South Carolina: Comprehensive health program for agricultural migrants, Beaufort County, health services for migratory agricultural workers and their families, Charleston County.

Texas: Texas State Department of Health, Jim Wells County migrant health project, Greenbelt Medical Society migrant health project, Childress, and Hall Counties, Crosby County migrant health service project, Del Rio-Val Verde County Health Department, Castro County migratory health project, Leon Valley migrant health project, Hidalgo County migrant health project, Goliad County migrant health project, Gonzales County migrant health project, Laredo-Webb County Health Department, Lubbock City-County Health Department, Plainview-Hale County Health Department, La Salle County migrant health project, Yoakum County migrant health service project, Port Lavaca-Calhoun County Health Unit, Cameron County Health Department, Hudspeth County-Dell City migrant health project, Spur-Dickens County health service project, Zapata County migrant health project, Floyd County migrant health service project, Jim Hogg County migrant health project, Southwestern Texas Health Department, Eagle Pass, Live Oak County Health Department, San Marcos-Hays County Health Department, Hidalgo County Health Department

Utah: Utah State Department of Health.

Virginia: Division of local health services.

Washington: Washington State Department of Health, Whatcom County migrant health program, Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department, Skagit County Health Department.

West Virginia: District No. 5 Health Department.

Wisconsin: Catholic Diocese of Madison, migrant medical aid program, St. Joseph Migrant Family Health Clinic, the Industrial Labor and Human Relations Commission of Wisconsin.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 159

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 159, to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CRIME AND THE JUDICIARY: PART I

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming increasingly concerned over actions of the judiciary, Federal, State, and local, and the responsibility they must share for the rising crime rate and civil disorders. I will comment on these matters from time to time in the near future.

One of the strangest happenings in American judicial history occurred in the Federal court in New York, where bond for H. Rap Brown was reduced so he could be set free. The spectacle of a Federal judge fleeing his own courtroom two times because of a mob, and then reducing the bond and giving the appearance of surrendering Brown to the cheering crowd, hardly reflects credit on the Federal judiciary. Apparently, not one arrest was made for contempt or disorderly conduct. The mob had its way—the judge retreated from his courtroom.

It was not too surprising that the same judge, later, gave Brown permission to travel outside the court's jurisdiction at will.

Brown's travels took him to Camden, N.J., last night. This morning we were greeted with the news that:

> A fiery black power speech by . . . Rap Brown, who extorted his hearers to get guns, touched off a flurry of bottle-throwing here last night. At least one store was looted.

Brown has been charged with two crimes, and been subject to court proceedings in four localities—yet he remains free to teach hate and rebellion. A State court in Virginia has delayed his hearing on extradition to Maryland,

where he is wanted for inciting to arson. The Virginia court set a nominal bail. Brown was free to travel. His travels took him to New Orleans, where he boarded a plane with a gun. The New York Federal court again set him free. Apparently, he is still traveling the country. Maybe even with a gun.

Brown was arrested for violating existing Federal gun laws—carrying a weapon across State lines while under indictment. Yet he is free today. The judiciary let him free.

This is a classic case. The police did their work. The FBI did its work. The Treasury agents did their work. A State grand jury in Maryland, and a Federal grand jury in Louisiana, and their prosecuting attorneys did their work. What did the courts do? The courts two times set the bail low and the accused free. Intimidating mobs had gathered on both occasions. Both times Brown was released to his supporters. And in the Federal courthouse in New York, a Federal judge twice had to leave the courtroom to the mob.

The judiciary too has a responsibility in the war against crime. The American people demand that this responsibility be recognized by the courts, Federal, State, and local.

COLORFUL CAREER OF ANNE MICHAELS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include an article from the Washington Post about a truly great woman—the dynamic Anne Michaels, who is as well and sympathetically informed on Africa as anyone I know, and who as a volunteer has been most helpful to me as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The article from the Washington Post of July 30, 1967, follows:

SILLY TITLE HAS SERIOUS HOLDER

"Director of Media Services-Audio Visual? I don't know what it means," says Anne Michaels, holder of that title at OEO.

"It's a silly title . . . so I sign it differently depending on the letter I'm writing."

Anne is flip about her title, but there is no nonsense about the way she handles her job. She directs all the TV action for OEO and is responsible for all of their films.

"A Year Toward Tomorrow"—a film about Head Start—won an Oscar. And two other OEO films are up for awards at the Edinburgh Festival.

"I think what I am proudest of is that we have never made a public information film. We come up with concepts," she said.

Anne came to OEO after working as a "Citizen for Johnson" during the 1964 campaign and working for a public relations firm that dealt with many foreign clients.

"It (the OEO) had a quality that I like. It was new and different, and yet in many ways it was similar to what I had been doing in foreign affairs. Only this was about underdeveloped America instead of under-developed Africa."

Anne heads a six-man office and says that as far as she knows she is the only woman in government heading up such an operation.

Anne, who is petite, has twinkling blue eyes (covered with contact lenses), and blonde hair usually hidden by one of three falls. She is a New Yorker born in Detroit—"mother, a designer of children's clothes, went there to be with her mother when I was born."

She was taken to New York when only 10 days old and led an uneventful life until she was three and became a child actress—"on Broadway and in radio." She graduated from high school when she was 15 and went to London to study on a scholarship at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Arts.

"I was married and unmarried, was in the American Club Theater in London, did some writing—a column for Billboard and some writing on the side for the Times.

"Then I went to Paris where I did a lot of things simultaneously. I was Tarzan's representative there, edited and wrote for a magazine like our 'Cue,' made a couple of films for USIS and got into intercontinental TV.

"When I came back to the United States I was only 22. . .

"I came to Washington to help a friend rewrite a book on the War of 1812, and later started working for a public relations firm. All of their clients were foreign—a lot of new African countries. And I did a fun thing at the World's Fair for Italian fashions and the Italian wine industry.

"About then I decided I had been working with other governments for so long I wanted to find out a little about my own. So, I worked during the campaign for Johnson and Humphrey."

From there, to OEO.

Six months ago she moved into a town house in Foggy Bottom. "I keep insisting it is going to be finished and every week it isn't."

All of her furniture came from the Thieves' Market, and she has achieved the dream of all antique buffs—she paid $65 for a chair and has been offered $2500 for it.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON A VERY GOOD AND A VERY GREAT MAN, SAYS THE PRESIDENT OF MALAWI

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and pleasure to report the expression of friendship to the United States in the resolution of the Parliament of Malawi and in the remarks of Dr. M. Kamuzu Banda, the beloved and universally admired and respected President of Malawi, on his return home from a visit in Washington June 2 to 12. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Banda has a host of friends in the district I represent, friends in the faculty and in the community and among his schoolmates when he was a student at the University of Chicago. The United States has no better friend in all the world than President Banda.

I am extending my remarks to include the resolution passed by the Parliament of Malawi and the subsequent speech by President Banda on June 27, 1967, as taken verbatim from the official reports of the proceedings of the Parliament, as follows:

ORDERS OF THE DAY—MOTIONS, JUNE 27, 1967

The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kumtumanji): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do welcome and approve the strengthening of the bonds of friendship between the Republic of Malawi and her friends overseas, in particular the United States of America, which has resulted from the recent visit of His Excellency the President to the United States and Britain and that the House do congratulate His Excellency the President on the success of that visit. (*Applause.*)

H.E. The President (Dr. Banda): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy to hear the Minister of Natural Resources, who is now Leader of the House, propose what he has proposed. This morning, as some of the Honourable Members may know, since the House last met, a number of important and significant events have taken place. To mention some of them; my own visit to the United States and the United Kingdom; the outbreak of the war in the Middle East and a reported statement by one of the leaders in a neighboring State.

As the House is aware, I left the country on the 29th May for a trip overseas. This trip overseas was occasioned by the invitation I received from the University of Massachusetts to receive its Honorary Degree. When the City of Independence, Missouri, learned that I was going to the University of Massachusetts, to receive an Honorary Degree there, it also, when I say it also I mean the city of Independence in the State of Missouri, decided to invite me. It extended an invitation to me to visit it while I was in the United States. As you know, the City of Independence in Missouri is a sister city to Blantyre.

The invitation from the University of Massachusetts and the City of Independence to visit the United States naturally gave me an opportunity to renew my contacts with the President of the United States, the Right Honourable Lyndon Johnson, whom I had met in 1964 when I went there on the occasion of Malawi's admission to the United Nations.

In particular, I was deeply touched and greatly impressed by the way in which the President of the United States of America, the Right Honourable Lyndon Johnson, received and treated me. At the time I arrived in Washington, the President was deeply engaged—and I mean just that—deeply and gravely engaged. The crisis created by the outbreak of war in the Middle East, between Egypt and Israel, was at its height. The President of the United States, at that time had every reason not to see me or, if he did see me, to see me only for a few minutes because he was truly and literally very, very busy. And what was even more, my visit was a private one—not a State or Official one. I would like to emphasize this, Mr. Speaker and Honourable Members. Yet, busy as he was, pressed for time as he was, the President took the trouble not only to see me and discuss international problems with me, but also to arrange and give a reception and a Luncheon in my honour. (*Applause.*)

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, he also saw to it that the streets in the City of Washington—at least in that part of the City where I was to pass and to stay from the Airport to the house where I stayed—was gaily decorated with Malawi and American flags. (*Applause.*) And although my visit was a private one, President Johnson accommodated me in his official Guest House, Blair House. It is not necessary for me to tell the House in detail what President Johnson and I discussed. Naturally we touched on the present and pressing international problems, in particular the war in the Middle East, and as you would expect, we also discussed Malawi's economic financial needs.

On the war in the Middle East, I was very glad to note and see that the President and I more or less have the same views or share the same views. (*Applause.*) We have identical views on the problems, not only of the present conflict between the Arabs and Israelis, but on the problems in the Middle

East in general. I was greatly impressed with the President's knowledge, understanding and interpretation of every thing that we discussed.

As regards my discussion with the President of the United States on Malawi, I was greatly impressed by the knowledge which the President had on our needs, and the interest he takes in the needs personally. I would rather not say very much on this subject just now, but all I would like to tell the House is this—that President Johnson is a true friend of Malawi. (*Applause.*) Here again, I do not want to interfere in domestic or American domestic politics or local politics, and I hope anyone who hears me here will not think that I am trying to interfere in the local politics of America, but what I would like the House to know is what I said at the airport. President Johnson is a very good man, indeed a great man; a very good man and a great man who is often misunderstood or mis-interpreted; a very good man and a great man who is not always given credit for the good he is doing in America. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I was educated in America. I was there for many, many years. I went to High School there, and to a College of Medicine. I know something about American life, about the racial situation there. But no one can deny that as regards racial problems or race relations, things have vastly changed since I was there as a student, beginning with Roosevelt, and then Truman, and then Eisenhower, Kennedy, and now Johnson himself. Every time things are definitely changing for the better.

Talking to Americans themselves, privately—not on the platforms, and not about what they shout on the platforms, and Americans that should know—in Massachusetts, in Missouri and in Washington itself, I came to the conclusion that President Johnson is misunderstood, mis-interpreted and very often not given credit for the good work he is doing. He is doing more for the American negro than some of the American negroes realize, I can tell you that. (*Applause.*) You have probably seen in the papers that quite recently he has nominated an American negro Judge as Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. No other President before has ever done that. This gives me great encouragement in what I am trying to do here. As you know, Mr. Speaker, ever since I came to Zomba I have done my best to preach the gospel of reconciliation between the Europeans and the Africans in this country, and now I am trying to extend that gospel beyond our borders—to Rhodesia, South Africa, Mozambique.

IMPORTANCE OF RAILROAD FROM ZAMBIA TO TANZANIA AND THREAT OF TAKEOVER BY RED CHINA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I expressed my deep concern over the prospect, as outlined in the August 12, 1967, issue of the London Economist, of Red China underwriting the building of a railroad from Zambia to Dar es Salaam in Tanzania. I said then, and I repeat today, that the procrastination or lack of interest of our country in giving encouragement to the interested African nations in building a railroad tied up with their destiny is a tragic mistake that may lead to our missing the boat as far as Africa is concerned. My speech of Monday appears on page 24221 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 28, 1967, and I urge its reading by my colleagues. If the London Economist is correctly informed, Red China is on the verge of financing a railroad that will give Red China a real, a very substantial foothold in Africa.

Make no mistake in estimating the future of Africa. No part of the world has a richer future than that of the Continent of Africa, and that future will be developed and advanced exactly as was that of our own western territory—by rail transportation and by water power development.

I have long advocated the railroad from Zambia to Tanzania, advocated it as vigorously as some years ago I advocated the Volta project in Ghana. The roadblocks there were finally overcome, and I do hope they eventually will be overcome as far as the Tan-Zam railroad is concerned. If Red China takes over while we are playing with our fingers it well could be that the United States would have no share commercially with Africa's rich tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in the hope of awakening an interest among my colleagues before it is too late, and at least giving them a background of facts as basis for deeper study. I am today, on this final session before the vacation, presenting the case of the Tan-Zam railroad project as I view it.

PRESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The physical works to be engineered and constructed include the necessary facilities to provide a complete railway system between the copper belt in Zambia and the sea at Port Dar-es-Salaam in Tanzania. The transport system consists of a new railroad of approximately 1,000 miles plus modifications to 300 miles of existing rail line, for an operating total of 1,300 miles. The facilities to be provided include:

Mechanized copper loading platforms, spur and yard tracks, terminals, locomotive and car repair shops in the copper belt near Ndola.

The necessary sidings, signals and other modifications to the existing 3-foot-6-inch-gage line from Ndola to Kampayo.

Construction of approximately 1,000 miles of new 3-foot-6-inch railroad from Kampayo across Zambia and Tanzania via Mbeya to join the existing Tanzanian meter gage—3 feet 3 inches—line at Kidatu.

Necessary new construction or modifications to convert the Tanzanian line between Kidatu and Dar-es-Salaam to allow through 3-foot-6-inch operation.

A marine terminal at Dar-es-Salaam including the necessary dredging, quay structure, transit sheds, loading and unloading equipment, rail terminal, yards and locomotive and car service and repair shops.

Stations, staff quarters and auxiliary facilities for the entire railway system.

Signals and communication facilities for efficient system operation and train control, including radio train communication.

Fuel and water storage and other auxiliaries required for operation.

Locomotives and rolling stock.

IMPORTANCE OF INTERREGIONAL AND INTER-AFRICAN ECONOMY

It is clear from the African map that the railway systems of south-central Africa and east Africa are separated by a considerable distance. The Tan-Zam project, if implemented, will fill this gap and unify the two systems into one network to provide sub-Sahara Africa with a through service from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, and from the Equator to the cape.

Since the economic activities in Africa are historically concentrated along the rail lines as they were in the United States in the early days of our development, the significance of this new link is likely to be far reaching. By joining the East African Railways to the Central and South African Railways, the new link would stimulate the development of inter-African trade, particularly in the landlocked countries. It would in fact serve as a route of integration for regional economic relations. The regionalization of the railways would implement a greater regional economy with the benefits of wider markets, more diversified supply and larger scale production and trade.

In a wider perspective, the rail link would constitute an essential section of the long conceived Capetown to Cairo Railway, and would therefore represent a major step toward the eventual development of an all-African railway network.

By providing a vital infrastructure, the new link would induce agricultural and industrial development in some of the potentially rich and underdeveloped areas of Zambia and Tanzania. By extending the radii of the markets, it would break the isolation of many localities and serve to integrate their economic and social activities. Thus the new link would enhance the process of commercialization and industrialization on a subcontinental scale.

There have been recent intergovernmental discussions by Zambia and Malawi as to joining the east African common market. The new link would enhance the possibilities of any such arrangement.

REGIONAL ECONOMICS OF COPPER

The proposed link will be of great significance to the African copper industry which constitutes 23 percent of world output and supply. The copper belt is located in the heart of south-central Africa, with mining operations primarily in Zambia and the Congo. In Africa as elsewhere, copper mining activities are principally determined by world demand and by sales price which as a rule fluctuates widely corresponding to the business cycles of the industrial countries being supplied. Thus, it is difficult to project future world copper consumption; however, recent studies indicate that the major upward trend in demand is likely to be maintained in the foreseeable future. In the meantime, the ore reserves in the African copper belt appear to be abundant for increased mining in future years, particularly since new techniques permit economic production from lower grade deposits. Thus it appears that the major problems facing the copper industry in Africa are the improvements

in the methods of production and transportation in order to reduce the price of the product on world markets.

For transportation of copper from the copper belt to the world markets, the Tan-Zam link would contribute greatly in terms of both capacity and shipment cost. The existing routes of copper movement, especially the Rhodesian, Mozambique, Beneguela and BCK railways, are reaching total capacity. These facilities will have to be expanded and modernized on a large scale, if required to transport the expanded copper output in the next 5 to 15 years. The Tan-Zam Railroad will accomplish this same purpose in addition to its other benefits.

From the standpoint of copper marketing, the choice between expanding existing routes and opening a new line depends upon the economics of cost and distance assuming the same capacities and availabilities. The Tan-Zam link has a route mileage from Ndola to Dar-es-Salaam of about 1,300 miles compared with some 1,500 miles on the Rhodesian and Mozambique railways, and 1,450 miles on the Lobito route. A shorter distance to the sea reduces transport cost as well as transport time. In addition, Dar-es-Salaam is located some 1,000 miles to the north of Beira or some 40 hours sailing time closer to Europe and Asian ports. Thus, it appears that the Tan-Zam link will provide substantial savings in shipping cost and delivery time to European and Far Eastern markets.

One more important contribution of the new link to the African copper industry would be to assure access to outside markets against interruptions arising from growth and capacity shortages, and in particular, from unforeseen political events in the years to come. The shipments and sales of the Zambian copper are even now severely handicapped by the present emergency conditions since the early months of the UDI by Rhodesia.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS TO TANZANIA

Apart from continental and international considerations, the projected railway will provide particular benefits to the individual participating countries. In Tanzania, the link would provide extension of its railway network to the southern part of the country, especially to the southern highlands where despite highly fertile soil and adequate rainfall commercial farming is severely restricted by lack of transportation. The agricultural potential of this area is comparable to that of the highly profitable Kenya highlands.

The rail link will follow the Kilombero Valley which is a major tributary of the Rufiji River, whose basin is suitable for multipurpose development, including electricity, irrigated agriculture, and reclamation. If this area is developed, the products can be shipped directly to the seaports 700 miles away by the new railroad.

South of Mbeya the rail line passes extensive deposits of coal and iron ore of high quality in the Ngaka area between Njombe and Songea. Reserves of 284 million tons of good quality coal have been proven and it is known that the deposits would extend far beyond the area drilled. Reserves of 44 million tons of iron ore have also been proven with additional tonnages indicated. These quantities are sufficient for the development of an iron and steel industry in the area if demand permits. The large scale mining and metallurgical activities are feasible only when the rail link is built with branches to the mining area.

Tanzania is now considering developing a pulp industry at Mufindi. The present project being discussed with U.S. AID envisages production of 250,000 tons per year of unbleached pulp for consumption in East Africa and overseas export markets. The viability of the project depends upon the availability of economic transport such as the projected railway.

The transit trade through the rail, port, and other facilities in Tanzania would benefit the country immensely in terms of financial receipts, multiplier and income effects, and commodity supplies. It would also increase the demand for local labour, services and industries and thus accelerate the process of commercialization and industrialization.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS TO ZAMBIA

In landlocked Zambia, the Tan-Zam project is beneficial in a different way. The Zambian economy has been growing constantly with its GNP rising by 9 percent in 1964–65. It is now enjoying the copper boom with sizeable budget surplus and favourable balance of payments. But the economic structure is faced with reorganization due to dissolution of the previous Federation and the advance of independence in 1964, as well as by the UDI in Rhodesia during 1965. Both events call for reshaping the country's economic, trade and transport patterns.

To date, the economic and social development of Zambia has been concentrated largely in the copper belt and along the Rhodesian Railway. Other areas of the country such as the eastern regions should now be developed through reconstitution and expansion of the national transport network. The Zambian section of the Tan-Zam line would add a major axis of transport and economic integration to the country's greatly localized economy.

Previously, Zambia received about 40 percent of its imports from Rhodesia, 20 percent from South Africa, and 17 percent from the United Kingdom and it needs to diversify the sources of import supply. The predominant portion of exports, mostly copper—over 90 percent—and imports—80 percent—were shipped via the Rhodesian railways and Mozambique ports and this route is now severely inhibited. The trade, transit, and payment arrangements with Rhodesia are becoming increasingly more difficult. Therefore, a new means of access to the sea such as the projected railway is necessary to alleviate the geographical isolation of the country and to assure the continuous flows of its exports and imports.

The railway would provide a new route from the copper belt and the other potential economic development belts in central Zambia to the sea, 150 miles shorter than the shortest rail route on Beguila Railway which is now being used to capacity. It would thus help develop Zambia's trade relations with many nations, both inside and outside Africa.

The new line would provide an artery for the entire eastern half of the country where extensive land resources exist in isolation due to lack of adequate transportation. The great area and sparse population of the country calls for the effective improvement of transport to shorten the economic distances between producing and marketing centers.

Implementation of the railway plus some subsidiary roads would permit the development and commercialization effects of the copper belt and the central section of the country to expand over the eastern areas, where now only isolation subsistence farming prevails.

SUMMATION

The importance of the projected railway to the international and interregional trade of southern Africa is obvious. By linking the East African and Central African Railways, it would serve to integrate the rail transport for most of the southern half of the continent. The proposed link would bring closer the economic relations among the various development belts of central and east Africa. For the two countries individually, the railway would become an effective instrument for implementing policies to open up new economic areas. It would facilitate greatly the expansion and diversification of their trade relations with nations, inside and outside Africa.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL RICHARDSON DAVENPORT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for 26 years Samuel Richardson Davenport has been a vibrant and valuable personality on Capitol Hill. In these years, and while serving with ability of the highest order as editor in the office of the House Coordinator of Information, he has answered more than 50,000 congressional inquiries.

In the 17 years of my membership in this distinguished body Sam Davenport has never failed me. Whenever I or a member of my staff had a question and there was no available answer, a telephone call to Sam Davenport produced the answer, sometimes in a matter of minutes, sometimes longer when research was necessitated, but always Sam Davenport came up with the answer, and always the answer was error-proof.

This is Sam Davenport's last day of service on Capitol Hill. His departure is a loss to the House of no mean dimensions. My own loss, and that of my constituents, whom he served through my office as he served the constituents of all my colleagues, is truly a great loss. With Sam Davenport in his retirement and his charming wife and family will go the every good wish of the entire membership of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States whom

he has served so many years with faithful dedication and matchless ability.

Sam Davenport is the author of more than 50 one-act plays and 100 short stories. In addition, he has been the poet laureate of Capitol Hill and his poems on Ireland echo and re-echo the melody in Irish hearts. He and his good wife leave for Ireland on September 6 for a month's visit. It is expected that on his return he will receive a well-earned and well-merited grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman and say that I have found the same kind of service from Sam Davenport; and we are going to miss him here on Capitol Hill.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] in tribute to Samuel Richardson Davenport are certainly well merited. During his 26 years of service on the Hill, he has contributed greatly to the efficiency and effectiveness of most, if not all, of our congressional offices. Not only his efficiency, but his pleasant smile and friendly manner have made him particularly effective.

But, there is another aspect of Sam's life that deserves mention. He is in most regular attendance at the House of Representatives prayer breakfast on Thursday mornings and, as he leaves for his visit to Ireland, we shall certainly miss him at these meetings. Sam is the only person not a member or officer of the House who is invited to and does regularly attend these breakfasts. There, too, with his knowledge and wit, he contributes a great deal.

I want to join with the many others who wish him a happy visit to Ireland and hope that in the greater leisure which he now has he will find time to do more writing.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for yielding. I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a great public servant, Sam Davenport. He has been a close personal friend for the past 15 years, and has been most cooperative and helpful to me and my entire office staff by keeping us advised of matters of national interest as well as things of particular interest to my district in California.

I recall one incident especially. During the earthquake in Alaska, one of my constituents had relatives in Kodiak and were unable to find out whether they had survived the quake. Through the assistance of Sam Davenport, messages were relayed by way of ham radio operators and, within less than 24 hours, we received information as to the safety of my constituent's relatives.

Seldom a week would go by that we did not have occasion to seek Sam's assistance, which was always given most freely.

We will miss him greatly, as he retires from a long term of public service. Mrs. Utt joins me in wishing Sam Davenport and his wife happiness in their retirement. I know he will find use for his many talents, and that he will continue to be of service to our Nation.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to one of the finest public servants to ever work on Capitol Hill, Sam Davenport. His retirement is truly a great loss to all of us. A personal friend for more than 20 years, Sam, to me, was almost like being a member of my staff. He never failed to keep me advised of matters that would be of particular interest to my State of Nevada. Whenever a question arose, and seemingly no answer was available, a telephone call to Sam produced the answer.

As editor in the office of the House Coordinator of Information, Sam Davenport was as indispensable as any person could be. His warm and personal service was above reproach.

I wish Sam Davenport and his wife untold happiness in their retirement.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with great regret and sadness I have learned of the retirement and departure from Capitol Hill of Sam Davenport. As a neighbor on the fifth floor of the Cannon Building and as an associate in the prayer breakfast group I came to know and admire Sam tremendously. We all wish him the best of health and happiness in his richly deserved retirement.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, information has come to me that Sam Davenport is leaving the Office of the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives after many years of devoted and dedicated service.

He served with zeal and dispatch in the handling of requests made of him by Members of the House. A few days ago I called Sam and asked his assistance in connection with a vital research problem. He fulfilled the assignment capably and cheerfully as he had done every time I had asked him to assist me.

It was a genuine pleasure to know Sam Davenport. I knew him particularly well from our association at the Thursday morning prayer breakfast meetings. He usually arrived about 15 minutes before 8 o'clock along with JIMMY UTT and ART YOUNGER. He contributed greatly to the success of the group by his faithful attendance and learned participation in the discussions. He prepared a valuable history of the founders and subsequent members as he was the individual with the longest service. He knew every one of the first members. He gave his impressions of each of them.

As he goes into new fields of endeavor, I wish he and Mrs. Davenport every continued happiness and success.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with colleagues who have commended Sam Davenport who recently retired as Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives. During some 20 years that I have known him he has been courteous, energetic and highly efficient. He took his job seriously and he performed his duties well. He has been my personal friend since I first met him. I express my appreciation for his services of the past and extend my best wishes for his future.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days following our reconvening on September 11 to add to this tribute to Sam Davenport.

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

There was no objection.

THE LONG, HARD ROAD TO VICTORY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, America is engaged in a great deal of soul-searching on the problem of Vietnam. We are heavily committed militarily, so much so that the strategic reserve in the United States is being depleted to provide troops for Vietnam. These are the forces which are held back for emergency requirements should a need arise anywhere in the world. This means that most of our ready combat forces are now directly committed to the conflict in Vietnam. We have seen 13,000 American soldiers killed and 78,000 wounded. The costs of war will run close to $30 billion in the current fiscal year.

Nevertheless, there is a strong undercurrent of doubt about the progress of the war. The administration insists that a definite military progress is being made. Possibly our major concern should lie in another area. Definitely the United States can win if the Vietnamese themselves also want victory enough to make a really determined effort. But there is serious doubt that the Vietnamese people have been made to feel that they have a worthwhile stake in the war. Land reform, and other badly needed reforms, to improve the lot of the people, have not been forthcoming from the central government and this has made more difficult the pacification program which is essential to final allied victory.

A recent House committee investigation tells a shocking tale of waste and corruption in the U.S. aid program and in black market operations. The care of refugees, which was already a serious problem when I visited Vietnam in December 1965, has apparently shown little improvement and, according to the committee report, the war itself is hampered by the all-around officiousness of an entrenched and inefficient bureaucracy.

I have repeatedly pointed to the fact that the 600,000 trained and equipped South Vietnamese troops are making but little contribution to the joint war effort. Despite the fact that it is their country and their war, they leave most of the heavy fighting to U.S. forces. I am convinced that a more effective use of South Vietnamese forces would make it unnecessary to send additional American troops to the combat area.

In all of this, the United States, through its missions in Vietnam, could bring stronger pressure for corrective action. But in this connection, the congressional report berates American aid officials in our Embassy in Saigon for their failure to insist on reforms, cleanup, and a positive approach to the war effort.

Too often—

The report says—

U.S. officials try to avoid rocking the boat instead of pressing for necessary reform.

These things simply mean that many of the South Vietnamese are withholding confidence and support from their leaders. It helps to explain why the Vietcong can hold its grip on so many villages.

It is time all these problems were brought out into the open, thoroughly aired, and solutions provided. There must be a positive commitment by the South Vietnamese leaders to the common objective of a lasting victory. These commitments must be implemented without further delay. Russian and Chinese weapons and trained forces from North Vietnam have made the war a big and difficult one. It is obvious now that a military victory will be costly and long drawn out. We are committed to the South Vietnamese cause. Yet victory can be meaningless if the South Vietnamese themselves are not convinced their cause is just and their Government worthy of support.

Lack of reform may be the Achilles Heel of the allied cause in Southeast Asia. Communism can continue to peddle its teaching to the poor as long as corruption and exploitation are unchecked. The Vietnamese have to be able to comprehend the meaning and the price of victory and to work for it with an effort that goes even further than ours. Otherwise their country can fall to communism just as soon as the shooting stops. If that is in prospect, we will have wasted American lives and American treasure.

URBAN RENEWAL PROBLEMS IN THE CITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the past month, I have made statements in the House concerning the problems of the cities. Earlier this month, I was shocked to learn that 80 percent of our public housing resources was spent in cities under 25,000 in population. I do not think that this program was intended to work out that way, but this is precisely what happened.

In studying the problem of urban renewal, I found that in my own State 70.4 percent of the urban renewal projects were designed for nonresidential use. I am sure that Ohio's urban renewal programs are typical of the rest of the country.

From the latest available figures, the value of redevelopment underway through urban renewal projects totaled $3.9 billion of which only $1.5 billion or 37 percent was for residential reuse. These figures fully describe the destruction of housing facilities of the poor and the failure to provide replacement housing. In our large cities, needy families have been shifted from hovel to hovel with little prospect of a better home.

The figures on urban redevelopment is as follows:

The value of redevelopment under way at the end of 1965 was over $1.5 billion for residential, about $1.2 billion for commercial, $169 million for industrial, and over $1 billion for institutonal construction—a total of more than $3.9 billion.

The reduction in the residential inventory of our large central cities resulting from highway construction, inhumane urban renewal, and disproportionate allocations of public housing resources have compounded the problems of the city.

At the same time, the wholesale migration of citizens to the suburban communities increased the ratio of the needy to the self-sufficient in our urban centers.

In Cleveland, for example, the exodus is estimated at 13,000 citizens per year, shrinking the present population to less than 800,000 persons, while the population of the metropolitan area made more than proportionate population increases.

Of the less than 800,000 people in Cleveland, almost 130,000 receive social security benefits, while almost 40,000 live on veterans disability or pension benefits. When those receiving benefits through Federal programs are added to those supported on public welfare, 81,604 persons, it appears that 251,604 persons or 32 percent of the population, are sustained through public support programs.

The inadequacy of these programs and the squeeze on low-income housing are proven components for urban disorders.

"LOOPHOLE"—OR EQUITY?

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the American public is being grossly and unfairly misled on a matter of vital concern to them. They are being misled by a small number of columnists and high public officials who display either an amazing lack of information, an unawareness of the facts, a desire for sensationalism, or a combination of these things. My purpose in requesting permission to address this House is to tell the practical, true story, once and for all, about a matter of vital concern to every consumer and to our Nation as a whole.

Before proceeding further, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that I have absolutely nothing to gain by my remarks—either politically or personally. I have already announced that I will retire from the Congress at the end of this term. To my knowledge no member of my family, including myself, owns a single share of stock in any companies in the industry which I will discuss, nor is that industry predominant in any way in my home State of Florida. The only personal interest I have in this matter is my desire to see justice done on a vital provision of Federal tax law. My qualifications for taking a stand on this issue derive from 19 years service in the Congress and, particularly, from my service on the Committee on Ways and Means, that committee which is primarily responsible for considering our tax policy. As I progress in my remarks I will present further thoughts about these few columnists and others who apparently feel they can get personal or political gain from this whipping-boy issue but who possess little or no qualifications for intelligently informing the public about them.

I refer to what is erroneously called the oil depletion provision. Let us get this straight first. The correct, practical name is "mineral depletion" provision. For this provision in the Internal Revenue Code applies to practically all minerals—over 100 in number—except those considered to come from inexhaustible sources. I realize that the attention-seekers much prefer to use the term "oil depletion" because they feel it conjures up the image of some ultrarich fat cat in the minds of the average audience and that, therefore, they will get a better reception to their misleading statements.

They also often leave the impression that this tax provision is a boon only to the oil-producing States. That just is not true. Every State has some mineral production that is covered by percentage depletion. To mention just a few examples: Minnesota has its iron ore with a 15-percent rate; Virginia has kyanite—with a 23-percent depletion rate; New York leads the Nation in titanium production—which also comes in the 23-percent category; Missouri's lead production gets the same rate; Oregon is the source of our nickel production—and also gets 23-percent depletion on the output of this mineral; Tennessee leads in zinc production—also in the 23-percent depletion category; West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Illinois are the big four coal producers—and there is a 10-percent depletion rate on that. In my own State, our chief mineral is phosphate rock—which has a 15-percent rate. A complete list of all the minerals and their depletion rates is submitted as an addendum to my comments. Clearly then, the true term is "mineral depletion" provision.

For a thorough understanding of the mineral depletion provision we should take a quick look at its history. And, since the critics use oil as their symbol, I will use it as my primary example where possible. The principles, however, apply to all minerals under this provision.

There was no need to take depletion into account in the tax laws until ratification of the 16th—or income tax—Amendment in 1913. Then, with this dramatic change in the Nation's revenue structure, Congress was suddenly confronted with a swarm of new problems in writing equitable legislation to put the income tax into effect. One of these problems was how to draw up tax provi-

sions that would effectively tax income without taxing capital.

In the case of ordinary capital assets, like machinery and equipment, this problem could be solved by authorizing regular deductions for depreciation until the cost of the income-earning piece of property was restored. The idea, of course, was to return the cost of the asset—tax free—over its life so that it could be replaced when worn out.

But this principle, though sound for machinery and plants and other depreciating things, did not work out at all with respect to depleting assets—such as oil and other minerals in the ground.

A simple illustration explains why this is so. If a man in some manufacturing business buys a piece of equipment for $100,000 he can take depreciation deductions over its useful life, and by the time the machine is worn out—he will have recovered its original cost. He will have the money he needs to buy a replacement.

It is not that simple for the mineral producer. Now suppose an oilman has a producing property that cost him $100,000, and suppose the tax laws permitted him to recover only that investment cost. The laws would be, in effect, putting him out of business. For he could not take $100,000 recovered from a successful discovery and expect to go out and drill a replacement. Of every 100 wells drilled in search of new fields, only three—on the average—will find enough oil or gas to recover costs of drilling and producing. Ninety-seven such tries in 100 will find no oil or gas at all—dry holes—or will find oil or gas fields so small that they are unlikely to be profitable.

And the average cost of drilling a well—whether it is a success or a failure—is around $56,000.

Tax laws have to be based on realities—if we are to have a workable system of taxation. And the odds against success in exploring for oil and in all other mineral exploration had to be recognized by Congress in applying the income tax law to these industries. Congress could not pretend that these problems did not exist and—at the same time—maintain that it was striving for equity in taxation.

After study and experimentation, Congress finally developed what is known as the discovery value depletion provision as part of the Revenue Act of 1918. This provision, which applied to all minerals, allowed for the depletion deduction to be based on the fair market value of the mineral- or oil-producing property, if that value was significantly different from the cost.

Although sound in principle, because it recognized the capital value of the mineral in the ground, this discovery value provision bogged down in administrative complexities. Too much was left to human judgment in estimating the size and value of a mineral discovery. So, in 1926, Congress tried again. At the suggestion of the Treasury, Congress tested a new approach by substituting a flat percentage depletion formula for the estimated discovery value in the case of oil and gas.

The rate set for petroleum—27½ percent of the gross income—was admittedly a compromise between the two Houses. Studies by the Treasury Department indicated that a rate of about 30 percent would be more in line with deductions available under the discovery value law. Subsequent analysis by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation also brought out that the shift from discovery value to percentage depletion materially increased the petroleum industry's tax burden.

However, percentage depletion—by its simplicity and ease of administration—worked out so well when applied to petroleum that Congress extended it to other minerals that had been entitled to deductions on the "discovery value" basis. As I have previously noted, today more than 100 minerals are covered by percentage depletion. The rates vary, as discovery values vary, but in each case the deduction for statutory depletion cannot exceed 50 percent of the producer's net income from the individual property or, as the law applies to hard minerals—operating unit.

The farmer does not pay an income tax on the "seed corn" that he sets aside from his harvest to grow another crop in the succeeding year. Percentage depletion is, in a sense, a way of letting the mineral-producer retain—free of tax—funds that represent his "seed corn." He can use these to undertake a search for new mineral reserves to replace those being harvested—or depleted—by production. Yet, as I have indicated, the oil producer and, to varying degrees every other mineral producer, must plant many, many seeds in the ground before he can find another productive crop of mineral reserves.

Mr. Speaker, clearly this is no tax loophole. This is a deliberate legislative decision of Congress, a principle that has been on the statute books for almost half a century, and has been repeatedly reviewed at public hearings held by both the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

Yet only a few days ago a columnist's poll of the House asked a question which—as nearly as I can recall—went like this: "How do you feel about the closing of tax loopholes in general and the oil depletion loophole in particular?" An examination of this question reveals that it assumes as a fact that oil depletion is a tax loophole. No one, in Government or out has proven, or can prove, that assumption.

Note the "oil depletion loophole" phrase—not a word about the other mineral depletion provisions—just oil. It makes one wonder if the accusers might have some personal interest in some other mineral industries entitled to the benefits of the laws on depletion. Would it not have been fairer to ask me—and my colleagues in other States, "How do you feel about abolishing the percentage depletion provision for the mineral industries in your district?"

How would any of us feel about legislation that would deal such a hard blow to the economies of most of our States, probably closing down many income-producing enterprises and putting people out of work, blighting communities and shrinking the State and local tax rolls while adding to welfare costs? How many of us would want to support such an irresponsible and callous scheme? And which one among us would be so naive as to think that the depletion rate for oil and gas can be cut or abolished without repercussions on the rates for each of our own local mineral-producing industries?

If percentage depletion goes down for oil and gas, it will go down for all the others—zinc, titanium, iron ore, coal—the whole list. And then we would all hear from our hard-hit constituents, and those of us who may now have doubts would find out most emphatically that this is no special boon for the oil-producing States. This is an essential provision for all America. It is essential because our mineral producing industries—all of them—from sand and gravel to oil and gas, are essential to America.

If the argument of those who would abolish depletion is carried to its logical conclusion, and if they would be consistent and fair, they would also necessarily have to advocate a Federal tax on all forms of capital including savings accounts, investments, land and appurtenances, including homes and the like.

Let us stop listening to columnists and get down to the facts. We cannot base tax legislation on slogans and word games—like the insistent harping on the term "loophole." This is a phrase the critics of mineral depletion love to bandy about. It is also a prime example of the use—or misuse—of language to convey a false impression. The unabridged dictionary defines "loophole"—when used in this sense—as "a method of evading the intent of a statute, contract, or obligation." As history clearly shows, in no way does the percentage depletion provision resemble this definition. We have from time to time in the Committee on Ways and Means amended the tax laws to correct unintended benefits which arose during the practical application of the law. This, in my judgment, is the true definition of what really is a loophole. Nowhere has anyone ever contended that the benefits to be derived from the mineral industry's depletion was not intended by the Congress—in fact, a study of the history of this legislation shows exactly the opposite.

I am convinced that our mineral depletion policy will be a decisive factor in determining whether the United States continues as the foremost power in the world with the highest standard of living, or whether it falls back into the ranks of the "have not" nations—the countries that must depend on other lands for their energy and fuels and other basic resources.

Rarely, if ever, do those who attack mineral depletion remind us that oil and natural gas together supply almost three-quarters of our Nation's energy.

Yet how can an intelligent decision be made on this issue without consideration of such facts as this? Rarely do critics of percentage depletion point out that this provision—and its forerunner, discovery value depletion—originated in a time of widespread fear that we were getting close to the bottom of our oil reserves.

It is hard for us to realize now that back in 1916 legislation was actually introduced in this House to prohibit the

exportation of petroleum products from the United States. Four years later, in 1920 the U.S. Geological Survey predicted that—if the then current rate of domestic consumption were to continue—the United States would run out of oil by 1938. Three years later, in 1923, a subcommittee of the Senate made sensational headlines with a report warning consumers that they had better start preparing themselves to pay at least $1 a gallon for gasoline.

Because Congress wisely recognized the need to encourage the risky search for oil deposits, the American petroleum industry was able to confound all the experts. It found enough oil to keep America going in the automobile age. It found enough additional oil to fuel a global conflict in World War II, and to meet the tremendous and unexpected demands of postwar prosperity. It is producing enough oil today to tide us over the current Middle East crisis. And I would like to remind you, without laboring the point, that we would be facing one of the most desperate emergencies in our Nation's history at this very moment if the U.S. oil industry had not been ready and able to replace those cutoff Middle Eastern supplies.

Were we dependent upon the Middle East for oil and natural gas—because we could not produce enough at home—we would today be at the mercy of those nations, helpless and immobilized until we met their terms for a resumption of our vital oil supplies.

It is a nightmare that could have happened but did not. If it had happened, the dollar-a-gallon price that was feared in 1923 would by today's standards be a bargain basement item to the American user of these products. It did not happen because the American petroleum industry continued its record of meeting one crisis after another. This has been done so often that the industry's achievements are taken for granted. But could this latest achievement—and the others—have been possible without percentage depletion? In my judgment, that is doubtful, indeed.

Remember that it is not enough for the petroleum industry to replace each depleted barrel of oil with another barrel of newly discovered reserves. If that is all the industry were able to do, we would have due cause for feeling once again the oil shortage alarms that shook this country in the first quarter of the 20th century. The petroleum industry must do more than replace one depleted barrel with another newly discovered barrel of reserves. This industry must continually step up its oil and gas finding to keep pace with steadily rising demand.

Last spring Interior Secretary Udall predicted that the United States will consume 78 billion barrels of oil and 283 trillion cubic feet of gas over the next 14 years—more oil and gas than was consumed in the previous 107 years of the petroleum industry's existence. I repeat—this supply will be needed to take care of just the next 14 years, and if that sounds like a long time just reflect that the year 1953 was only 14 years ago. Time passes more rapidly than we realize. It is passing very rapidly indeed for an industry that has to meet this enormous future demand.

Can the oil be found? The experts believe it can—though this is an exceedingly difficult assignment. But what if percentage depletion for oil and gas were abolished or sharply curtailed? The critics of this provision never seem to trouble themselves with any question about the effect of such a move on our future oil supplies. But the rest of us had better trouble ourselves with this question. For the future security and prosperity of our country and of the free world could hinge on the answer.

It is ironic that some of the very people who are most aggressive in attacking percentage depletion benefit handsomely from provisions in the tax laws that others would brand as "loopholes."

I happen to know that this is true of a public official—a constant critic of mineral depletion—who boasted of his profit on a cattle sale because, due to a provision in the law, a "loophole" if you will, he had to pay only a capital gains tax on the transaction. I know of another public official and mineral depletion critic who invests in tax-free municipal bonds, thereby reducing his tax bill substantially. Some people call this a "loophole." And I could name another extremely wealthy public official who uses the foundation exemption to reduce his tax bill. Yet he is most boldly outspoken in condemning what he thinks are other people's "loopholes." Those who are fond of applying the term "loophole" to mineral depletion and other provisions of the tax code that they do not happen to like frequently quote a book called "The Great Treasury Raid" by Philip Stern. You might say this book is almost their bible. But they are highly selective in quoting from it. You would not guess from listening to them that the biggest single tax preference—or "loophole"—in the tax law according to Mr. Stern's own list is the provision that permits married couples to split their incomes for tax purposes.

Mr. Stern puts it this way, and I quote from his book:

> The tax laws permit the husband, in making out his tax return, to make believe that half of the paycheck has been earned by the little wife. This is commonly known as filing a "joint return."
>
> This is a highly expensive fiction: it costs the United States Treasury $5 billion annually.

End of quotation from Mr. Stern.

Now I do not agree with Mr. Stern that this is any kind of "loophole" or tax preference. Nor do I agree that the other examples which I have cited are "loopholes." I maintain that they are fully justified and sound public policy. It is simply a case of one man's "loophole" being another man's tax equity.

Mr. Speaker, in my years on the Ways and Means Committee I became intimately acquainted with the hard work—the actual drudgery that goes into writing our Nation's tax laws. I also learned the supreme importance of digging and probing and searching out the facts. For with tax rates as they are today, a serious mistake, or oversight, or example of plain carelessness in drafting tax legislation could have ruinous consequences on an economic activity vitally important to our Nation—like the extractive industries covered by percentage depletion.

Tax policy is far too important to be made on the basis of slogans or catch phrases. People who write books, articles, or gossip columns about the tax laws do not have to take responsibility for the consequences of their recommendations, but the members of the Ways and Means Committee do have this responsibility. And in my observation it is a responsibility that they exercise with integrity, diligence, fairness, and dedication second to no group of human beings on earth. I consider my association with them a privilege and a most inspiring experience.

It is quite a striking contrast to compare the laborious study and research of the Ways and Means Committee and its staff with the effusions of those who do their research in Playboy magazine or other sensation-seeking publications.

We on the Ways and Means Committee must concern ourselves with facts, whereas the sole concern of these responsibility-free commentators is the size of the headlines they can make. Therefore, they feel no qualms about giving the impression that oilmen have achieved what amounts to tax exemption. They have even gone so far as to claim that the producing branch of the oil industry escapes $10 billion a year in taxation.

What are the facts behind this claim? Well, according to preliminary figures from the U.S. Bureau of Mines—a somewhat more authoritative source than Playboy—the total value of all the crude oil, natural gas, and natural gas liquids produced in the United States last year was $12.4 billion. Now how can an industry with output valued at $12.4 billion pay an additional income tax of $10 billion—on top of what it is already paying the Federal, State, and local governments, and have any money left to pay its employees, its royalty owners, its stockholders and investors, its creditors, and its operating expenses—not to mention the more than $4 billion the industry spends annually on exploration for and development of new reserves, including almost $1 billion each year in dry hole losses.

Let us turn from this myth about the industry's tax status to a serious study made to bring out the facts. The Petroleum Industry Research Foundation has made what is—to my knowledge—the only thorough study ever undertaken of the domestic petroleum industry's tax burden in comparison with that of other enterprises. The findings for the latest year covered—1963—are right in line with those for prior years.

In 1963, this study found, the petroleum industry paid at least $2 billion in direct taxes to Federal, State, and local governments. This figure does not include any of the gasoline and other petroleum product taxes of $6.5 billion paid in that year.

The study found that the petroleum industry's direct 1963 domestic tax burden amounted to 5 cents in tax for every dollar of revenue. The ratio for other

businesses was almost exactly the same. The biggest part of the petroleum industry's tax bill was paid to State governments, with a heavy portion of the total represented by severance and other production taxes that nonextractive industries do not pay.

But a tax dollar is a tax dollar, whatever level of government it is paid to, and with the tax-sharing ideas now being discussed in Congress, the petroleum industry's contributions to State revenue should be most welcome.

The charge of fabulous oil industry profits likewise falls apart when held up to the light of fact. According to figures compiled by the First National City Bank of New York, from 1925—the first year's income to come under the percentage depletion law—through 1966, oil industry after-tax earnings have averaged less than 10 percent of invested capital. The figure for all manufacturing companies in this same period was a shade higher—10.7 percent. Last year the relationship was: petroleum industry—12.6 percent, compared with 14.1 percent for all manufacturing companies. Clearly, then, the petroleum industry is not making any profit bonanza out of percentage depletion.

These figures make it clear that percentage depletion—instead of giving the petroleum industry an undue advantage—simply counteracts, to some extent, the tremendous disadvantage entailed in the high-risk, high-cost search for new oil and gas reserves.

Actually, the big beneficiary of the percentage depletion provision is the consumer. I mentioned earlier that a Senate subcommittee predicted back in 1923 that the price of gasoline would soon rise to $1 a gallon. The average price of gasoline in that year was 21 cents—excluding tax. And in August of this year the national average price of regular-grade gasoline—an incomparably better product than that sold in 1923—was 22.65 cents per gallon. This is, again, excluding tax. So the consumer is paying only 8 percent more for gasoline today than he paid in 1923. How many other products today could meet such a test?

After more than 40 years, percentage depletion has become part of the economic structure of the petroleum industry. Under this provision, the industry has been able to meet the Nation's steadily increasing appetite for oil and do it with reasonable prices and below-average levels of profit. If now, after all these years, the percentage depletion provision were repealed—or the rate for oil reduced—it is inevitable that the price of crude oil and of petroleum products would have to rise. There would be no other way to close the gap—not with the industry's profits as moderate as they are and not with the future investment requirements what they are certain to be. It might not happen overnight, it probably would not happen that way, but in time—if percentage depletion was curtailed—something would have to give.

Higher prices for gasoline and other oil products would not mean much to the well-to-do people. They would not suffer much distress if changed income tax policies force the price of regular grade gasoline to rise sharply from the present level of less than 23 cents per gallon. But this would be a hard blow indeed at the tight budget of the family with only a moderate income. And quite often these are the very people who have to use gasoline more because housing costs force them to live a greater distance from the job, and also because pleasure driving is one of their favorite forms of low-cost family recreation. The worker, the farmer, the salesman, the rural letter carrier—these are the kinds of people who would feel the ricochet effect of a cut in the statutory depletion rate for petroleum.

From time to time we see figures that are supposed to show the sums involved in percentage depletion for the mineral industries. I wish there were some way to calculate in monetary terms how much this provision means—and has meant over the years—to Americans. But you cannot put a price tag on security or on national independence in raw material. You cannot calculate in dollars and cents how much it meant to have the oil and iron and copper and coal to carry us to victory in World War II.

This we do know: Every product in the marketplace represents the result of combining two basic ingredients under the guidance of human intelligence and skill. One of these basic ingredients is the raw material of which the product was made; the other basic ingredient is the fuel energy that was used in the manufacturing process.

Reducing or eliminating percentage depletion can only have the effect of increasing the cost of both ingredients. And the consumer will pay. In fact, I can think of no step that could do more to increase the cost of living—to make all our constituents pay more for everything they buy—than a cut in the rate of the mineral depletion provision.

Let me briefly review the main points I have covered:

First. Percentage depletion is not a tax loophole. It was deliberately devised by Congress more than 40 years ago and is consistent with the policy of not taxing capital value as income.

Second. The phrase "oil depletion allowance" is a misnomer. This provision applies to more than 100 different minerals important to our national welfare and to the economies of every State.

Third. Ours is an energy-based economy—with oil and gas supplying nearly three-fourths of that energy. Percentage depletion is essential if the industry is to meet the anticipated tremendous future demand for petroleum.

Fourth. The petroleum industry pays its fair share of domestic taxes—exactly the same percentage of its revenue as other industries, according to authoritative studies.

Fifth. Percentage depletion has not produced excessive profits for oil companies; in fact, their profits have averaged slightly less than those of manufacturing industries as a whole.

Sixth. The real beneficiary of percentage depletion is the American consumer. If the mineral depletion provision were deleted from our tax laws, the consumer would have to pay more for his every purchase since the cost of both the raw material in the product and the energy required to produce it would be more expensive.

Seventh. Percentage depletion has worked. It has enabled the petroleum industry and other mineral producing enterprises to meet the rapidly rising demands of an industrial civilization in peacetime, wartime, and the cold war era. It has helped keep our standard of living the highest in the history of the world. And, if we want an especially timely reminder of the value of percentage depletion, all we have to do is read any morning's headlines about what is going on in the Middle East.

Eighth. We have just seen the nationalization of oil properties of several American companies in the Middle East. How much more of a warning do we need that we cannot afford to let ourselves become dependent on foreign oil any time or anywhere in the world? We need percentage depletion because we need to maintain our national independence and our vital fuel supply. It is as plain and simple as that. And if we can learn anything at all from the news of the day, it is that percentage depletion—far from being a loophole is a lifeline for America.

Back in 1962, an excellent report of the National Fuels and Energy Study Group was prepared for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This report contained the following statement on page 23:

> The economy of the United States rests upon a small base of energy. National income originating in the energy industries is only about 4 per cent of the total national income.
>
> Consumers, manufacturers, and government spend but a small proportion of their incomes in the purchases of energy—household consumers about 5½ per cent, manufacturers 1½ per cent, and government possibly 3 per cent. Despite the expanding use of energy these proportions have remained fairly constant.

End of quotation.

The figures may be slightly changed today, but I am sure the essential facts are the same. The American people are getting a tremendous bargain in the energy that runs this country—oil, natural gas, coal—and yes, even uranium for nuclear power. And all these minerals come under percentage depletion. So does the iron that makes the steel in the family car, the titanium for supersonic planes, the bauxite for aluminum cooking utensils and other products—most of all the basic necessities of light, heat, transportation to and from jobs and countless other things which every consumer needs in today's world.

This is not an oil industry measure or even a mineral industry measure; this is a measure that looks after the immediate and long-term interests of the American consumer. And the strongest justification for this provision is what it has accomplished in giving us an ample supply of reasonably priced energy fuels and raw materials needed to maintain an industrial civilization. I would be proud if this Congress could accomplish as much for the American people as the 69th Congress did when it originated the percentage depletion provision 41 years ago.

PERCENTAGE DEPLETION RATES FOR MINERAL PRODUCTION

Since 1926, the Internal Revenue Code has authorized percentage depletion at a 27½% rate for oil and gas wells. This rate is applied to the gross income from the wells, subject to a 50% of net income limitation.

During the decades that percentage depletion has been a part of the revenue laws, it has been extended to almost all other U.S. minerals at rates ranging from 5 to 23% of gross income from the mineral producing property, as follows:

TWENTY-THREE PERCENT DEPLETION APPLIES TO THESE MINERALS

Antimony.
Anorthosite (to extent alumina and aluminum compounds extracted therefrom).
Asbestos.
Bauxite.
Beryl.
Bismuth.
Cadmium.
Celestite.
Chromite.
Clay (to extent alumina and aluminum compounds extracted therefrom).*
Cobalt.
Columbium.
Corundum.
Fluorspar.
Graphite.*
Ilmenite.
Kyanite.
Laterite (to extent alumina and aluminum compounds extracted therefrom).
Lead.
Lithium.
Manganese.
Mercury.
Mica.
Nephelite Syenite (to extent alumina and aluminum compounds extracted therefrom).
Nickel.
Olivine.
Platinum.
Platinum Group Metals.
Quartz Crystals (Radio Grade).
Rutile.
Block Steatite Talc.
Sulphur.
Tantalum.
Thorium.
Tin.
Titanium.
Tungsten.
Uranium.
Vanadium.
Zinc.
Zircon.

FIFTEEN PERCENT DEPLETION APPLIES TO THESE MINERALS

Aplite.
Barite.
Bentonite.
Borax.
Calcium Carbonates.
Clay, Ball.*
Clay, China.*
Clay, Refractory & Fire.*
Clay, Sagger.*
Copper.
Diatomaceous Earth.
Dolomite.
Feldspar.
Fullers Earth.
Garnet.
Gilsonite.
Gold.
Granite.
Granite (Flake).*
Gypsum.
Iron Ore.
Limestone.
Magnesite.
Magnesium Carbonates.
Marble.
Metal Mines (not otherwise named).
Mollusk Shells (when used for chemical content).*
Molybdenum.
Phosphate Rock.
Potash.
Quartzite.
Rock Asphalt.
Silver.
Slate.*
Soapstone.
Stone (dimension or ornamental).*
Talc.
Thenardite.
Tripoli.
Trona.
Vermiculite.
Other minerals not covered elsewhere.

TEN PERCENT TO THESE MINERALS

Brucite	Perlite
Coal	Sodium Chloride
Lignite	Wollastonite

FIVE PERCENT TO THESE MINERALS

Clay (used for drainage and roofing tile, flower pots, etc.).*

Gravel.	Sand.
Mollusk Shells.*	Scoria.
Peat.	Shale.*
Pumice.	Stone.*

If from Brine Wells—Bromine, Calcium Chloride, Magnesium Chloride.

SEVEN AND ONE-HALF PERCENT TO THESE MINERALS

Clay and Shale (used for sewer pipe or brick).*
Clay, Shale, and Slate, (used as lightweight aggregates).*

* Note differing rates, depending on use.

AMERICAN PATRIOTISM STRIKES A BLOW AT GEORGE LINCOLN ROCKWELL

Mr. GOODLING. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the cremation of George Lincoln Rockwell has laid to rest a burning issue that has troubled red-blooded Americans throughout this land.

I would like to say that I have, from the outset, strongly protested the burial of Mr. Rockwell at a national cemetery with full military honors if the ceremony were conducted against a background of Nazi symbols. On August 28—as I have advised this House on August 29—I wired Secretary of the Army Resor as follows:

> Strongly object to burial of George Lincoln Rockwell in a National Cemetery with full military honors if he is garbed in a Nazi Uniform and borne by a replica of Nazi storm troopers. Do not object if he is buried with military honors minus the Nazi paraphernalia. Burial in Nazi regalia would act to honor that evil which American soldiers of World War II fought, died, and bled to destroy.

On August 29, the Department of the Army notified me that it had refused to permit George Lincoln Rockwell to be buried at a national cemetery with military honors because his followers had refused to comply with the standards set forth by the Department of the Army. These standards required abstinence from display of Nazi symbols and also called for a proper display of the American flag. The Department further informed me that it absolutely refused to give consideration to any additional burial applications that might be submitted by the Nazi Party unless it received assurance there would be compliance with the standards set forth for burial in a national cemetery.

The members of the Nazi Party refused to comply with these standards, and the Department of the Army did not yield on the matter. As a consequence, the body of George Lincoln Rockwell was cremated on August 30 while, at the same time, a local branch of the American Civil Liberties Union initiated proceedings to obtain a court order that would allow burial of the ashes with a Nazi ceremony in a national military cemetery.

From a practical standpoint, then, this matter has been successfully resolved, and I would like to say that the Department of the Army is to be highly commended for the good judgment and efficient conduct it demonstrated throughout this emotionally charged affair. It remained firm in carrying out the dictates of the law and service regulations and, at the same time, it proved eminently fair in inviting compliance with the requirements of and standards for burial in a national cemetery. As a result, the Department spared desecration to a national cemetery and preserved the dignity of America.

Personally, I want to express my deep appreciation for the superlative cooperation extended me by the Department of the Army in keeping me promptly and adequately posted on this matter of my interest. I call this an "A-number 1" job of posting.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to know that what has been a very delicate matter has been suitably and fairly resolved. In summary, it can be said that a great blow has been struck for American patriotism.

PLACEMENT SUMMARY, PARKS JOB CORPS CENTER, PLEASANTON, CALIF.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, much of the controversy that has surrounded the Job Corps program has centered around the allegation that these young people are not being prepared for gainful employment by these programs.

I recently sought some statistics from the Parks Job Corps Center that serves my district in California. These statistics would seem to rebut that allegation.

Apparently the program is returning dividends to the taxpayer that warrants their continued investment in the effort to retrain and remotivate these young dropouts from our national life.

I have no idea how you can properly put a pricetag on the fact that 2,526 young people have been placed in gainful

employment as a result of the Job Corps training. I am certain, however, that the pricetag in tax moneys saved and earned would far exceed the investment required.

Mr. Speaker, I include the statistics on placements at this point in my remarks:

PLACEMENT SUMMARY, PARKS JOB CORPS CENTER, PLEASANTON, CALIF., AS OF JULY 31, 1967

Since the Parks Job Corps Center, operated by Litton Industries, in Pleasanton California was opened in April of 1965, a total of 2,526 young men who were exposed to the training and environment there have been placed in gainful positions. This total represents approximately 30% of the men who were graduated from or left the Parks Job Corps Center in the last two years, including a high percentage who were involved in this rehabilitation program for even a short period of time.

The former Parks Job Corpsmen who are now employed are earning an average hourly wage of $1.78. Sample, follow-up checks show a 71.9% job retention rate. Further, in the same sampling, 78.9% of those placed have been promoted since being employed.

The latter record is particularly impressive when viewed against the background of the boys involved. Of the total Parks population nearly ⅓ have had previous criminal records, 91.5% were dropouts from elementary and high schools and 48% came from broken homes. The Parks corpsmen are from poverty areas of all 50 states. An analysis of the Parks placement record points up one significant fact: vocational training in itself is not enough. Reshaping of attitudes and reorientation to a responsible productive life is equally if not more important in the Job Corps rehabilitation program. More than half of the corpsmen employed by private industry were placed in positions not related to their job corps training.

The breakdown of the placements generated by the Parks Job Corps Center shows 905 young men were placed in positions related to their job corps training at an average hourly wage of $1.93. Youngsters trained in electronics who were placed in related positions earned starting wages averaging $2.16 per hour. A total of 980 Parks Corpsmen were placed in positions not related to their training. This group drew an average starting hourly wage of $1.64. A number of the young men placed were employed at starting wage levels exceeding $3.00 per hour. The balance of the Parks Job Corps Center placements included 641 young men who were qualified for military service or enrollment in educational institutions.

TRAINING/PLACEMENT STATISTICAL EVALUATION [1]

Vocation	Training-related placements		Non-training-related placements		Military and educational placements	Total placements
	Placed in training-related positions	Average hourly wage	Placed in non-training-related positions	Average hourly wage		
Electronics	248	2.16	225	1.64	199	672
Automotive	207	1.80	232	1.70	131	570
Maintenance	149	1.91	79	1.68	56	284
Office machine repair	67	1.87	79	1.70	49	195
General skills [2]	135	1.83	121	1.70	86	342
Culinary arts	99	1.79	51	1.70	38	188
Resignees			193	1.52	82	275
Total	905	1.93	980	1.64	641	2,526

[1] Based upon latest follow-up information of 2,526 placements as of July 31, 1967.
[2] Includes office occupations placements.

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL THOMAS C. LYNCH, WESTERN STATES DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

Mr. WALDIE. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, last week Los Angeles was the host for a very informative Western States Democratic Conference.

The speakers of this conference provided the kind of information that helps the American people distinguish between constructive attempts at solutions for our vast problems and blind, negative obstructionism.

I would like my colleagues to have the opportunity to read just one of the speeches given at the conference—that of Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch of California. The context of this speech follows:

It is always somewhat disconcerting to be asked to keynote a conference of Democrats. I feel like a minister who is asked to preach at a meeting of fellow ministers.

You all know the message.

I do feel, however, that I can at least claim tenure to justify my position at this rostrum. My service as a messenger for the Democratic Party goes back to the 1920 Democratic Convention in San Francisco.

As a young lad—very young—I delivered messages for such luminaries as Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was nominated for vice president at that convention.

(I only hope my current messenger service will augur better for the party in 1968 than it did in 1920.)

As California's lonely Democratic statewide officeholder, I am happy to welcome our visitors to California.

I hope you enjoy your visit to a state which has overcome an exotic reputation to become a national testing ground for political candidates and political trends.

I am often asked if California government has changed much under the Republicans and Ronald Reagan. Well, as I was saying to Jesse Unruh in the Capitol's Makeup Room . . . "A little theatrical excess is all right, but I still object to calling the opening session of the Legislature a premiere."

Actually, there is a very serious message for all Democrats in Ronald Reagan's political career.

An old saw about Hollywood said, "Strip away the phony tinsel and you'll find the real tinsel." Well, with Governor Reagan, you strip away the amateur act and you find a very professional act.

Ronald Reagan has successfully and skillfully capitalized on a widespread American distrust of men and women professionally dedicated to politics and government. This distrust seems to spring, in part, from the massive problems which plague our nation and the apparent inability of the professionals in government to deal effectively with these problems.

Please note, I said *apparent* inability. The gambit of those who would play successfully on this American animus toward politics and government is simple. They rush to denounce programs before the programs have a chance to work—preferably even before they are enacted. These anti-government apostles refuse to consider our problems in terms of the years and decades which will be required for their solution. They appeal to the natural desire for the quick, the easy, the simple answer—regardless of its ultimate toll.

This is a major problem which the Democratic Party—as the party in power—faces in the coming year.

Our party on both the national and local levels must go to the people and ask for a commitment to the future. This is the commitment which our party has always stressed.

It is a commitment which will be severely challenged by those opponents who offer some vision of momentary respite and comfort—albeit at the cost of future generations.

This meeting is billed as a "nuts and bolts" conference. I am assured by Gene Wyman that this title does not refer to the two-party system. It refers to methods of electing Democrats.

(Incidentally, I note that one of the panels is called "Packaging and Selling Candidates." Times change. It was only a few years ago that a minor uproar occurred in California when a candidate's advisor publicly stated that he looked on his job with the candidate like selling a bar of soap.)

Yet, I believe that whether we are considering fund-raising or turning-out the vote, we must remain aware of the political thicket which we face in 1968.

It is certainly an election year in which we cannot afford party strife and dissension. While I recognize that by its nature a political party is an amalgam of personal careers and personal egos—in this election there must be some subordination of personal drives by all party leaders, if the party—as a whole—is to succeed.

In our discussions here, we must also remember that beneath the charges and countercharges of a campaign, behind the billboards and TV ads, underlying the general theme and debate, is the necessity for the successful candidate to somehow strike a central chord of the popular will and spirit. This basic appeal and its roots should concern us throughout this conference and in all our varied discussions.

We are facing today national and international crises which have become very personal crises for millions of Americans. As these crises grow, individuals feel increasingly threatened. They see their own lives imperiled by the dangers of modern life—dangers which lurk in their own cities and which threaten from thousands of miles away.

In this election, Americans will seek reassurance and a renewal of national determination.

I am convinced that the Democratic Party can provide this reassurance and renewal. I am certain that President Lyndon Johnson can successfully lead our party in this effort.

Yet if success is to be ours, we must deal strongly and decisively with the divergence and disaffection which are obviously present in our nation—divergence and disaffection which the Republicans will seek to weld into a victory formula.

In an affluent society, we cannot ignore the poor. Nor in our war on poverty can we ignore the special needs of the evergrowing affluent middle class. In attempting to provide new outlets for youth, we cannot ignore the problems of our older citizens. In seeking to affirm the civil rights and liberties of all our citizens, we cannot ignore the challenge of

the lawless and the lawbreakers who respect no one's rights or liberties. In attempting to pay for needed programs, we cannot forget the burdens imposed on taxpayers.

The years of the Johnson Administration have seen uniquely farsighted and sweeping programs launched to deal with all these problems.

If modern poverty as a government problem was discovered by Senators John Kennedy and Hubert Humphrey in the 1960 West Virginia Primary, it has certainly been named, claimed and explored by President Lyndon Johnson.

Yet today—in the wake of bloody riots and civil distress—we hear Republican governors demanding that President Johnson mount a massive attack on urban poverty.

I would only recommend that these governors—these new voices—first talk to their own congressmen.

Republicans in Congress have spent the past four years hacking away at the President's poverty proposals. The Ninetieth Congress has reached a new high—or low—in this regard.

While tragedy stalks our nation's cities, the Republicans of the Ninetieth Congress have slashed at programs to restore health to our cities by removing the blight of poverty . . . slashed at programs to erase the stain of disease and ignorance . . . slashed at programs to alleviate the tragedy of unemployment and slum housing.

With almost incredible frivolity, they rejected the President's request for funds to fight the plague of rats in our urban slums. (Incidentally, I don't think we have yet heard the last of that *milestone* vote.)

How can we expect children born in the 1960's to grow into responsible citizens if they have been raised in the medieval terror of rats? In a nation which is sending men to the moon, in a nation where air conditioning, and color television, and automated kitchens are becoming necessities for millions of Americans, how can we expect children to respect a government which will not protect them from rats? No man can honestly rationalize such a question.

The Republican governors demand action for our cities, and every year since 1964, the Republican congressmen have cut away at President Johnson's proposals for building better cities. The President's request this year for $662 million for the Model Cities Program has already been cut to about one-third the requested figure.

In so many important areas, in housing and in medical care, in education . . . in social security . . . in mental health . . . in civil rights . . . in minimum wages . . . in manpower training . . . in urban affairs . . . in mass transportation . . . in recreation and in consumer protection—the President's proposals have faced and are facing stiff Republican opposition in Washington, while the Republicans in the states and cities are demanding action in these very same areas.

This summer has seen these same Republican governors decry the crises in our cities. Yet two years ago, Lyndon Johnson created the new federal Department of Housing and Urban Development over the massive opposition of Republican congressmen.

As a member of the President's Crime Commission, as Attorney General, and as a former District Attorney, I am most familiar with the Administration's approach to the problems of crime, law enforcement and criminal justice—certainly among the most sensitive of national urban problems. I am proud to have played a part in mapping the first truly national strategy against crime.

Yet I have already seen the Republicans in the House turn this critical effort into a political football, sinking serious consideration of police needs in a morass of old political shibboleths.

Similarly, I have seen Republicans in Washington block all attempts at controlling the deadly proliferation of mail order firearms and the equally dangerous traffic in heavy military weapons—a traffic which has become a national scandal.

This national Republican attitude toward crime is consonant with their behavior in other vital areas. It involves a belated response to crises featuring a tidal wave of oratory and frantic alarms and excursions. It involves a sense of urgency which is apparently energized only by virtual disaster.

This record of Democratic action and Republican resistance, however, is not an instant ticket to victory in 1968, on either the state or federal levels.

As they say in Sacramento, you're only as good as your last picture. None of these programs have achieved immediate success. None were intended to. In fact, in the face of many of these programs, the United States has been torn by rioting and terror-ridden with civil disturbances.

The way is open for the type of non-program which has served the Republican party so well in the past. A P. T. Barnum style with platitudes and slogans; a fraudulent general-store approach to economics; a philosophy toward social and human problems which is as irrelevant—but also as palatable—as the homilies of Ma Perkins or Mary Worth; a portrayal of government—as practiced by Democrats—as some sort of arcane and probably "black" art; a special appeal to the home-owning, boat-owning, mortgage-owing, comfortable and insecure middle class voter—all of these elements wrapped in a flag and carried by a handsome man who proclaims his distance from politics.

Such an appeal will be hard to overcome in 1968. It will not be overcome by relying on such tired chestnuts as the right wing, or the inexperience of our opponents, or the Republican failures of other years. It will not be overcome by futilely decrying and criticizing the opposition. It will not be overcome by dependence on the empty cliches of past campaigns. It will be overcome by the thorough and positive presentation of the unparalleled record of legislation which has been created by President Lyndon Johnson. It will be overcome by presenting candidates on all levels who answer—really answer—America's problems in this same spirit.

We must seek to assure the American people of our ability to better control the massive forces which are driving modern America.

We must neither ignore nor dispute the alarm and concern which has spread across our nation. We must not attempt to gloss the uglier truths about our nation *circa* 1968. We must not rely on old formulas of success which ignore the new social structures.

We must emphasize our past successes and offer new proposals. We must demand that our Republican opponents base their campaigns on the harsh realities and realistic responses. We cannot allow them to respond to realities with wistful dreams of an untroubled past and a simpler future.

We cannot allow the Republican Party to conduct its typical campaign of dealing with new problems by complaining about them. The White House, the Congress, the State Capitols are not wailing walls. Government today demands action, not accusations; compassion, not complaints.

We must insist on a campaign which will embody the "candid and universal" debate which Woodrow Wilson saw as the saving virtue of our nation. In doing this, we must ourselves insist on candor and reason. We must ourselves refrain from substituting rhetoric for reason and platitudes for problems.

We must strive to create political campaigns which are healthy for America—which will not play on either hidden or open prejudices; which will not seek to set one group against another; which will not allow candidates to cloak intolerance with an attitude of self-righteousness to conceal indifference with the banner of economy, to heighten fears with inflamed demands for public safety, to inflate pettiness into public spirit.

The temper of the nation is such that we cannot afford the posturing and the demagoguery which has been tolerated in other years. Campaigns of deceit, of division, of vilification could be a national tragedy.

Our party faces a most difficult election. In California, we've had several recently. And, I note, in the other Western states, a few Republicans have been getting elected. Hopefully, recent defeats will have prepared us for this election.

We have a national administration with an unparalleled record of programs dealing with the problems which beset us. In President Lyndon Johnson and Vice President Hubert Humphrey, we have national leaders who have proven their greatness, their understanding, and their feeling for all Americans. This we must successfuly present to the American people.

We must respond to the challenges of our times in a manner which is understood, accepted, and supported by the American people.

I am certain we will.

Thank you.

A NEW LOOK AT GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION: BUDGET BUREAU COMMENTS ON H.R. 69

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, for almost 2 years, in both the 89th and 90th Congresses, I have advocated creating a new blue-ribbon commission, similar to the two Hoover Commissions, to review the operations of the executive branch and recommend organizational and management reforms. Over 30 Members of the House joined me in introducing this legislation in September 1965, and in this Congress more than 40 have cosponsored the measure which I reintroduced in January as H.R. 69.

Significant support for such a step has been expressed on both sides of the Capitol, and by many national organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Last month a large number of my colleagues joined me in a presentation marking the 20th anniversary of the first Hoover Commission and outlining some of the pressing problems which make another overall assessment of Federal operations so imperative. These remarks appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 13, beginning at page 18702.

In my statement of July 13, I noted that, although this proposal had been pending so long, the executive branch had never seen fit to submit any departmental reports to the Government Operations Committee. In fact, officials of the Bureau of the Budget and other agencies had made no specific comments on the proposal at all.

I am glad to report that some comment, although very general and short,

has now been made by BOB. On August 24, Mr. Charles J. Zwick, Assistant Director of the Budget Bureau, responded at some length to a note which I had sent to Director Schultze on July 17, requesting a response to my floor statement.

I feel that Mr. Zwick's remarks about H.R. 69, and my reply of August 29, may be of interest to the cosponsors of this legislation, and to all others who share our concern for efficient conduct of the public business. Accordingly, I would like to place this correspondence in the RECORD at this point:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MATHIAS: This is in response to your letter of July 17, 1967, concerning your speech on current problems of Government organization.

We certainly agree with your basic observation that the Federal Government has undergone major changes in recent years. Most significant, we believe, has been the rapid expansion since 1961 of our grant-in-aid and other programs of assistance to State and local governments. This Administration has emphasized the objective of a system of creative Federalism which brings the resources of various agencies at all levels of government to bear on the solution of our society's very complex problems.

The successful execution of many of these new programs cannot depend solely on the establishment of clear lines of authority. And, because of our multijurisdictional approach and the growing interrelationships between many programs, it is no longer possible to solve our management and organizational problems simply by transferring functions and grouping related activities under a single agency. In the domestic area that would result in trying to create a Department of Everything.

What we need now is close cooperation and coordination, not only between various Federal agencies but also the various levels of government. This is never easy to achieve, but we have taken a number of actions and have others under way aimed at making this complex system work better.

We have reservations about the creation of a new Hoover-type commission at this time to conduct an overall review of Federal operations. It may be desirable at some point to have an outside group review and make recommendations with respect to the overall goals and objectives of Federal programs and the Federal system. However, the area of study proposed in H.R. 69 and other bills is most difficult and complex, and we doubt that a single group of the type proposed could undertake the far-ranging study envisioned in the bills. We would have particular reservations about members of Congress, Governors, and Federal agency heads being able to devote sufficient time to the effort. Finally, such a study would duplicate or overlap many current efforts.

With respect to a number of the specific problems cited in your speech of July 13, we have the following comments:

1. *Water resources management*—We recognize that the area of water resources management represents a most difficult problem of coordination. It typifies our multijurisdictional and intergovernmental approach to dealing with a broad problem area. In part, to help achieve needed coordination, the Administration has proposed the creation of a National Water Commission to conduct a comprehensive review of water resource matters. Other steps have also been taken. For example, through Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration was transferred from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Department of the Interior to facilitate coordination with the other water resource programs of the latter. In addition, the agencies making grants and loans for water and sewer facilities have concluded agreements to coordinate those programs.

2. *Catalog proliferation*—In a letter dated February 7, we asked Federal agencies to avoid duplication in the production of general catalogs of Federal aid programs. As a result a single general catalog has been published under the leadership of the Office of Economic Opportunity. While other agencies may continue to issue publications regarding their own programs, the OEO catalog is intended to be the Government's one comprehensive effort. To improve that catalog further, we have established an interagency task force to advise on necessary additions, changes in format and methods of periodic updating.

3. *Information centers*—Enclosed is a copy of Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-84 which establishes a systematic means of reporting Federal outlays by geographic location. These data, to be incorporated in OEO's Federal Information Exchange System, will give State and local government a comprehensive picture of Federal activities in their areas.

In addition, the Bureau is working closely with a task force representing State and local government associations and various agencies to explore various problems involved in intergovernmental information systems including (a) compatibility of data which governments collect and use; (b) joint utilization of automatic data processing facilities; (c) coordination of efforts to conserve scarce statistical manpower skills; and (d) the possibility of developing a central data bank.

Finally, on a pilot basis, the General Services Administration has established central information centers to serve the public as well as others in Atlanta, Georgia, and Kansas City, Kansas.

4. *Forms, directives, and reports*—Enclosed is a copy of our recent Circular No. A-85 which establishes a procedure for advance consultation with State and local chief executives on Federal regulations affecting their governments. Also enclosed is a copy of Circular No. A-73 aimed at simplifying grant-in-aid audit procedures.

5. *Regional offices*—In his message on the Quality of American Government, the President directed the Bureau of the Budget to undertake a study of the structure and use of the Federal field service. That study is now under way and involves such matters as the location of field offices, regional boundaries, and delegations of authority.

6. *Planning*—Enclosed is a copy of Circular No. A-80 on the coordination of development planning for programs based on multi-jurisdictional areas. The Circular implements the President's Memorandum of September 2, 1966, on the coordination of Federal development planning. Agency procedures for carrying out the instructions have been reviewed to assure maximum consistency among the many Federal agencies and programs concerned. Under the Circular, Federal agencies are required to consult with Governors before designating planning and development districts or regions in their States. Where the State has established such districts, the boundaries of new districts designated by Federal agencies will conform to them unless there is a clear justification for not doing so.

Bureau staff are also participating in a Planning Coordinating Committee established by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and representing the several Federal agencies which have grant programs which aid or require development planning. Three early tasks outlined for the Committee are:

To act as a clearing house of information on grants-in-aid awarded to State and local governments for various types of development planning.

To create a "map room" which will monitor the creation and adjustment of sub-state and multi-county planning jurisdictions supported by Federal planning grant programs, in order to achieve coordination between Federal agencies, and State and local governments in the designation of planning territories.

To comprehensively survey the many Federal requirements for planning in order to ease the burden of the applicant State and local governments in supplying data, progress reports, and other types of justifications of planning activity.

7. *Coordinating and advisory groups*—In connection with the various points you raised, you may be interested in the enclosed copies of Circulars No. A-49 and No. A-63. The former sets criteria for the use of certain types of contracts to provide advisory and other services. The latter establishes a system for the periodic review of interagency committees.

8. *Information management*—In addition to the efforts you cited, you may be interested in the work of the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information described in the enclosed issue of the *Navy Management Review*.

The above description has been necessarily brief. We would be happy to furnish you with any additional information you may wish on the activities to which we referred.

Sincerely,

CHARLES J. ZWICK,
Assistant Director.

AUGUST 29, 1967.

Mr. CHARLES J. ZWICK,
Assistant Director,
Bureau of the Budget.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ZWICK: Thank you very much for your thoughtful letter of August 24 in response to my statement on problems of governmental organization and the need for creation of a new Hoover-type Commission.

I appreciate having the material which you enclosed, summarizing steps which are being taken to resolve or reduce some of the problems which I cited. I especially welcome your observations about my bill, H.R. 69, since your letter is the first time in nearly two years that the the Bureau of the Budget has offered any comments on this legislation at all.

I trust that your brief remarks on the bill indicate that your agency is growing more interested in at least discussing this topic, and that a formal departmental report will be submitted to the appropriate Congressional committees very soon.

In reviewing your letter, I am glad to see that we generally agree that serious problems of Federal organization and management have been produced by the rapid recent expansion of Federal activities, the great changes in techniques of management, and the continuing evolution of our Federal structure. We agree, too, that the scope and complexity of present Federal operations place a high premium on coordination and cooperation among Federal agencies and all of the partners in American government.

Our basic conflict appears to be over the extent to which an overall, intensive review of Federal operations by a mixed commission could be helpful and constructive. According to your letter, your "reservations" about H.R. 69 may be summarized as follows:

(1) "The area of study proposed . . . is most difficult and complex, and we doubt that a single group of the type proposed could undertake the far-ranging study envisioned in the bills;"

(2) In particular, Members of Congress, Governors, and Federal agency heads may not be "able to devote sufficient time to the effort"; and

(3) "Finally, such a study would duplicate or overlap many current efforts."

Certainly the study proposed in H.R. 69 is "far-ranging," "difficult and complex." I feel, however, that this very scope makes the creation of a special review commission both necessary and appropriate. From a negative point of view, no existing governmental machinery has proved capable of reviewing governmental operations overall. The GAO focuses only on relatively narrow points of inquiry. Congressional committees, and especially the appropriations subcommittees, perform invaluable oversight efforts, but their work is somewhat fragmented and inconsistent. Within the executive branch, surely BOB has accomplished a great deal, but I am sure you would be among the first to agree that much more needs to be done.

From a positive approach, a special commission has particular merits. First, such a panel would be supported by the prestige of its individual members, and by the strength of its Congressional and Presidential mandate. Second, the panel would, under H.R. 69, be authorized to gather a sizable and expert staff, and to consult individuals with professional background in many fields, both inside and outside the government. Third, this panel would have the detachment and objectivity secured by its lack of involvement in the day-to-day workings of government. Fourth, it would be completely non-partisan. Fifth, its recommendations would be able to command special attention from the press, the public, and all officials and special-interest groups involved.

In regard to the amount of time which Members of the commission might have, I would point out that Members of Congress and Governors have served with distinction on many special groups in the past, and now contribute a great deal, for example, to the work of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The provisions for adequate professional staff are also relevant in this regard.

In response to your third "reservation," let me emphasize that a commission would be a supplement to, rather than a substitute for, existing efforts to reform Federal operations. In the many areas in which the Budget Bureau is now active, I would anticipate that the commission would build on your work, rather than rejecting it and beginning again. Similarly, the commission would probably rely greatly, at least in its initial stages, on the work of the GAO and those Congressional committees which have been active in oversight.

It seems to me that, from your point of view, the commission could be most helpful, first, in advancing and helping to implement some of BOB's recommendations and directives, and second, in continuing your efforts and measuring their actual impact on the Federal establishment. I certainly do not view this review as any kind of adversary proceeding, but rather as a study which could prove to be as useful to the executive branch as to the Congress and the public generally.

Quite frankly, one of the considerations which impelled me to sponsor this legislation was not the absence of coordinating efforts, but rather the existence of so many of them. For example, I suspect that the number of interagency committees reported on April 30 under BOB Circular A-63 (March 2, 1964) is greater than the number reported to the Muskie Subcommittee last November. To me, this proliferation of coordinators dramatizes the extent of our problems, and the need to give your agency some overall assistance in evaluating problems and assessing alternatives.

In conclusion, I am somewhat puzzled by your comment that "it may be desirable at some point to have an outside group review and make recommendations with respect to the overall goals and objectives of Federal programs and the Federal system." This type of inquiry, which would go beyond the reach of H.R. 69 into substantive policy questions, would be essentially political though not necessarily partisan, in nature. I fail to see how the executive branch could consistently delegate its policy-making powers to any outside group, and at the same time fail to endorse the type of procedure-oriented management study contemplated by H.R. 69.

I look forward to your response to my comments.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr.

A SENSIBLE WAY TO FIGHT RATS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the House decision not to consider H.R. 11000 in July has become one of the most widely publicized votes of the year. Unfortunately, too many comments have emphasized labels and symbols, rather than the real problem—how to fight rats in the most sensible and effective way.

In his Washington Report for the current week, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] has thoughtfully analyzed the situation, summarized the defects of H.R. 11000, and emphasized the advantages of expanding the present public health programs to combat rats.

I am very pleased that Mr. PIRNIE has announced his support for the amendment to H.R. 6418, the Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967, which will be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and I, when this legislation reaches the floor. Instead of creating an entirely new administrative structure for programs categorically limited to rat extermination and control, our amendment will simply increase the annual authorization for public health project grants by $20 million, so that more sufficient funds may be available to those States and communities with severe rat problems.

I would like to call the attention of the entire Congress to Mr. PIRNIE's newsletter, and include it in the RECORD at this point:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman ALEXANDER PIRNIE)

One of the most publicized, yet least understood legislative actions of the House of Representatives involved a measure attractively labeled "The Rat Extermination Act of 1967."

On July 20th, by a vote of 207-176, the House defeated a proposal to consider the bill. I supported this move.

According to a number of political columnists and editorial writers, those of us who stood up to be counted against what we considered poor legislation were turning our backs to a harsh reality of life—the fact that many areas of our Nation are rat-infested and that an estimated 90 million rodents pose a continuing, serious threat to the health and safety of our people.

Unfortunately, emotional appeals, rather than factual statements, have predominated the majority of accounts on this subject.

Admittedly, there has been some justified criticism of the manner in which the House debate was conducted. Some of my colleagues, both supporters and opponents of the bill, sprinkled their position statements with alleged humor. Such comments were inappropriate.

Rats are not to be ignored. They do exist, not in small numbers, but by the millions. They are responsible for untold damage, both in the cities and on the farms. They do threaten the health and safety of great numbers of people.

If the foregoing is true—and there is expert testimony to substantiate that it is—then why my opposition to a program designed to attack the problem? The answer is basic.

It takes more than an appealing label to make a good bill. Most of us, at one time or another, have been excited upon receiving an attractively wrapped gift, only to be disappointed upon discovering that the contents did not come up to expectations. That's exactly what characterized the Rat Extermination Act—we were hopeful that the bill would outline a sensible, meaningful approach to a problem of serious proportions, but it did not measure up.

Most of the critical news media accounts of the House action have failed to mention that already four Federal agencies are engaged in the control and elimination of rats. The measure we reviewed on July 20th, if approved, would have added a fifth agency to the list. Instead of further duplicating the functions of Federal agencies, in approach both costly and wasteful, we should be pressing to streamline Government operations.

My reaction to the rat problem is not to ignore it, but to recognize it for what it is—a menace to the public health. Operating on this assumption—and the facts document its validity—I have reached the conclusion that the Public Health Service is the appropriate agency to direct the war on rats.

Last year I voted for a comprehensive public health services program which authorized $62.5 million in grants to the cities and states to carry out public health programs. The measure passed and since then the Public Health Service has established programs designed to wage a major offensive against this menace.

Of course, only a small portion of the funds authorized has been apportioned to programs directly related to rat elimination. All available evidence indicates more money must be committed to the effort if the Public Health Service is going to be in a position to do the job that has to be done.

However, it must be remembered that fundamental to the solution of the problem is the cooperation of individuals at the local level. Proper sanitation and garbage disposal are necessary preliminaries to effective rodent control. No government program can change this very elementary fact of life.

Many of us in the Congress, though opposed to the poorly-conceived measure that was defeated on July 20th, have not weakened in our resolve to get on with the job. Presently there is underway a bi-partisan effort to gather support for a key amendment to the Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967, due for House consideration in the near future. The amendment to which I refer will provide the Public Health Service with additional funds to advance and expand its rat elimination program.

Wisdom dictates that we should provide additional funds for the Public Health Service to effectively handle an assignment for

which it is already prepared by experience. We must remember that our goal is less rats, not more bureaucracy.

A PROPOSAL TO PREVENT INTERSTATE SMUGGLING OF CIGARETTES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include txtraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have witnessed an alarming increase in the occurrence of interstate cigarette smuggling design to evade payment of State and city cigarette taxes. Much disturbed by this situation, I am today introducing, with the cosponsorship of some of my distinguished colleagues, H.R. 12761, a bill to help prevent the illegal interstate transport of cigarettes by requiring: First, cigarette manufacturers and importers to affix a label to each cigarette package indicating the State of final use; and, second, upon request of the State or eligible city, to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to collect the State or eligible city cigarette taxes. The term "eligible city" means any subdivision of a State with a population of 1 million or more people.

Once a minor impropriety of individual interstate travelers who exceeded their tax-free quota of cigarettes when entering a high-cigarette-tax State, the illegal interstate smuggling of cigarettes has now entered a new phase under the blessings and direction of the grand old families of organized crime. Having burgeoned into a full scale and exceedingly prosperous racket, bootleg cigarettes represent a malignant threat to law and order as well as an enormous loss to public income.

For the people of the States and cities affected, this evasion of taxes has precipitated a loss of tens of millions of dollars annually in State and city income. New York State officials estimated a current annual loss to their State of between $40 and $60 million. New York City officials estimate losses of $20 million or more. Costing only 19 or 20 cents a pack in North Carolina, the same cigarettes can be sold for 30 to 40 cents on the black market in New York City, where each pack is subject to 10 cents State tax, 4 cents city tax, and a 2% sales tax. The market and the organization for large-scale cigarette bootlegging already exist in New York City, but its success there promises expansion into nearby States where high taxes offer attractive returns. Maryland, with 6 cents tax, is already feeling the effects of contraband cigarettes. Pennsylvania, with 8 cents tax, Massachusetts and Vermont, with 10 cents tax, and New Jersey, with 11 cents tax, are also ripe targets.

An illustrative exposition of this growing problem by Lloyd Shearer appeared in the July 23, 1967, issue of Parade magazine. Entitled "The Mafia Moves in on Tobacco Road," this article cites Brooklyn District Attorney Aaron Koota as linking the chieftains of the infamous Cosa Nostra families to "what the FBI has termed a 'million-dollar-a-day' bootlegging operation, which begins along Route 301 in North Carolina and ends up in factories, filling stations, beauty salons, and small tobacco stores throughout the Eastern States."

It is manifestly impossible—

Reports Mr. Shearer—

for the states of New York, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Wisconsin (where the state tax on cigarettes is 10 cents per pack) or the states of New Jersey, Texas, and Washington (where the state tax is 11 cents per pack) to order their tax inspectors to check every vehicle coming into their domain for search and possible seizure of contraband tobacco. There aren't that many excise inspectors.

For some of the more distant States it is merely a question of the transportation costs as opposed to tax rates:

The higher states and local communities raise the tax on cigarettes, the easier they make it for the mob to move in.

In 1949 the so-called Jenkins Act was passed to facilitate the collection of State cigarette taxes and prohibit illegal interstate mail-order sales of cigarettes which bypassed State taxation. This law requires any interstate distributor of cigarettes to file his name and principal address of business with the tobacco tax administrator of the State into which the cigarettes are being shipped, and to provide him with a monthly record of all shipments into that State setting forth the name and address of the receiver, the brand, and the quantity of each shipment.

The problem which confronts us today, however, no longer concerns the distribution practices of legitimate cigarette manufacturers and distributors, but rather is the result of intentional bulk smuggling by organized criminals who purchase cigarettes legitimately in North Carolina and ship them, using special trucks and backroads, to high-cigarette-tax States without paying the tax. What is needed is a new approach which would deny the crime syndicate the opportunity to bootleg cigarettes.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 12761, would provide the States and cities over 1 million population with an alternative method of levying their respective cigarette taxes that would guarantee their collection prior to any opportunity to smuggle them into the various States. It would allow a State or eligible city to enter into a contractual agreement with the U.S. Treasury Department under which the Secretary of the Treasury would act as an agent for the State or city, utilizing the Federal jurisdiction over interstate commerce. Since the arrest of cigarette smuggling truly requires the assistance of an interstate authority, the purpose of this bill is only to make additionally available to the States and eligible cities the interstate services of the Treasury Department.

To this purpose, section 1 directs each manufacturer or importer of cigarettes to affix to each package of cigarettes a label indicating the State of final use; that is, of taxable use, and the amount of State cigarette tax, if any. This, in turn, would require that each retailer or distributor of cigarettes report to the manufacturer where cigarettes are finally to be sold.

Section 2 then authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to collect the appropriate State or eligible city cigarette taxes, upon the voluntary request of the State or city, from the manufacturer or importer. By entering into such an agreement with the Federal Government, a State or city may hereby assure the most efficient collection of its cigarette taxes.

The criminal provisions of H.R. 12761 apply to section 1 as well as to the interstate transport of unlabeled cigarettes, thereby protecting against a manufacturer selling unlabeled cigarettes within his own State which could then be smuggled.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide an effective instrument for curtailing illegal interstate smuggling and substantially discourage organized criminal operations. Further, Mr. Speaker, I believe that by this sort of creative federalism, where our National Government seeks ways to assist and promote the tax collecting function of the States through mutually voluntary cooperation, we can best solve the problems that beset State and local governments. Therefore, I strongly urge immediate and sympathetic consideration of H.R. 12761 so that this onerous situation may soon be dealt with.

FRIGHTENING EVIDENCE OF NEED FOR NEW HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who has introduced legislation calling for the establishment of a Hoover-type commission on the organization of the executive branch of the Government, as well as legislation to carry out a war on waste in the organization and operation of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, I am heartened by the recent hard-hitting editorial, "Frightening Evidence of Need for New 'Hoover' Commission," which appeared in the Wichita, Kans., Sunday Eagle on August 27.

This editorial spells out the need for immediate action in cold, hard facts and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring this summary to the attention of my colleagues because it shows several areas where the Federal Government has expanded to the point where the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing and billions of tax dollars are involved in the bureaucratic confusion. The editorial follows:

[From the Wichita Sunday Eagle, Aug. 27, 1967]

FRIGHTENING EVIDENCE OF NEED FOR NEW HOOVER COMMISSION

Twenty years have passed since the establishment of the first Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch, and

we agree with a growing number of legislators that it is time for another.

Adoption of recommendations made by the 1947–49 Hoover Commission and another in the mid 1950s have resulted in savings estimated at billions of dollars.

Both Sen. James Pearson, and Rep. Garner Shriver, R-Kan., have introduced bills to form a new commission, as have several others.

And they have good reason.

Generally, since 1948:

The federal budget has grown from $34-billion to $135-billion.

The non-defense budget total has grown 170 per cent.

Some 220 grant-in-aid programs have been established, administered by at least 21 agencies.

Specific examples of waste are even more revealing. For example, in the field of environmental pollution, the government is conducting research in 192 laboratories administered by nine separate departments and agencies.

A Library of Congress study showed that the federal government spends nearly $4-billion annually on research and development in its own laboratories, but does not know exactly how many laboratories it has, where they are, what kinds of people work in them or what they are doing.

The secretary of labor recently testified before Congress that there are 15 to 30 separate manpower programs administered by public and private agencies, all supported by federal funds, in each major U.S. metropolitan area.

Small-scale bungling, when added up, accounts for a staggering amount of money wasted. For example, a WAVE barracks was built in Maryland at a cost of $1.2 million, after the Navy had shipped the women to Florida.

Duplication probably is the largest single culprit. Five agencies are involved in administering federal programs for community water supply, sewers and sewage treatment facilities. Nearly 60 programs are devoted to vocational education.

An article in "Nation's Business" will give you an idea of how the government operates. It points out that some 40,000 university professors spend all or part of their time exclusively on research for Uncle Sam. This takes them away from the classroom.

At the same time the government spends millions on aid to higher education to produce the same kind of talent to make up for the shortage of professors.

The largest amount of waste could be found in defense spending, but it is among the most difficult to detect.

The Defense Department's budget of $75.5 billion represents more than half of the entire budget. But the sheer size of it, security matters and the confusion arising from the Vietnam War make waste cutting nearly impossible.

Most of the bills suggesting investigation call for a Presidential commission of some sort, with 12 members the average number suggested.

The Pearson bill would "promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business" in the various departments, boards, and bureaus of the executive branch by:

Recommending methods and procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities and functions.

Eliminating duplication.

Consolidating services, activities and functions not necesary to efficiency.

Abolishing services, activities and functions unnecessary to the function of the government.

Defining responsibilities of officials.

Eliminating nonessential services and activities which compete with private enterprise.

Relocating agencies now responsible directly to the President in departments or other agencies if it can be shown to be more efficient as a result.

A bill by Rep. Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., is similar, but also suggests that the nation assign priorities in its national goal. This certainly should be a part of any bill which eventually becomes law.

It is evident to every taxpayer that something must be done. It costs $4,281 a second to run the federal government—that is $4,281 every second, of every day, of every week, of every month, of the year.

Chances are excellent that a new "Hoover" commission could reduce this frightening figure. The first commission made some 273 recommendations, and 72 per cent subsequently were adopted. The second commission proposed 314 changes, of which 77 per cent were accepted in whole or part.

Among the reforms were the Military Unification Act of 1949; establishment of the General Services Agency; and liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corp., a move which returned $474-million in capital funds to the treasury.

The gains from the suggestions of the first commission alone have been estimated at no less than $7-billion.

The need for a comprehensive review of executive efficiency is as great today as it was in the 1940s and 1950s.

USEFUL PEACE PROPOSAL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in continuing to call the attention of the House to the favorable editorial support for the July 10 proposal of eight House Republicans for the gradual, reciprocal deescalation of the war in Vietnam, I include for the RECORD today editorials from the Barre-Montpelier, Vt., Times Argus; the Burlington, Vt., Free Press; the Bennington, Vt., Banner; the Huntington, W. Va., Herald Dispatch; the Fond Du Lac, Wis., Commonwealth Reporter; the Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., Daily Tribune; the Green Bay, Wis., Press Gazette; the Milwaukee, Wis., Journal; and the Racine, Wis., Journal Times:

[From the Barre-Montpelier (Vt.) Times-Argus, July 12, 1967]

USEFUL PEACE PROPOSED

Eight Republican congressmen including Vermont's lone member of the U.S. House of Representatives have joined in a statement on the Vietnam War and series of specific proposals to de-escalate the war.

Robert T. Stafford and the eight congressmen called for a series of "small steps taken quietly." Among those steps was the cessation of bombing of North Vietnam. They suggested a halt of the bombing activity north of the 21st parallel for 60 days. During that time North Vietnam would be expected to make some tangible step to lower the level of military action.

The proposals suggest a stage by stage reduction in the bombing. A second halt would be bombing north of the 20th parallel.

The comments of the eight Republican congressmen are critical of Administration policies in the war. They discuss at some length the difference between the objectives in a limited war and total war.

It is a neat distinction they make but neither a dead U.S. Marine nor a dead Viet Cong can make that neat distinction. Nor does it apply very effectively to the victim of napalm or guerrilla murder.

The proposal from the eight Congressmen is welcome. It is not characterized by great boldness. In fact quite the contrary. While stopping bombing around Hanoi it would leave the Haiphong area still open to attack.

The threat to resume bombing is restated several times. The congressmen seem to be walking a narrow path attacking both the Doves and the Hawks and throwing in the Administration for criticism too.

Clearly they don't want their proposal to be called "dovish." And they have stepped away from the hard line Hawks. It is obviously the statement of men who will be seeking reelection soon and are not quite sure what the electorate will say about their proposal.

These eight Republican Congressmen have contributed to developing more discussion of the basic issues. The Administration would do well to heed their proposal.

The eight congressmen come out squarely for U.S. action in taking the initiative which could lead to the bargaining table.

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, July 11, 1967]

ANOTHER PLAN FOR ENDING THE WAR

There have been numerous proposals for ending the war in Vietnam. Many of these proposals have been idealistic and unworkable. Some of them have been presented by persons or groups who really don't know what they are talking about.

At least the latest proposal, announced yesterday, is put forth by persons who should know what they are talking about. The plan calls for a "staged de-escalation" in Vietnam, and it is the brainchild of Vermont's Representative Stafford and eight other Republican Congressmen.

All of these nine Republicans are "liberals" and members of the Wednesday Club, a Capitol Hill organization once led by John Lindsay of New York. So the group's Vietnam proposal is bound to be rather "far out"—which it certainly is—but perhaps we should not consign it too quickly to the wastebasket. After all, none of the previous proposals has served to bring the war to a close.

Stafford's plan, in a nutshell, is as follows: The United States would halt all bombing in North Vietnam north of the 21st parallel for 60 days. (This area includes Hanoi but not Haiphong). If the North Vietnamese responded "with a similar de-escalatory step" within the 60 days, then the U.S. would end all bombing north of the 20th parallel for another 60-day period. If both sides continued to respond in a five-step process, "both the U.S. bombing of the North and the North Vietnamese infiltration into the South could come to an end."

At first glance, this proposal appears to be ridiculous. At second glance, it appears to be even more ridiculous. Certainly it could never be initiated without more consideration for detail than the Stafford group saw fit to give it.

The proposal contains huge gaps, notably the lack of any mention of the role of the Viet Cong. It is an accepted fact (Harrison Salisbury to the contrary) that the Viet Cong are largely supported by and-or from North Vietnam. If the U.S. stopped bombing, and the North Vietnamese stopped "infiltrating," then the war might de-escalate into what conceivably could be considered a "civil war." The next step? Withdrawal of all U.S. troops and subjugation of South Vietnam by the Communists.

Perhaps we are being too cynical. Perhaps Stafford's proposal contains more merit than is apparent. Perhaps we should be enthusi-

astic about any proposal which seems to promise an end to the war, even including Senator Aiken's peculiar suggestion that the U.S. declare victory and retreat.

But we've lived through too many disappointments, too many heartaches, too many smashed promises to think for a moment that the Vietnam war can be magically ended by a military initiative on the part of the United States.

[From the Bennington (Vt.) Banner, July 11, 1967]

GOP DEESCALATION PLAN

U.S. Rep. Robert T. Stafford and seven Republican colleagues announced yesterday a reasonable and attractive proposal for bringing a much-wanted end to the seemingly endless war in Vietnam.

Some of the specific points in the proposal present practical problems and may not be workable, yet its overall theme is valid. The congressmen suggest that the administration's step-by-step escalation of the war—with the next step always being the one that will defeat the Viet Cong—has been a failure, and is, in fact, drawing us not toward peace but into a full-scale land war in Asia. The congressmen challenge this policy, and suggest instead that a step-by-step de-escalation, in which neither side would lose face or feel that it had been defeated, would be far more likely to bring peace to Southeast Asia.

The proposal reveals an understanding of present day diplomatic politics. It firmly points out that the war is, and must be, limited. The Republican congressmen apparently understand that the war, as Sen. Mike Mansfield has pointed out, is "open-ended," that is, both sides can continue to escalate indefinitely, until the now limited conflict becomes World War III.

The eight congressmen correctly conclude that the war must be ended by negotiation, and by negotiation "among equals" in an atmosphere of "mutual confidence," which they say, can only be achieved by gradual de-escalation. They reject further escalation because it would expand, rather than limit, the war. But they also reject an immediate bombing pause long enough to convice Hanoi of the United States' sincere interest in de-escalation, because they feel such a pause would jeopardize our military position in the south. This is a debatable assumption, since the bombing has not slowed Hanoi's flow of men and supplies into the south, and has not succeeded in bludgeoning the North into defeat. All evidence shows, in fact, that its effect has been just the opposite.

What the Republicans have proposed is an exceptionally moderate de-escalation initiative. The U.S. would cease bombing north of the 21st parallel for 60 days, which means that bombing would then continue over at least half of North Vietnam, including the port of Haiphong. In return, the North would order a comparable de-escalation, such as the curbing of some supply routes, ending terrorism in specified areas, exchanging prisoners, or other actions. Neither side would be expected to put itself at a military disadvantage. Politicians on both sides would be able to boast that they were taking peace initiatives.

If the first step worked, then the U.S. would further reduce the level of bombing, and the Communists, likewise, would take another step back down the escalator.

There are a number of difficulties with the plan. The most obvious is that the extent of the North's control over the Viet Cong is uncertain, and Hanoi may not be able to call a halt to aggressive action in a specific area even if it wants to. Communication within the Cong is slow and limited, and word may not get around to all field commanders. Serious violations would automatically trigger a return to the previous level of bombing.

Nevertheless, the Republican proposal does offer a concrete proposal for de-escalating the war. And so slight are the necessary initiatives, that the U.S. military position would scarcely be endangered. The objection to previous de-escalation plans is therefore automatically answered. The GOP plan is also a welcome alternative to the administration policy, which promises nothing but a longer, bloodier war.

Rep. Stafford and his colleagues have shown that their party can offer intelligent, creative opposition to present policies. They are perhaps heeding Sen. Aiken's suggestion that the GOP is the only party in a position to thoroughly review the war and suggest new approaches to bringing it to an end. President Johnson may now find that a moderate Republican challenge in 1968 would be more formidable than he now expects.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Dispatch, July 13, 1967]

AN ALTERNATIVE TO "MORE WAR"

Eight House Republicans have proposed that the United States take the lead in a step-by-step de-escalation of the Vietnam War as a possible route to the negotiating table.

Their proposal, pooh-poohed by Democratic leaders as impractical, is that the United States put the plan in motion by stopping for 60 days all bombing north of the 21st parallel, which includes Hanoi but not the port of Haiphong.

If, during that period, North Vietnam made some "visible, meaningful" response, the U.S. would pull its bombers back to the 20th parallel. Five such reciprocal steps would stop all bombing of the north and might cool the war off to the point where talks could begin.

Such is the plan proposed by Rep. Bradford Morse (R-Mass.) and seven Republican colleagues. While there is no tangible evidence on which to build hope that the plan would be successful, this little Republican contingent deserves credit for coming up with an imaginative alternative to the present apparently hopeless course of action.

Secretary McNamara has returned from Vietnam with more cliches about "making progress," but the truth is that progress can only be counted when and if there is some prospect of peace, and when and if the South Vietnamese can take over the job of defending themselves against Communist aggression. The head count of Viet Cong dead, which may have risen over the last year, is no indication of progress.

Cynicism is abundant in Washington today and it is easy to classify these Republican Congressmen as naive and their proposals as unworkable.

The fact remains that they have suggested a course of positive action which leaves the initiative in U.S. hands. Little would be ventured, since the bombing is ineffective anyway. The plan is well worth considering.

[From the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter, July 14, 1967]

ESCALATE OR DEESCALATE?

"We are winning the war—but . . .," was the message given to Robert McNamara by field commanders during the ninth visit by the secretary of defense to Vietnam.

The "but" translates into a call for still more troops—perhaps 100,000—to be added to the 466,000 there at present.

This number, we are told, is the minimum needed to complete the job begun by a relative handful of American advisers only a few short years ago.

Yet behind the now somewhat guarded and muted predictions of eventual victory for the cause of democracy lies the sobering belief of the generals that this many troops will be required solely to keep us on top of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese during the coming months.

For the fact is that escalation has been met by escalation since the beginning. Communist troop strength is higher than it has ever been, despite the bombing of North Vietnam and ever-increasing battle losses.

McNamara described more than the immediate situation when he said at Da Nang: "Our casualties are high but we have also inflicted high casualties on North Vietnamese army units."

What he described was the situation as it was in 1965 and 1966 and as it is likely to be in 1968. Only the numbers have been changed—for the higher.

It is often forgotten that escalation is not the prerogative only of this country. Options open to the Communists include a step up of terrorist bombings in Saigon and other South Vietnamese cities; the infiltration in even greater numbers of the large North Vietnamese standing army; the use of Communist "volunteers" from other countries; the opening of diversionary action in Korea.

This was emphasized by eight Republican congressmen the other day as they introduced a scheme for a de-escalation of the war that would steer a middle course between "those who would bomb more and those who would bomb less."

Representatives Morse of Massachusetts, Dellenback of Oregon, Esch of Michigan, Horton of New York, Mathias of Maryland, Mosher of Ohio, Schweiker of Pennsylvania and Stafford of Vermont propose a halt to all bombing in Vietnam north of the 21st parallel for 60 days. This would exempt the city of Hanoi but not the port of Haiphong.

If the North Vietnamese responded with a similar de-escalatory step, such as dismantling major supply depots along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the United States would then end all bombing north of the 20th parallel for a like 60-day period—and so on down in five steps until the 17th parallel dividing North and South Vietnam was reached.

The staged de-escalation plan would produce a growing atmosphere of mutual confidence, think the congressmen. Its virtue is that most military targets are in southern North Vietnam.

Thus, should the North Vietnamese fail to respond to the first bombing limitation, bombing could be resumed north of the 21st parallel without having caused the military effort in South Vietnam any disadvantage.

Would such a plan work? The congressmen honestly don't know. Their proposal is put forth not as a panacea for Vietnam but in the belief that the best chance for peace lies in small steps, taken quietly, that make the position of each side credible to the other.

That we are willing to invest another 100,000 men in Vietnam is probably quite credible—and acceptable—to Hanoi. That we are ready to de-escalate by small steps, however, is something that does not seem to have been made as credible to them as it might be.

[From the Wisconsin Rapids (Wis.) Daily Tribune, July 13, 1967]

WHAT PRICE ESCALATION, IF FOE ALWAYS FOLLOWS SUIT?

"We are winning the war—but . . .," was the message given to Robert McNamara by field commanders during the ninth visit by the secretary of defense to Vietnam.

The "but" translates into a call for still more troops—perhaps 100,000—to be added to the 466,000 there at present.

This number, we are told, is the minimum needed to complete the job begun by a relative handful of American advisors only a few short years ago.

Yet behind the now somewhat guarded and muted predictions of eventual victory for the cause of democracy lies the sobering

belief of the generals that this many troops will be required solely to keep us on top of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese during the coming months.

For the fact is that escalation has been met by escalation since the beginning. Communist troop strength is higher than it has ever been, despite the bombing of North Vietnam and ever-increasing battle losses.

McNamara described more than the immediate situation when he said at Da Nang: "Our casualties are high but we have also inflicted high casualties on North Vietnamese army units."

What he described was the situation as it was in 1965 and 1966 and as it is likely to be in 1968. Only the numbers have been changed—for the higher.

It is often forgotten that escalation is not the prerogative only of this country. Options open to the Communists include a step-up of terrorist bombings in Saigon and other South Vietnamese cities; the infiltration in even greater numbers of the large North Vietnamese standing army; the use of Communist "volunteers" from other countries; the opening of diversionary action in Korea.

This was emphasized by eight Republican congressmen the other day as they introduced a scheme for a deescalation of the war that would steer a middle course between "those who would bomb more and those who would bomb less."

Representatives Morse of Massachusetts, Dellenback of Oregon, Esch of Michigan, Horton of New York, Mathias of Maryland, Mosher of Ohio, Schweiker of Pennsylvania and Stafford of Vermont propose a halt to all bombing in North Vietnam north of the 21st parallel for 60 days. This would exempt the city of Hanoi but not the port of Haiphong.

If the North Vietnamese responded with a similar de-escalation step, such as dismantling major supply depots along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the United States would then end all bombing north of the 20th parallel for a like 60-day period—and so on down in five steps until the 17th parallel dividing North and South Vietnam was reached.

The staged de-escalation plan would produce a growing atmosphere of mutual confidence, think the congressmen. Its virtue is that most military targets are in southern North Vietnam.

Thus, should the North Vietnamese fail to respond to the first bombing limitation, bombing could be resumed north of the 21st parallel without having caused the military effort in South Vietnam any disadvantage.

Would such a plan work? The congressmen honestly don't know. Their proposal is put forth not as a panacea for Vietnam but in the belief that the best chance for peace lies in small steps, taken quietly, that make the position of each side credible to the other.

That we are willing to invest another 100,000 men in Vietnam is probably quite credible—and acceptable—to Hanoi. That we are ready to de-escalate by small steps, however, is something that does not seem to have been made as credible to them as it might be.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette July 13, 1967]

A STEP-BY-STEP DEESCALATION

The proposal of eight Republican congressmen for a matching step by step de-escalation of the war in Vietnam by the United States and by North Vietnam is deserving of detailed examination by the Johnson administration which is at the point of decision on another major increase in the American manpower contribution to the war.

The eight congressmen propose that the United States offer to stop bombing north of the 21st parallel for 60 days as the first step in determining whether North Vietnam would match this act with a degree of de-escalation. As geography has it, use of the 21st parallel as a line for halting the bombing of North Vietnam would exclude Hanoi from raids but would keep Haiphong's port and supply centers on the target list. It would enable North Vietnam to make a decision on whether to claim that a major part of its demand for agreeing to negotiations had been met.

As matching steps of de-escalation from North Vietnam, the eight congressmen proposed halting of shipment of war supplies into South Vietnam, an end to terrorist activities, the release of American prisoners of war, and the movement of MIG fighters to airfields in the extreme north of North Vietnam. If and when the North Vietnamese agreed to a specific act of de-escalation, the American bombing limit would be moved south a parallel at a time until the 17th parallel dividing line between North and South Vietnam was reached.

The plan could be abandoned or reversed if the North Vietnamese went back on their word. As Rep. F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, one of the plan's proponents, pointed out, the idea would not mean placing the American military position in South Vietnam in jeopardy as President Johnson insists it would be if the United States halted bombing of the North without the North Vietnamese agreeing to stop infiltration of men and war equipment into the South at the same time.

Such a plan, of course, would require a third party or an international body for supervision and inspection.

The eight congressmen have presented an idea which, at the very least, would test the sincerity of North Vietnam and which would demonstrate for world public opinion which power is responsible if war were to continue or break out again after some de-escalation was achieved. This is exactly what the White House fumbled away last winter when there were signs in several European capitals that North Vietnam was willing to negotiate if some form of a bombing halt of the North came about.

The proposal appears even to have taken the Republican high command by surprise. Rep. Gerald Ford, the House Republican leader, limited himself to saying he was glad that his party was producing new ideas for possible ways out of the Vietnam dilemma.

This is the very least that can be said for a development of the idea, unless both political parties are in agreement that the only United States policy can be that North Viet-Nam must be driven to the negotiating table by force of American arms and the continuing casualties which this will mean.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, July 21, 1967]

ONE WEEK IN VIETNAM

This is a report from Saigon by a Washington Post writer on the week in Vietnam that ended July 8:

"The 1.2 million men of the allied forces conducted 41,959 ground actions, 33,354 air sorties and unnumbered naval gunfire attacks against the enemy in the south. The results: 2,114 enemy dead. From all indications they were quickly replaced.

"The week's accomplishments carried a monetary cost to the United States of about $500 million. The human was 2,027 casualties (not all Americans), of whom 449 were killed and the rest wounded. Three B-52 bombers, valued at $3 million each, and number of smaller aircraft were lost during the week.

"So far as is known, no territory of any significance changed hands, the balance of power between the sides was unaltered and neither the tactical nor the strategic situation changed."

It was a normal week. We paid $236,000 for every enemy soldier killed. There is still, as the current phrase goes, "no light at the end of the tunnel." More American troops are to be sent to Vietnam. This will enable our forces to conduct more of the same kind of operations. Civilian and military observers, the Post report says, doubt that more troops "would bring about dramatic changes in either the nature or the course of the war." Some American mission members feel "that more manpower will simply mean less effort by the South Vietnamese army."

The need is a dramatic move for peace. London reports, not confirmed by our government, are that some form of de-escalation or cessation of bombing is planned. That, at least, would be a bid for peace and worth trying even if in the end it doesn't work. Eight Republican house members had a sensible proposal the other day. They suggested a stop to bombing north of the 21st parallel and asking North Vietnam to make some move on its part to de-escalate. If the North Vietnamese co-operated, we would stop bombing above the 20th parallel and again ask for reciprocal action. If this worked, step by step the war would be slowed down and negotiations and peace might come.

There are also suggestions that the dispute be taken to the United Nations security council for a peace effort there. That, too, is worth trying. * * *

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal Times, July 12, 1967]

GOP IDEA MERITS CONSIDERATION

The plan of eight Republican congressmen for a stage-by-stage, or parallel-by-parallel, de-escalation of the war in Vietnam shouldn't be brushed off as a gimmick. The idea has some merit; at least it expresses more imagination than we have heard about the war from Washington in recent months.

The Republicans' idea goes like this: The United States would announce that it was halting the bombing of North Vietnam north of the 21st parallel (that is, the city of Hanoi and its environs) and would wait 60 days for a corresponding concession from the Communists. If such a concession came, we would halt bombing north of the 20th parallel, and wait another 60 days for a Communist concession. If it came—one more parallel down, and so on, until at the fifth stage our no-bombing line was the 17th parallel, the border between North and South Vietnam. At that point, if there were corresponding Communist concessions, the fighting could be practically halted.

Note that, with the exception of the novel plan of stages by parallels, this is not exactly a new idea. The Republicans are proposing to do in space what the Johnson administration has several times done in time. That is, the administration has ordered bombing halted for periods of time, ranging from several days to several weeks, and waited for corresponding Communist concessions. None has ever come.

That argues against the success of the Republican plan. Unless Hanoi was willing to take the second step after our first step, nothing would be accomplished, and Hanoi has never been willing, in public, to take any steps at all.

What this idea and all the others really add up to is a growing doubt among Americans and American leaders that the bombing of North Vietnam is really an effective way to carry on the war.

The bombing represents, in the eyes of Communists, neutrals and many Westerners, including some in the United States, the largest single obstacle to negotiations on Vietnam. But more practically, many Americans rightfully begin to wonder if the bombing has proved to be an effective military weapon.

After months and months of bombing, the American military claims that it has knocked out a high percentage of the Communists' industrial productivity, a high percentage of power production, a high percentage of oil storage facilities, etc.

Yet Secretary McNamara has been in Vietnam listening to General Westmoreland's plea for more troops, on the grounds that the 475,000 Americans now in Vietnam cannot accomplish the double job of guarding South Vietnam's borders and securing, or "pacifying," the interior. Westmoreland wants 100,000 more troops, and he cannot promise to stop there.

So what has bombing actually accomplished, in military terms? Those who argue for more bombing and more troops seem to us to be contradicting themselves. If bombing is so necessary and so successful, why do we need more and more manpower to control more and more North Vietnamese invaders?

Or do we reconcile ourselves to the fact that this open-end war, with its open-end manpower demands and its open-end casualty list, will go on forever?

DISCONTINUANCE OF TRAIN SERVICE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that we have reached an age where diminishing services in transportation and communication to rural America is the rule. A few weeks ago, I asked this House to consider a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that moratoriums be declared on the discontinuance of passenger service and railway mail contracts, until a study of the effects of such actions on the economy can be completed and these effects evaluated.

The legislation I am introducing today would insure that all involved individuals, municipalities, businesses, and others dependent on rail service throughout the country would be provided ample opportunity to object to further discontinuance of railway mail and passenger trains.

The action of snatching away these services from rural areas seems to be gaining momentum, and unless some kind of brake is applied, we will see them completely disappear before anything can be done. This is why I am asking that all due consideration be provided when any carrier requests discontinuance of service, including a mandatory period of 18 months "grace" before such discontinuance can be accomplished.

I have also repeatedly urged the Post Office Department to reconsider its policy of discontinuing use of the railroads in mail delivery. This is usually the first step in eliminating the trains altogether.

There is much discussion about the crowded conditions of our cities and the constant migration from the countryside. Would it not be a far more sensible policy to encourage the growth of our smaller towns and the development of our resources of space, so that those who have chosen to live in a rural community may not find less convenience than they had a few years ago, and so that others might be drawn toward these areas?

I believe this bill would be of service in clarifying certain procedures and providing more consideration to rural citizens.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS FOR THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the many economic problems that presently confront the producers of dairy products in this country, it seems most essential that the Congress should extend for 3 years the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans' hospitals.

In addition, it is equally important that the Armed Forces and the veterans' hospitals be provided the health benefits of this program which has served them and the milk producers of the country in a most commendable and acceptable manner. Dairymen have been plagued during the past year by inadequate prices, which has given cause to far too many individual owners of dairy operations to have to sell their herds and find other means of livelihood.

I have, on any number of previous occasions, called to the attention of this House the health and food hazard that these circumstances present to this Nation. Government has been negligent in permitting imports of dairy products to further aggravate the price situation, and while limiting quotas on dairy imports has now been instigated under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, millions of dollars were lost by the dairy industry prior to such recommended and commendable action having been taken.

It now seems to me that it would be further folly to permit this special program to expire on December 31 of this year. Consequently, I am introducing legislation today which would extend the present provisions of this special milk program to December 31, 1970.

Favorable congressional action would find favor and benefit, I know, for the Armed Forces, veterans' hospitals, and milk producers.

As a direct indication of the success of this program since its authorization in 1954, it has made possible the use of 5,357,850,097 extra pounds of fluid milk, along with 312,653,000 pounds of butter, 23,421,000 pounds of cheese, and 897,000 pounds of nonfat dry milk. Such volume of distribution is ample justification for the early approval by the Congress of this legislation.

USDA, THE ADMINISTRATION, AND LOW FARM PRICES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the 35,000 farmers who protested low farm prices at a National Farmers Organization meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, 2 weeks ago were simply reacting to the effects of the many antiagriculture maneuvers of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Farmers are angry over the depressed prices they receive for the commodities they raise. And justifiably so. The farm parity ratio has dropped to depression-year levels, farm production expenses are at an all-time high, and farm income is severely lagging behind nonfarm income.

In fact, the Department's own figures show that net farm income skidded from $16.4 billion in 1966 to an annual rate of $14.6 billion in the second quarter of this year. Therefore, it is not surprising that 35,000 farmers gathered together to call attention to these deplorable conditions caused by USDA and administration decisionmakers.

The House Republican task force on agriculture, of which I am chairman, has time and again pointed to recent examples of where the executive branch has dealt American agriculture harsh economic blows:

Dumping huge stocks of Commodity Credit Corporation grain upon the domestic market in order to break and depress grain and livestock market prices.

Delaying the necessary action to reduce price-depressing dairy imports, then failing to cut back permissible imports to the average 1961–65 level.

Underestimating cattle numbers by 4 million head and the turkey population by 5 million birds, thereby bringing an already weak market down further.

Cutting back purchases of pork and dairy products by the military.

Restricting exports of cattle hides, calf and kip skins, such action causing lower domestic livestock prices, notwithstanding subsequent increases in shoe and other footwear prices.

Boosting imports of raw sugar, designed to hold down market prices for domestic sugar producers, and so forth.

The task force has repeatedly called attention to these and other actions by the USDA and the administration aimed to depress farm prices. The alarming extent to which they have succeeded in their effort to hold down farm income has again been verified by the feelings expressed at the Des Moines meeting.

No wonder our declining farm population is not optimistic about the prospects for economic survival, and that rural discontent with depressed farm prices is being expressed vociferously and with increasing frequency.

Obviously, American agriculture is never going to play an effective role in feeding the hungry world under such adverse income conditions. What our farmers need is proper incentive to keep them producing the required food and fiber; namely, a satisfactory financial return for the commodities raised.

Ample documentation of the causes of farmers' anger over low prices and inadequate income can be found in many official publications, including an informative handbook on American agriculture prepared recently by the House Agriculture Committee.

This 96-page study, entitled "Food Costs—Farm Prices," is packed full of facts and figures that help explain how American farmers are getting shortchanged for their productive efforts. By depicting the current economic plight of American agriculture, this handbook provides further statistical support for the task force statements during the past 2½ years when we continually pointed out how the administration persisted in making the farmer its favorite whipping boy for inflation.

For instance, our corn producers now received only 2.8 cents for the corn in a 30-cent box of cornflakes, according to the House Agriculture Committee study. Wheat growers get only 3 cents for the wheat in a 22-cent loaf of white bread. And cotton raisers receive only 23 cents for the cotton in a man's $4 dress shirt.

Yet if the grain farmer were paid just one more penny for his commodity contribution to a cornflakes box or a loaf of bread, it would result in millions of dollars of added farm income. Certainly American agriculture deserves a larger share of the consumer's food dollar than it is presently getting.

Farmers have every right to be indignant over the shoddy treatment they have received from the Department and administration decisionmakers. In order to give our agricultural producers a square deal, they must be assured that their productive efforts will be equitably rewarded and that there will be no repetition of the many antifarm price maneuvers by the executive branch.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in President Eisenhower's second inaugural address, he expressed his awareness that in the atomic age, "peace may be the only climate possible for human life itself." To that end the President said:

> We must use our skills and knowledge and, at times, our substance to help others rise from misery, however far the scene of suffering may be from our shores.

It was with this in mind that last week I cast my vote in favor of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967. To be sure, it is not a perfect program, which made my final decision a most difficult one. But the drastic alternative of complete withdrawal of our foreign aid would simply create still further vacuums in the world of international politics—vacuums requiring even greater sacrifices than mere economic and social aid. And while multilateral aid programs are desirable and should be encouraged—vis-a-vis the United Nations and regional organizations—complete dependence upon the multilateral approach, for the present is unrealistic: unrealistic because combined assistance from donor countries with varying national interests makes any consensus on objectives very difficult, thereby reducing the effectiveness of such programs.

While I have misgivings concerning certain provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act, I believe our technical assistance program, by making U.S. skills and technical knowledge available to qualified people of less developed countries, provides a relatively inexpensive method of developing and carrying out economic and social reforms at the grassroots level. Therefore, when this particular aspect of our foreign aid program was before the House, I cast my vote in favor of it.

The late Senator Vandenberg, speaking in support of our first major postwar foreign aid program—the European recovery program—said:

> There are no blueprints to guarantee the results. We are entirely surrounded by calculated risks.

While this is no less true today, we cannot use it as an excuse to shirk our responsibilities as leader of the free world.

For—

Again as President Eisenhower so eloquently stated in his second inaugural address:

> wherever in the world a people knows desperate want, there must appear at least the spark of hope, the hope of progress—or there will surely rise at last the flames of conflict.

ADDRESS OF GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to the thoughtful and perceptive remarks of Gov. George Romney at the recent International Congress of Orientalists meeting at the University of Michigan.

Governor Romney clearly discussed the importance of improving communication and understanding between the East and the West. His remarks centered on the role of Red China in the world community and urged new efforts to bring China to take responsibility and contribute to the stability of the Far East.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members of the House will take time to read the Governor's remarks. He points the way toward a new and constructive policy for the United States. I insert his remarks to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY, OF MICHIGAN, TO THE XXVII INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ORIENTALISTS, ANN ARBOR, MICH.

It is a great pleasure for me to be a part of this distinguished international gathering. On behalf of the people of Michigan, I am particularly honored to welcome the International Congress of Orientalists to the first meeting in its 94-year History that has been held in the United States.

When Professor Fifield first asked me to attend the Congress several months ago, it appeared that, when I reached this point in my remarks, my function for the evening would be complete. But since then my role in these proceedings has evolved from "greeting" to "greeting and introduction" to "greeting and speech and introduction" to "principal and only speech".

And with all respect for your own distinguished Secretary-General, we are all deeply disappointed that he is the only Secretary-General present.

We all regret that the Secretary-General of the United Nations cannot be with us. Like many of you, I have been privileged to meet with him in the past—and two of his special qualities have particularly struck me: his independence of spirit, and his deep religious feeling.

U Thant has repeatedly demonstrated his belief in upholding the integrity of his position and has steadfastly refused to permit the undermining of his office. His deep spiritual dedication to international understanding and world peace is an inspiration to all our efforts.

It is also a disappointment that all of the delegations originally expected to attend this Congress are not here.

This Congress—in its diversity, its professionalism, and its interchange—is a symbol of hope and encouragement in a world which seeks greater understanding among all peoples in a period of change and danger.

What we all seek is a progressive, interdependent world—a dynamic, pluralistic, open world of peace and freedom, in which each nation can develop to its full potential.

The achievement of such a world depends, in part, upon three factors: (1) improved communication and understanding; (2) development of a greater degree of self-competence and self-reliance on the part of many of the less privileged nations; and (3) wise and restrained assistance by the stronger, richer nations.

You are working to improve communication and understanding. And perhaps the greatest gulf in this respect today is the gulf between East and West—between the nations of Asia and the Occidental countries.

We in the West must admit to our share of the blame for a cultural gap influenced not only by historic forces but also by our own preoccupation with our own society and our own wants. Despite our enormous industrial and technological development, and despite our rich experience in self-government, we still lack the full reward that flows from sufficient understanding of other cultures and longer histories.

We must build up bridges of common identity and mutual interest.

Your work as members of this Congress is ultimately directed toward that end. Both East and West can benefit profoundly from your scholarship and the respect and cooperation you give to one another in your efforts.

Central to any lasting progress in a pluralistic world is the principle of self-reliance, self-determination, and self-competence. For nations and peoples can only realize their full potential, their full capacity, by the application of their own efforts.

Every nation must work out its own destiny in its own way. To put it generally but relevantly, Asians must work out Asian solutions to Asian problems.

This is not to say that nations from various parts of the world should not help each other. They must—but with wisdom and restraint.

The stronger nations must be neither presumptuous nor pre-emptive. They must guard against suffocating the initiative of others or stifling those unique qualities which fashion and sustain an individual hu-

man being, or society, or culture, and make it great.

Even my own country—acting largely out of generosity and idealistic intent, sometimes out of inexperience or ignorance, sometimes out of the presumption of its own great strength and affluence—tends too often to conduct its foreign activities in a manner that suggests that the United States can do the job for other nations—that we know the best way—that we have all the answers.

I believe that this is a serious mistake for any nation. I believe that the United States in its policies and programs must stress the goal of encouraging the other fellow to stand on his own feet and make his own decisions. We must improve our capacity to offer assistance with proper respect for other nation's experience, traditions, special problems and special opportunities.

These factors of communication, self-reliance, and enlightened assistance can be applied to many aspects of East-West relations.

Many crucial developments across the huge expanses of Asia command the world's attention. The continuing struggle to establish stable relationships and mutual progress in the Middle East is just one current example. But nothing so dominates any consideration of Asia as the fact of Communist China.

This vast land of 700 million people challenges our ability to establish a peaceful, progressive, open world community. Its isolation and belligerence resist communication and understanding. Its internal social, political and economic difficulties hinder its self-development. Its involvement in the third world has been meddlesome and disruptive.

And I believe all of us—professionals, concerned citizens, and political leaders—must grapple with one crucial question: what can be done to encourage this troubled giant to make a constructive contribution to Asian stability and progress and to world peace?

A small but important facet of this problem is the question of Communist Chinese membership in the United Nations. Without addressing overall U.S. policy toward Communist China or toward the United Nations, I do want to make some brief remarks on this point.

Many of you are experts on this subject. Some of you from Washington have served diligently in developing the U.S. government position. But you may be interested in some observations from an individual American citizen.

Year after year, the knotty question of admitting Communist China to the United Nations plagues the General Assembly. Year after year, political jockeying and parliamentary maneuvering expend large amounts of time and energy.

Since the voting began in 1950, the threat of Nationalist China losing the seat it occupies as one of the principal founders of the United Nations has been linked with consideration of the admission of the Communist Chinese. The reaction of the United States has been to work very hard indeed not only to preserve the position of our friends, the Republic of China, but to keep the People's Republic of China out of the United Nations.

The General Assembly has repeatedly denied membership to Communist China and upheld the rights of the Nationalist Chinese. But the problem remains, generating more animosity and recrimination. In each session, the outcome is in doubt. Each year, Communist China's admission looms as a major prospect.

The voting trends are interesting and instructive.

In 1950, a resolution to seat the People's Republic of China was defeated 16 votes for to 32 votes against, with 10 abstentions; and a resolution to unseat the Republic of China was defeated 10 to 38, with eight abstentions.

From 1951 through 1960, the U.S.-sponsored moratorium on consideration of changes in Chinese representation in the United Nations prevailed.

In 1961, the resolution was adopted which made any proposal to change the representation of China an "important question" requiring a two-thirds majority for approval. That year the Soviet Union's resolution to replace the Nationalist Chinese with the Communist Chinese was defeated with 37 votes for, 48 votes against, and 19 abstentions.

By 1965, the "important question" procedure was adopted by a substantially reduced margin from its original passage—and the Albanian resolution to oust the Republic of China and seat the People's Republic of China ended in a tie, 47 to 47, with twenty abstentions. This represented a major erosion of strength over the years away from the Republic of China and in favor of the Communist Chinese.

Last year this trend was slightly changed. The vote on the "important question" requirement gained support, and the Albanian resolution was defeated 46 to 57 to 17.

This shift was due to many factors, most of which relate to Communist China itself—her belligerence and encouragement of violent revolution abroad, involvement in the Vietnam war, snubbing the test ban treaty and developing a nuclear bomb, and the uncertainty and turmoil of the so-called "cultural revolution".

And this behavior is added to Communist China's earlier record of U.N.-condemned aggression in Korea, the use of force to subdue Tibet, the overrunning of India's frontiers, attempts to gain control of the Offshore Islands in the Formosa Strait, and subversion in widely-scattered areas including Indonesia and Africa.

Further, Communist China has criticized and abused the United Nations, rejected its authority, and threatened to set up its own competitive international organization. In late 1965, Foreign Minister Chen Yi set forth his own list of conditions for Communist China's entry into the United Nations.

He demanded that the United Nations rescind its condemnation of his country for aggression in Korea and instead brand the United States as the aggressor. He demanded that the United Nations be re-shaped along lines favoring Communist China, drastically reducing the rights of what he calls the imperialistic Western nations. He demanded the expulsion of member states which he considers enemy puppets. And he demanded that the United Nations not only expel Nationalist China but abandon her to the mainland Communists, who would have a free hand to take over the people and territory of Taiwan.

This record makes several things clear.

First, it is clear why advocacy of U.N. membership for Communist China has recently lost some of its momentum.

Second, it is clear that—apart from the policies of the United Nations and individual countries toward Communist China—Peking seems intent on self-isolation from the rest of the world.

Third, it is clear that the People's Republic of China is now precluded from membership by its own behavior. She is not yet ready to take on the responsibilities of fostering peace and progress which participation in the United Nations should entail.

The United Nations Charter provides that membership is open to "peaceloving" states which, in the judgment of the organization itself, accept the obligations of the Charter and are able and willing to carry them out. This is so even though some nations now within the U.N. may not seem to be deserving of membership according to these standards.

Despite all these considerations, it is my view that the trend toward Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations will tenaciously reassert itself—if not at the upcoming session of the General Assembly, soon thereafter. The danger we face is that Communist China will be invited to join as a substitute for an ousted Nationalist China.

I believe that persistent U.S. throttling and lapel-yanking of our United Nations colleagues to maintain the same rigid position on this issue will be self-defeating in the long run. I am convinced that this practice actually weakens Nationalist China's position in the United Nations. And it does nothing to further our own true interests, to strengthen the cause of the United Nations, and to foster peace around the world.

Given this situation, we must be sure that we have our own priorities in order—and that we do not become fixed to a policy which is unrealistic and dangerous to our own best interests.

It would be in the common interest for mainland China to enter into the community of nations and accept the responsibilities which that entails. The possibility of such a change may appear remote—but we should spare no reasonable effort to encourage it.

In this spirit, let me suggest that the United States, instead of concentrating on the negative—on keeping the Chinese Communists out of the United Nations—should stress the positive, by placing its emphasis upon three principles:

First, unyielding support of continued U.N. membership for Nationalist China.

Second, strong international encouragement of Communist China to end her self-isolation from the world, and to qualify herself for full participation in the community of nations.

Third, clear recognition that Communist China must accept the responsibilities of membership in a spirit consistent with the principles of the Charter before admission.

The United States showed encouraging signs of moving toward the priorities and the approach I am suggesting, in backing an Italian-sponsored resolution during the general session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1966.

This resolution would have appointed a special committee to investigate Communist China's position concerning United Nations membership and to recommend an "equitable and practical solution" to the Assembly by July of this year. Our representative properly made clear that his vote in favor of the resolution in no way repudiated U.S. commitments to Nationalist China.

It is my hope that Communist China's current unpopularity, and the apprehension which her behavior is arousing in the world—combined with the slightly favorable trend in last year's voting—will not encourage the United States to return to its earlier inflexible approach. This would be unrealistic and contrary to our own interest—particularly given the forces which are at work, not all of which are clear on the surface.

For other plans are afoot to bring Communist China into the world body prematurely and without adequate protection to Nationalist China. We cannot rely wholly on the protection of the two-thirds vote under the "important question" device, since that procedure itself is determined by a simple majority.

Many of our supporters are going along only reluctantly with our position. Some of our principal allies have already left us on this issue. For example, Britain, France, Denmark and Norway voted for the Albanian resolution in 1965 and 1966.

We must not drain our prestige, endanger American leadership on other issues, or jeopardize Nationalist China's seat in the United Nations.

I hope that the hint of flexibility shown by the United States at the last General

Assembly session will be reinforced in the future.

The American people may well be ahead of their government in this regard.

In November of 1953, a National Opinion Research Corporation survey showed 74 percent opposed to the admission of Communist China into the United Nations, with only 12 percent favorable.

The Survey Research Center, of this University, conducted a poll in May and June of 1964 which asked the question: "Suppose the President suggested that we let Communist China join the United Nations?" Thirty-one percent favored such a move, while 53 percent opposed.

A Gallup poll in October, 1966, revealed that 55 percent favored the admission of Communist China to the United Nations,—"if it would improve U.S.-Chinese Communist relations"—with 30 percent against.

These are not the same polls, and the questions and samples are different. But a trend is emerging. Americans seem to be more and more willing to have their government explore ways of communicating with a land of 700 million people, to help reduce Communist China's isolation.

I have said for some time that I think we ought to do everything we can to help the Communist Chinese reach the point where they will deserve and desire membership in the United Nations. We must not erect useless and arbitrary barriers to Communist China's normal participation in world affairs. We must seek to remove any false apprehensions the mainland Chinese may hold about U.S. motives in Asia.

But ultimately the responsibilty is Communist China's. She must make the decision. That decision may be a long way off—but the future is never entirely clear, and no one knows what will come out of the present turmoil in Communist China.

A China which remains isolated is negative and destructive and dangerous to all, even to herself. A peaceful, stable mainland China could make an immense positive contribution within a diverse and dynamic world of mutual security.

The United States and the United Nations must be prepared for the day when those who govern mainland China feel it is in their interest to accept the responsibilities and receive the benefits of close collaboration within the community of nations. When they are willing to step forward we must be ready to accept them. While they are unwilling we must be unmistakably firm.

Bringing 700 million Chinese into the international community is a great challenge. If they are to support rather than disrupt the peace of the world, they must become more intimately involved with the world at large.

For the day has long since passed when the East could either be ignored or exploited by the West. The stability and health of Asia affects the stability and health of the whole world. And Western attitudes and actions have a vital impact on the future course of Asian history.

As we move forward in a critical and uncertain period of history, we must act with energy, with vision, and with prudence to build the dynamic world of peace and progress that we all desire.

And in that joint endeavor, I am heartened by the knowledge that the men and women in this room will be committed not to isolation, but communication—not to reaction, but enlightenment—not to prejudice, but understanding.

REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE REPORT: REVITALIZING OUR RURAL AREAS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to have served on the Republican Task Force for Job Opportunities and Welfare and to have helped draft an important report, released last week, dealing with the revitalizing of our country's rural areas. The subject is of particular interest to me, as a Representative from West Virginia, one of only three States which has suffered population losses during the past 3 years.

West Virginia is not a State of great urban centers nor is it included in the three great megapolis projected for the future in the Eastern United States.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this report is emphasized in realizing the new role rural America must play in solving today's complex social and economic problems. The redevelopment of the rural areas could well be the eventual salvation of our troubled urban communities.

The tragedies of this summer in some of our Nation's greatest cities is being traced to the influx of population that heightened the ghetto problems. In 10 years while rural areas of America were experiencing a decline, urban America gained 28 million people. Between 1950 and the present, my own State has lost 200,000 people. Such a shift created situations that demanded immediate attention. But we have tended to overlook the very areas wherein an obvious solution may lie.

Mr. Speaker, this report, though not attempting to answer all of the problems, does present specific proposals in five vital fields which combined into an action plan, will furnish an immediate program for the solution of some of these pressing problems. From this report, I believe the Congress can furnish the tools for revitalizing rural America, and at the same time, furnish a partial solution to many of our urban complaints by reversing the trend of urban migration.

I have labored long and hard for the rebirth of the rural areas in the firm belief that herein lies the answer to many of the Nation's social and economic ills. I have witnessed in my own State the tragedy of outward migration dictated often by economic necessity. By 1980, West Virginia will stand alone as the only State with a continued projected loss of her greatest resource. I have advocated incentive programs that would relocate, and diversify industry at the base of our natural resources, which ironically in my own State have become pockets of poverty.

Renewal of Rural America with better education, industrial development and extensive social services could be most beneficial in the answers we seek.

I am hopeful of congressional consideration of this much needed program for rural America. I would submit this policy statement in its entirety for publication in the RECORD as well as an enlightened editorial commment from the Washington Post of August 24, 1967, which brings deserving recognition to this most important program of rural renaissance:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 26, 1967]

URBAN-RURAL IMBALANCE

Both the major parties are now seeking a better balance between urban and rural population. Last week the Republican Coordinating Committee, composed of the top leaders of the GOP, came out for a five-point effort to revitalize rural areas. Its statement follows a very similar warning by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman that the rush of peopeople into overcrowded central cities is creating a grave imbalance.

The main burden of the Republican complaint is that little has been done to create job opportunities, in the rural areas, for people who have been displaced by the agricultural revolution. Two decades ago 18 per cent of our people were required to produce food and fiber. Now the same tasks are performed by 6 per cent of the population, and most of the workers no longer useful on the farm have flocked into big cities where some of them are very poorly prepared to cope with the problems of urban life.

The cost of this brain and brawn drain from the countryside is enormous. Most of the migrants leave in their teens and early twenties, at the beginning of their productive years, after heavy investments have been made in their upbringing and education. Don Paarlberg, chairman of the Coordinating Committee's Task Force on Job Opportunities, estimates that "this human investment is a contribution from the rural areas that runs about $12 billion a year, several times the total of all subsidies to agriculture."

Rural America is in no position to make such a contribution to the economic prosperity of the remainder of the country. The disadvantaged position of the rural areas stands out in every test that is made. The President's manpower report of 1967 shows a farm unemployment rate last year of 6.5 per cent compared to the 3.4 per cent urban rate. The farm population has 33.1 per cent of its families below the poverty level compared to 14.4 for urban families. Schooling for farm youths averaged 8.7 years compared to 12.2 years in the cities. These figures doubtless explain a very large part of the "urban crush" which has created such grave problems for the big cities.

No progress toward righting the urban-rural imbalance can be expected until these inequalities are corrected. Families who wish to live in the country should at least have job opportunities, health and education services and some of the amenities of life that are available to urban residents. Nothing can be said for policies which tend to drive people into congested and smog-bound ghettos for want of equal public services and economic opportunities in a more congenial environment.

The GOP policy-makers call for more educational aid, vocational training, economic incentives for the establishment of rural industries and the channeling of defense and supply contracts into such areas when feasible. One specific recommendation is aimed at great expansion of the Economic Development Administration which seeks to utilize local resources and provide part- or full-time employment in rural communities. Another aim is to give rural workers employment services equal to those provided in the cities.

Much remains to be done by way of shaping programs and policies, but the objective is highly commendable. The forecast that 80 per cent of our people will live in "five super strip-cities" by the year 2000 is frightening to everyone concerned. Reversal of that trend has become one of our urgent national necessities.

REVITALIZING OUR RURAL AREAS

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey . . ." was written of the English countryside nearly 200 years ago. But it might be written of rural America today.

Our rural areas are being depleted of people. From 1950 to 1960 the rural population—farm plus non-farm—declined by 400,000; the urban population increased by 28 million. These trends have continued. The Department of Agriculture anticipates further out-migration to the year 1970.

About one-fourth of the rural population consists of farm people. The others are part of the rural non-farm population, living in the countryside or in small villages. Since 1960 the farm population has been declining at an annual rate of about 6 percent, an accelerated pace.

Most of those who migrate from the rural areas leave in their teens and twenties, when on the verge of their productive years. They carry with them the investment in their upbringing and education. Conservatively estimated at $15,000 per person, this human investment is a contribution from the rural areas that runs about $12 billion a year, several times the total of all subsidies provided to agriculture.

What becomes of these people? They move into our great cities. Without necessarily desiring it and almost by default, we are becoming an urban society. Seventy percent of our people now cluster in cities that cover one percent of our land area. If present trends continue unchecked, by the year 2000, 80 percent of our people will be living in metropolitan areas and most of them will be crammed into five super strip-cities.

And will these be alabaster cities, gleaming, "undimmed by human tears"? Not likely. The migrants concentrate, unassimilated, in Detroit, in Cleveland, in the South Side of Chicago, in Watts, in Harlem, in Indianapolis and in a hundred other cities. Smog, congestion, water pollution, law enforcement and other problems of the megalopolis beset them and their uneasy neighbors. By generating a kind of "urban crush," they create a problem in the cities to which they go. By depopulating the countryside, they create a problem in the rural areas from which they come.

But move they must, if there are no nearby jobs.

And why are there so few jobs in the rural areas?

For several important reasons.

First, because of the agricultural revolution. The mechanization of agriculture has so multiplied the productivity of human beings that the production of our food and fiber is now accomplished by 6 percent of our population, as compared with about 18 percent only two decades ago. There simply are not as many farm jobs as there were. These revolutionary changes have by no means run their course. The Department of Agriculture says that from 1965 to 1980 farm employment will experience an additional decline of more than one-third.

Second, because imagination has been lacking. Little has been done to create job oppportunities, in the rural areas, for people forced out of agriculture. Rural people do very well at off-farm jobs if the jobs are there and if they have the necessary education. They have manual dexterity and they know how to work. They do not want to live on a dole. If off-farm jobs are available within driving distance, they continue to live in their accustomed surroundings, among their friends and families, benefiting from increased incomes, providing education for their children and utilizing the services of the local community. But without such jobs they must go on relief or move to the city.

Seemingly, almost everything has conspired to prevent the creation of jobs in rural areas:

Federal farm programs have cut our cotton crop to 10 million acres, compared with 43 million acres before the programs began. Tobacco acreage is now only half as great as 35 years ago.

Local communities have not provided the services and utilities needed to attract industry.

Wage policies have discouraged industry from expanding into areas of abundant labor.

Industry, which has been urban-minded, has not sufficiently sought to decentralize.

The rural labor force lacks the federal employment services available to urban workers.

Educational policies have discriminated against the poorer areas. For example, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides more than twice as much help per pupil to the counties ranking *highest* on the index of rural well-being as it does to those ranking *lowest* ($350 as against $157.). (Manpower Report of the President, April 1967, page 116.)

Farm programs, largely designed by the Democratic party, have continually sought parity of prices as an objective, when they should have sought parity of opportunity. For more than 30 years these programs have been commodity-oriented, when they should have been people-oriented.

The following statistics vividly describe the disadvantaged position of rural areas. All are taken from the President's Manpower Report of 1967:

	Farm	Urban
Unemployment rate, 1966, percent	6.5	3.4
Percent of population below $3,000 income per family, 1965	33.1	14.4
Median years of schooling, male, 1966	8.7	12.2
Percent of people with activity limitations because of health, 1963–65	6.4	4.7

These things need not be so.

It has been fashionable to point critically at the hardships which resulted from the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century and to find fault with those who could have alleviated these difficulties.

Now, in the twentieth century, we confront an Agricultural Revolution which creates problems and opportunities in some ways similar to those of the Industrial Revolution. There is no reason to accept, unquestioned, the social and economic consequences of this Revolution. Conscious efforts should be made to determine and assert the public interest.

The American people want some balance between the rural and the urban sectors. There should be some opportunity for those who wish to live in the country to find decent work there, to have access to reasonably good education and health services, and to pursue a way of living that gives diversity and balance to our economy.

What the American people really want and will work for, they can have. We are not the helpless objects of blind economic forces, we are capable of helping to shape the institutions which in turn help shape us.

These things can and should be done:

(1) *Locate more of our new factories in rural areas.*—This can be done by local, state and national tax policies to provide realistic economic incentives. It can be done by providing better roads, better schools, and better public utilities in the rural areas. Factories may now be operated successfully in areas where this was formerly not possible. At an earlier time, when transportation was poor and the emphasis was on heavy industry, a factory had to be close to its raw materials or to its markets. This is far less true today. The Federal-Interstate Highway Program, established by a Republican Administration, has greatly facilitated transportation. For some industries a plant can now be established almost wherever a trained labor supply and the necessary supporting services are available.

(2) *Provide better education for rural people.*—This means better education of all kinds, at all levels: elementary, secondary and advanced; vocational, technical and academic; continuing education for adults, apprenticeship, retraining and all the rest. It means on-the-job training as proposed in the previous Job Opportunities Task Force report entitled "The Human Investment," and it means Technical Education for the Future, also previously recommended by this Task Force. It means equal educational opportunities for the nonwhites, who comprise about one-fourth of the rural poor. Education is a great adjuster; people who are making great changes are in greater-than-ordinary need for it. Rural young people move freely across state and county lines. The sharing of the cost of education on a national basis is appropriate in view of the fact that we are concerned here with a national problem. The need is greatest where the taxable wealth is most scarce.

What is here proposed is not a blueprint for the economy, with a certain calculated number of people on farms or a carefully computed balance between rural and urban areas. Rather, we propose to redress the imbalance in education and opportunity which has worked to the disadvantage of the rural areas and threatens to make us almost totally urban.

To undertake the actions here offered does not introduce a rural bias; rather, it would remove an urban bias, largely unintended, that has been allowed to develop. We propose to provide the equality of opportunity which will give our people a chance to develop the kind of society they want. If this is done, we can safely leave with the people themselves the decision as to the balance between rural and urban living.

This is not a new idea. It was first proposed by President Eisenhower in his Special Message on Agriculture of January 11, 1954. In 1956, a Republican Administration launched the Rural Development Program, the first coordinated assault on this problem.

In attempting to find possible solutions to these root problems, Republicans realize there is no panacea. There is no one-shot, sure-fire, cure-all solution to rural unemployment, underemployment, and general rural underdevelopment. There are, however, a variety of programs, policies, and procedures that singly and in combination can help to mitigate the consequences of this rural stagnation. What is required is a multi-pronged attack on the numerous ills that beset our rural areas. The recommendations here offered are in keeping with the Rural Development Program launched under President Eisenhower's pioneering effort in 1956.

SPECIFIC PROPOSALS TO IMPLEMENT THE TASK FORCE PAPER

1. Encourage state and federal legislation which would identify rural areas in which unemployment and underemployment are critical problems and give these areas preference:

a. In educational assistance, including various vocational training programs.

b. By providing economic incentives to industrial firms that establish new plants in these areas.

c. By contracting in these areas for the manufacture of defense materials and other government supplies and by building new government installations therein when feasible.

2. Push for enactment of Rural Community Action Programs under Title V of the Republican-sponsored "Opportunity Crusade Act of 1967," H.R. 10682.

3. Push the work of the Economic Development Administration in rural areas of low income.

4. Change the focus of the Vocational Ed-

ucation Act of 1963 so as to increase the number of area vocational-technical schools in rural areas.

5. Provide the rural areas with the same kind of employment services as are offered to urban workers.

TABLE 1.—POPULATION IN URBAN AND RURAL TERRITORY 1790–1960 (IN THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE)

Year	Rural	Urban	Percent urban
1790	3,727	201	5.1
1800	4,986	322	6.1
1810	6,714	525	7.25
1820	8,945	693	7.19
1830	11,738	1,127	8.76
1840	15,224	1,845	10.81
1850	19,648	3,543	15.28
1860	25,226	6,216	19.77
1870	28,656	9,902	25.68
1880	36,026	14,129	28.17
1890	40,841	22,106	35.12
1900	45,834	30,159	39.69
1910	49,973	41,998	45.66
1920	51,552	54,157	51.23
1930	53,820	68,954	56.16
1940	57,246	74,424	56.52
1950	[1] 54,230	[1] 96,468	64.01
1960	[1] 54,054	[1] 125,269	69.86

[1] New urban definition.

Source: Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957, p. 14; and Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1965, p. 15.

MISLED PUBLIC OPINION: ANSWERS FOR THE PRESIDENT

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a citizen of Illinois has answered the questions posed by President Johnson during his announcement of the Commission on Civil Disorders: What happened? Why did it happen? And what can be done to prevent it from happening again? This answer to the President comes in the form of a letter which was addressed to the White House.

I believe it has the answers. Or, at the least, the beginnings of them. It is a quiet, yet passionate appeal to turn away from the policies which have failed, and courageously institute policies which will succeed. Letter writer John T. McCarty makes an excellent case for the fact that "misled public opinion" is the "central problem which exists in America today."

Pointedly, Mr. McCarty writes:

I don't think you or I or anyone should waste time seeking to blame someone for these riots in our cities. I believe the answer lies in the phrase "mea culpa."

The letter follows:

ROCKFORD, ILL.,
August 1, 1967.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States of America,
White House, Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Page one of the July 30 New York Times announces your new Commission on Civil Disorders and quotes you as asking three questions: (1) "What happened?" (2) "Why did it happen?" and (3) "What can be done to prevent it from happening again and again?" Ironically, the adjoining news story announces that New York "City's Welfare Roll Soars Despite Jobless Rate Dip." I think both stories are related to the central problem which exists in America today, namely "missed public opinion."

I am writing my three answers to your questions primarily because of the pictures in the newspapers and on TV with you and your new grandson. For the sake of him as well as the other children in this country plus their confused parents and grandparents, I hope you will consider reading these answers and sending me your reply. I don't think you or I or anyone should waste time seeking to blame someone for these riots in our cities. I believe the answer lies in the phrase *mea culpa.*

I believe misled public opinion is the answer to your three vital questions. Here's why. Almost two years ago, on August 3, 1965, you made a speech on the south lawn of the White House, among other things, you said:

". . . Free speech, free press, free religion, the right of free assembly, yes, the right of petition, the right to buy ads and to have teach-ins and sit-ins and parades and marches and demonstrations—well they're still radical ideas. And so are secret ballots and so are free elections, and so is the principle of equal dignity . . .

"I hope that you . . . will go out into the hinterland and rouse the masses and blow the bugles and tell them that the hour has arrived and their day is here; that we are on the march against the ancient enemies and we are going to be successful."

I honestly believe many people in the cities accepted your statement as a reason to riot. The late Adlai Stevenson said many times something to the effect that a jail sentence on behalf of what one believed in would be a badge of courage for those who took every measure to satisfy their wants. Martin Luther King is one of many Negro officials who has urged his following to violate any law that they do not like. Mr. President, I think the answer to your first question "What happened?" was that thousands of people in our bigger cities decided to follow the bad advice of you and other officials in Negro organizations as well as the bad leadership of too many political officials in both parties.

Misled public opinion is the No. 1 problem of our country because the representatives of the news media are too often substituting their personal solutions for the economic, social, and political problems of our time. They are trained as reporters but too many of them fail to report the facts and, instead, transfer their credentials as a reporter into making themselves experts on economic, social and political issues which, of course, they are not. A recent example of this is the two editorials in the July 30 New York Times. This paper consistently wins my prize for creating "misled public opinion."

This gets complicated when the politicians see minority groups as their best insurance for perpetuating themselves in office by promising these groups more and more. Thus, misled public opinion leads to a gullibility that exists among too many of our citizens. This gullibility enables politicians to get away with political solutions to economic and social problems. It is my hope that you who have all the money that you could possibly use, you who have attained all the power and glory that any one man could wish for, would in this time of crisis, refuse to give any more political solutions to the economic, social, and moral problems that exist in America today.

Your second question "Why did it happen?" should be obvious. In 1960 the late President Kennedy unveiled his "New Frontier" philosophy which in effect said that every American citizen was entitled to food, housing, clothing, education, jobs, and recreation, etc. You came along and unveiled your "Great Society" which went several steps further and implied that each person in the world was entitled to all of these values at the expense of the United States. Please remember the lengthy debate before the Civil Rights Bill was signed in 1964. Sen. Barry Goldwater and Sen. Smith were the two senators who voted against this bill saying that this law would *not* solve the problem of the Negroes and, in fact, would leave them expecting more than they were going to get. This was the political solution to the social problem of civil rights. The Supreme Court's famous decision of 1954 again led too many Negroes to the false hopes that immediately they would receive all the things President Kennedy and you promised them. And so, I say the answer to the second question, "Why did it happen?" is this: too many Negroes living in squalid conditions of our cities decided that they had waited long enough for the things promised by you and other officials and that they were going to get these things they wanted right now, even if they had to *break store windows* to get them!

Your third question is "What can be done to prevent it from happening again and again?" First, let's remember that poor people have come to America from all the countries of the world. You came from a poor family. Many of the prominent people of today came from poor families. Some of them were brought up from the slums of New York, Chicago, Newark, Detroit—the very same cities where the riots took place. Most of the poor people of the past had mothers and fathers that demanded respect for the law, respect for the country, respect for a church, and most of all, respect for themselves. This country is filled with examples of how immigrant parents and grandparents scrimped and saved to enable their children and grandchildren to get an education which would permit them to move from the slums and take their place in the mainstream of America. Poverty existed, slums existed, but the key ingredient is that respect for law and order also existed.

I would hope that you would review the history of "urban renewal" so that you could understand and help others to understand that this estimated $20 billion has failed to solve the problems in the cities of America. I would wish that you would read again the news story describing the welfare problem in New York City which states that 665,621 people are receiving more than a billion dollars in welfare in New York City. I wish you would think about the current welfare objectives and policies in America today which, in effect, subsidizes illegitimate children by instilling the incentive plan which allows more money for the mother for each illegitimate child she brings into the world. You are aware that the largest amount of money spent on welfare is aid to the dependent children which means that our laws will pay to dependent children only when the mother can prove that there is no father available to support her children. I repeat, you and I and all citizens are responsible for subsidizing illegitimate children and for insisting that the father be absent from the home in order for the mother to collect additional benefits. I submit this is in direct confrontation with what I said earlier; namely that the history of this country could be measured by the sacrifices of fathers and mothers, by grandmothers and grandfathers, to instill value judgments in their children. When you realize that the safest place in New York City or San Francisco is Chinatown, then you cannot overlook the importance of a society that insists upon mother and father being held accountable for their children. I suggest that you examine the relief rolls of the major cities in this country and you will find very little, if any, Chinese. This is because they have a strong sense of family responsibility.

And so, Mr. President, in order to help you answer your third and most important

question, "What can be done to prevent it from happening again and again?" I suggest that you *not* listen to the mayors, the governors, and the members of Congress, and your own aides who are promoting more massive doses of Federal aid. Newark, N.J., probably receives more Federal aid than any other city of the U.S. with the exception of maybe Detroit. The current Mayor of Detroit probably worked harder for Negroes and the poor than any man in our time and was rewarded with more devastation than Newark had.

America and most of its citizens have enjoyed the good life because of our individual enterprise system of incentives, based upon risks, rewards, and responsibility. As a Harvard professor said recently in *Life* Magazine, "Businessmen and politicians must pay for their mistakes; the academic never does." I think you have to correct the central problem of misled public opinion by demanding that the "action-intellectuals" who leave the campuses for a more exciting life in Washington be held accountable for their actions. I think the mass media of this country should be severely criticized for playing up out of proportion the zealots and the quacks who would be laughed out of town if it were not for the widespread publicity and attention they get via TV and the newspapers.

Finally, Mr. President, it is quite obvious that you personally are in great political trouble for getting re-elected in 1968 primarily because of the War in Viet Nam and now because of the domestic riots in our cities. I did not vote for you and could tell all my friends who *did* how wrong you were, but you are still the President.

I suggest two things:

1. *Win the War in Viet Nam Now!* It is unthinkable that the same U.S. that destroyed Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo could be held to a stalemate in Viet Nam particularly with the hardware that we have now. For the sake of your new grandchild and other grandchildren in this world, why not announce to North Viet Nam that we are through trying to win a popularity contest and that we intend to bring peace to the world by winning this war immediately and will use nuclear weapons to do so because we value the life of a single American boy *more* than we value winning the world popularity contest. Ignore your advisers who tell you that Red China and/or Soviet Union will retaliate. The former *cannot* and you know that the latter *will not* risk the destruction of their key cities for the swamps of Viet Nam. In announcing your decision to win the war in Viet Nam immediately, you should also announce to all the peoples of this world that the people of the United States of America have contributed more than $100 billion to help the rest of the world since the end of World War II. It has *not* helped us in any lasting way and we are going to *stop* supporting the rest of the world and instead turn all of our capabilities to solving the problems here at home.

2. The second suggestion is to address both Houses of Congress and the nation at large on television in order to tell them of your first decision and, secondly, to announce your recommendation for solving the domestic problems at home all of which stem in my opinion from *misled public opinion*. You can tell the Congress and the people that you have come to the conclusion that giving away money overseas has *not* brought us any lasting friendships and that giving money away at home has *not* brought us respect, responsibility, and cooperation. Tell the Congress and the American people that you want to restore the American values of individual incentive, risks, rewards, and responsibility. Tell them that you are the first politician in recent time who is giving up the practice of offering political solutions t. economic, social and moral problems. Tell them that Americans should stop the current welfare practice of subsidizing illegitimate children and the equally damaging one of insisting that the father *not* live at home in order for the mother to collect aid for the dependent children. Tell the Congress and the American public that you sincerely believe that most American citizens would welcome as their neighbors decent, law-abiding Negroes. Most of us want Negroes and all other citizens to be economically free, to have jobs that will enable them to support themselves and their families, to *pay* taxes instead of accepting tax handouts. Tell the Negro officials and the Negro people that they must help themselves by censuring those in their ranks who advocate lawlessness, disrespect, and immorality.

Mr. President, this is a long letter but I sincerely want to help you find the answers to your three questions. As I listened to your recent TV speech announcing your decision to send Federal troops into Detroit, I detected that you were playing politics with a potential Republican nominee. I don't happen to believe that Romney would make a good president but I don't believe you should play politics this way. Although I live in Illinois, I happen to think your appointment of Gov. Kerner to head up your new Commission on Civil Disorders was pure politics in the old Noah's Ark concept of putting two of everything on board. Finally, you instructed the members of the new commission "to find the answers without regard to conventional wisdom." Here again, I believe you are wrong because we've gotten into trouble in our cities today precisely because we have ignored the conventional wisdom and are now accepting political solutions to economic and social problems. Do you think that the Negroes and the Puerto Ricans would leave their homes and come to New York, Chicago and other big cities if *they were not paid to live there* by politicians who care more about their vote than about principles?

I came to Illinois after working and living most of my life in New York City in a major industry in this country. I came to work at a small college in order to seek solutions to problems confronting the country today. I conclude that misled public opinion is the main problem. I hope you will read this letter instead of giving it to one of your aides who will suggest a political solution. I am sending a copy of this letter to my Congressman, John B. Anderson, and my Senator, Everett M. Dirksen, because I am proud to have them represent me.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. MCCARTY.

GUERRILLA POLITICS

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing much these days about the National Conference for New Politics—NCNP—which is beginning preconvention workshops and caucuses today. The Washington Star of August 29 ran an article entitled, "Plan by U.S. Reds To Run 'New Politics' Reported" which I insert at this point:

PLAN BY U.S. REDS TO RUN "NEW POLITICS" REPORTED

Government investigators have uncovered a Communist party plan to take over control of the National Conference for New Politics, a coalition of peace, civil rights and antipoverty figures, informed sources said today.

Communist organizations have instructed their workers to conduct an intensive effort to win control of the conference at its five-day convention which starts in Chicago Thursday, sources said.

The Communists have been told to become convention delegates, obtain positions on convention committees or other key organs, and keep their Communist party membership a secret.

The over-all plan, sources said, is for the Communists to use the conference as a third political party to replace the defunct Progressive Labor Party and control "New Politics."

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. is scheduled to give the keynote address at the conference, which might consider formation of a third party—running King and Dr. Benjamin Spock, the baby specialist-peace activist, in the 1968 presidential campaign. Reports from Chicago indicate, however, that a third-party move is doubtful.

Among leaders of the national conference are Spock; Julian Bond, the Georgia Negro legislator; Simon Cassidy, former California Democratic Council president, and Paul Booth, former president of the Students for a Democratic Society.

The leadership also includes Stokely Carmichael, the black power advocate; the Rev. William Sloane Coffin Jr., chaplain of Yale University, and Warren Hinckle III, editor of Ramparts Magazine.

These leaders hope to unite a wide coalition of members of the peace and freedom movement ranging from black nationalists to peace activists and use the coalition to split and pressure the two major political parties.

The Communist party plans to infiltrate the conference were mapped at a meeting of the Reds' national committee in New York in June, according to federal security investigators.

After the meeting, party public relations director Arnold Johnson sent out letters to all party segments reporting that leaders wanted "immediate attention" given the convention, sources said.

Communist leaders have been issuing "word of mouth" instructions to members for several weeks, investigators said, instructing them to "attend the convention, become a delegate, obtain key positions on steering committees or convention commissions. Above all, do not allow your Communist membership to become known."

The party leadership hopes that through infiltration, it can intensify the convention's expected demands for U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam, support for militant civil rights elements connected with city riots, and the initiation of a third party presidential ticket, sources said.

Government sources said the planned activity of the party was in line with information investigators received earlier this year that the Communists were ready to move out into an independent political venture connected with the peace and civil rights movements.

A comprehensive treatment of the NCNP appeared in Barron's, the business and financial weekly on August 28 and written by Alice Widener, the nationally syndicated columnist and publisher of the biweekly U.S.A. This excellent coverage of the nature of the NCNP should be well digested by those who are committed to preserving our Nation, its basic freedoms, rights and responsibilities. At this point I request that excerpts from the article "Guerrilla Politics: Old or New, the Left Aims To Destroy the Free Society," by Alice Widener be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GUERRILLA POLITICS: OLD OR NEW, THE LEFT AIMS TO DESTROY THE FREE SOCIETY

(By Alice Widener, nationally syndicated columnist and publisher of the bi-weekly U.S.A.)

A presentable young man in a hurry, with shining corn-silk hair worn long enough to be in with the radical ins, but not too long for the middle-class outs, stood on center stage at McMillin Theatre, Columbia University, on Thursday evening, August 17, 1967. Impeccably dressed in a rust-colored sports jacket, white shirt, black tie and dark slacks, he surveyed the small, hastily assembled audience of leftists and told them in a well modulated but decisive tone that the old society in America is dead, that the Democratic and Republican parties are bankrupt, and that a new radical society must be created by New Politics. "The only thing that matters," he said, "is how to do it. It must happen."

The young man was William F. Pepper, executive director of the National Conference for New Politics (NCNP). Mr. Pepper was in a hurry to organize a local chapter of New Politics, empowered to send delegates to the first national convention of NCNP, which will be held at the Palmer House in Chicago over Labor Day weekend. Pre-convention workshops and caucuses will take place on August 29–31. Dr. Martin Luther King will be keynote speaker at the convention rally, August 31, at the Chicago Coliseum, under the slogan "1968 and Beyond."

More than two thousand delegates, representing approximately 330 leftist, youth, and "peace" organizations, are scheduled to take part. Most are said to favor the organization of a nationwide third party to run Dr. King and Dr. Benjamin Spock, the famous pediatrician, as New Politics candidates for President and Vice President of the U.S. in 1968. It is unlikely, however, that the NCNP will formally announce a King-Spock ticket at the forthcoming convention, because the Communist Party, U.S.A. opposes a premature decision prior to the Republican and Democratic conventions next summer. Arnold Johnson, public relations director of the Communist Party, has been working closely with the NCNP convention steering committee in Chicago, where he conferred last month with Michael Wood, official convention coordinator.

As William F. Pepper made clear in his speech at McMillin Theatre, the Chicago convention probably will decide to confine New Politics activities mostly to local and state areas. However, some regional independence among radicals will be permitted, and "it is possible the group at Berkeley, if they want to, will work now for a King-Spock candidacy." Mr. Pepper explained that New Politics is a two-pronged operation, which is "issues-oriented and action-oriented." He said there are only three things that count in professional politics—"money, power and numbers."

The National Conference for New Politics is the brainchild—said Pepper—of "a small group of academicians and theorists who met on the West Coast in the summer of 1965." They were aided and abetted "by a fund that performs large services as a bank, a funding operation by a fund longtime established."

To a student of New Politics, Pepper's deliberate failure to name names failed to deceive. A year ago, The Houston Post carried an article, "New Political Force Rising Across U.S.," by Paul White, who reported from New York City: "In less than a year, the NCNP has become the rallying point for pacifists, campus radicals, leftwing crusaders, social theorists and Reform Democrats. . . . To found the National Conference, (Julian) Bond, (Simon) Casady, Stokely Carmichael of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (Snick) and a host of militants assembled last August at the Santa Barbara, Calif., facilities of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions." The left wing center at Santa Barbara is the sole institution supported by the tax-exempt Fund for the Republic, which was created in 1954 by a $15 million grant from the Ford Foundation.

Mr. Pepper continued his recital of NCNP history by saying that the activities of the group which created New Politics on the West Coast were subsequently "transferred to the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C." The first nationwide organizational meeting was held in McCormick Place in Chicago on January 15, 1966, under the auspices of the radical leftist Committee for Independent Political Action (CIPA). At that time (Barron's, January 31, 1966), Co-Chairman Dick Gregory sounded the keynote, with the statement: "If Watts was wrong, we'd better go burn all the American history books." Mr. Gregory is now a member of the NCNP executive board.

Mr. Pepper told his audience: "The National Conference for New Politics is non-exclusive." It certainly is. Stokely Carmichael, for example, is a member of its national council and executive board. On the same day as Mr. Pepper was organizing the National Conference for New Politics' New York chapter, his fellow board member, Mr. Carmichael, was broadcasting a call over Havana Radio in Cuba for "total revolution in the United States." What Mr. Pepper really meant by "non-exclusive" is that NCNP is willing to admit to its membership or executive leadership any member of the Communist Party or of other revolutionary groups, such as the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), directed by Robert Williams from Cuba, and the New Breed, mysterious militant Negro group in Chicago.

In 1968 and beyond, Mr. Pepper continued, NCNP expects "to play the numbers game" by seeking voting support for its activities and local candidates from "the grass roots numbers of the minorities and the poor, and the middle-class peace groups and their supporters." This is undoubtedly true. Robert Schwartz, national board member of the Committee for Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE), was on the theater stage with Pepper and handled the parliamentary procedure for setting up the New York NCNP chapter.

There will be a move at the Chicago convention over Labor Day weekend to expel Stokely Carmichael from the executive board, not because of his revolutionary views, which are close to those held by several top NCNP people, but because of a recent pamphlet issued by Carmichael's own organization, "Snick," which sided with the Arabs in the Arab-Israeli dispute and inveighed against Jewish shopkeepers and landlords in Harlem and other Negro urban residential areas.

The National Conference for New Politics is a leftist united front which strikingly resembles the Communist-controlled Progressive Party that ran Henry Wallace on a third party ticket for President in 1948. There is, however, a major difference. In those days, the traditional forces for law and order in our country had not yet been badly undermined by Supreme Court decisions in criminal and Communist cases. Today, law and order have been subverted by misinterpretations of the U.S. Constitution, imposed on most Americans by a zealous minority of leftist activists in the American Civil Liberties Union, the Communist-front Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (whose brilliant attorney, Leonard Boudin, has won so many of the Communist cases brought before the Supreme Court), and by intellectuals at the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas is a member of the Fund's board of directors, a consultant to the Center and a fund-raiser for it.

For 1968 and beyond, New Politics threatens the U.S. government and the nation's social and economic system with anarchy and destruction. The National Conference for New Politics, which claims to be an expression of the young New Left, is now largely controlled by the Old Left, i.e., by the Communist Party, U.S.A. and the worldwide Communist apparatus.

As defined in the original document, "A Call to New Politics," issued by a group of academicians and theorists—including W. H. Ferry and Hallock Hoffman, respectively vice president and secretary-treasurer of the Fund for the Republic's Center at Santa Barbara, its staff members Stanley Sheinbaum and Harvey Wheeler, and Robert Scheer, publisher of Ramparts magazine—New Politics is "pressure point politics—operating directly on society's most vulnerable points," as well as "guerrilla politics," "liberation front politics" and "revolutionary politics," which hold that the so-called evils accompanying the process of capital formation "can be exterminated at their roots." New Politics also condemns private enterprise as responsible for "exploitation, corruption and pollution," and calls for total regulation and control of business by the states and cities.

It should now be clear to an American businessman that if he gives a dime to anyone in New Politics—whether on his own or through a tax-exempt foundation, church or "peace" organization—he is helping to subsidize his own, his family's and his nation's ruin.

Onstage at McMillin Theatre, William F. Pepper stressed the dual intellectual and political nature of New Politics and said flatly, "The press doesn't understand it." In general, he is correct. Through the failure of most of the communications media to inform the public about the activities and aims of left wing radicals, they are left free to pursue their pressure point politics on vulnerable areas of society until a culmination is reached in Cambridge, Md., Newark or Detroit, or in unlawful demonstrations on Capitol Hill.

Bob Ross is administrative director of the Radical Education Project, run by Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), a main participant in the NCNP convention and a prime mover in New Politics. In the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, dated October 1, 1966, J. Edgar Hoover describes Students for a Democratic Society as "a militant youth group that receives support from the Communist Party and which in turn supports Communist objectives and tactics." The National Conference for New Politics convention in Chicago is receiving and welcoming support from long-time Communist Party officials Dorothy Healey of California and Claude Lightfoot of Illinois.

Among the members of the National Conference for New Politics national council and executive board are: Paul Albert, California Democratic Council; Donna Allen, Women Strike for Peace; Julian Bond, Georgian State Legislature; Paul Booth, national council, Students for a Democratic Society; Reverend William Sloan Coffin, Jr., chaplain, Yale University; Victoria Gray, Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party; Dick Gregory, actor; Martin Peretz, Committee on Social Studies, Harvard University; Robert Scheer, publisher, Ramparts magazine; Monroe Wasch, American Federation State, County & Municipal Employees; Henry Wineberg, Committee for Independent Political Action, Chicago; and Michael Wood, former member of the National Student Association who leaked to Ramparts information about the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Prominent socialist scholars on the NCNP national council include Erich Fromm, psychiatrist; Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgi, Nobel laureate; Professor of Philosophy Herbert

Marcuse, University of California at San Diego; and Professor of Industrial Engineering Seymour Melman, Columbia University.

The main pressure points of the NCNP convention in Chicago will be the Vietnam war, the Negro revolution, the organization of welfare workers and recipients into activists making demands to overburden local, state and federal government budgets, and—perhaps most perilous of all—anti-military propaganda, designed to effect the unilateral disarmament of the United States.

The first edition of New Politics News, published by the NCNP Convention Center in Chicago, describes America as "the scourge of the world." It proclaims, "We start with one commitment: Don't mourn for America— Organize!"

If NCNP succeeds in its nationwide and local community organizing, it is safe to predict that the riots, flag burnings and subversion of 1967 will be insignificant compared with what will happen in 1968 and beyond.

What William F. Pepper, executive director of NCNP, achieved onstage at McMillin Theatre on August 17, was to organize a New York chapter of New Politics to help overthrow the government and bring about what the National Conference for New Politics calls "the radicalization of the American people." That, he says, "must happen."

It must not.

REVIEWING THE RECORD OF CONGRESS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, at the opening of this session, January 19, 1967, Senator DIRKSEN and I presented a Republican appraisal of the state of the Union. In my domestic portion of this presentation I outlined a 40-point program of constructive Republican proposals for consideration of the 90th Congress.

Thirty of these proposals were in the area of Republican alternatives to the tired Democratic approaches of the 1930's, reflecting philosophical and practical political differences. Ten were in the vital area of national security, where there is substantial agreement between knowledgeable Democrats and Republicans on key defense committees but very wide disagreement between Congress and the executive branch.

In reviewing the record of this Congress between the Lincoln's birthday and the Labor Day recesses, in which the bulk of the legislative workload is usually done, Republicans can be gratified by the fact that most of our national security proposals have received bipartisan backing and approval in the Armed Services, Merchant Marine, Joint Atomic Energy, and Appropriations Committees from the whole House of Representatives. But the President and his Secretary of Defense continue to resist some of these recommendations, including the ever-more-urgent need to get going on an anti-ballistic-missile defense system.

Among the 30 practical, problem-solving Republican legislative proposals outside the defense field, the House has completed action on only eight, one of which bears a Republican label—the Cramer antiriot bill—and one of which was belatedly embraced by President Johnson—restoration of the investment tax credit.

The other six House actions—though some have not passed the Senate—bear strong Republican imprints and embody the sentiments of a great majority of our citizens on matters deeply and directly concerning them. They are:

Creation of a House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which would never have been approved except for the insistence of Republican members—notably some of the 59 newly elected last November—in the wake of Democratic scandals in the Powell, Dodd, and still pending cases.

A greatly improved and strengthened social security bill, increasing benefits to help our senior citizens resist the ravages of Great Society inflation, and providing needed new direction and constructive State control of welfare programs.

A balanced package of crime prevention and law enforcement legislation, including the previously mentioned antiriot bill, a companion bill guaranteeing Federal protection to civil rights workers in lawful exercise of constitutional rights, amendments to the Law Enforcement Assistance Act strengthening the role of the States and local governments in upgrading law enforcement as a career, and establishing a National Institute of Law Enforcement for the dissemination of the latest methods of police science.

Long overdue legislation giving veterans of the Vietnam war equal benefits with veterans of other conflicts, and increasing benefits to veterans' widows and children to keep up with rising costs of living.

Some progress or partial success can be reported on eight more of my Republican state of the Union proposals, so that we have made visible strides thus far in this session on 16 of the 30 nondefense programs.

First. Under constant pressure from Republican members, both in committee and on the floor, the House so far has trimmed the President's budget requests by about $4 billion, although it has rejected additional economy efforts by the minority in many instances. Republican efforts to have the President submit a revised budget have been blocked, but the administration has admitted that its initial estimates were unrealistic.

Second. The Republican principle of rejecting categorical Federal aid, with its ever-burgeoning Washington bureaucracy and inability to adapt to local conditions, is winning converts daily. While our alternative of revenue sharing with the States and local governments has not been accepted across the board, the principle prevailed in the final House version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Republican-amended Law Enforcement Assistance Act, and may still be applied to important pending legislation such as the comprehensive health and poverty bills.

Third. The bipartisan clean elections and campaign reform bill—Ashmore-Goodell—now under consideration by the House Administration Committee embodies the major Republican recommendations in this important area which demands action before the 1968 campaign year.

Fourth. The Senate has effectively pigeonholed the Long amendment calling for financing of national political campaigns through a checkoff of individual income tax dollars, which Republicans opposed.

Fifth. Participation sales as a devious device of deficit financing was not repealed, as we proposed, but the debt ceiling bill finally approved by the House does require honest reporting of such borrowings in future budgets.

Sixth. The imaginative Republican plan for homeownership by low-income Americans advanced in the Widnall-Percy bill has received attention in both Senate and House committees and is in some danger of being kidnaped by the Johnson administration.

Seventh. Our call for tax incentives to encourage reduction of air and water pollution was partially answered by restoration of the investment tax credit, though more action in this area is under study by Republican task forces.

Eighth. Although the Republican reform package for the District of Columbia government was approved by the District of Columbia Committee, the House rejected it in favor of the President's reorganization plan. However, Representative ANCHER NELSON's proposals for an elected school board and a delegate in the House of Representatives may yet win separate consideration.

There remain 14 of my 30 January 19 state of the Union proposals in the nondefense domestic category, and one of the 10 in the area of national security, upon which no action has been taken by the House under its present Democratic control.

Republicans regret that no action has been taken on their proposal for a bipartisan, blue ribbon commission of the Nation's best experts to re-examine our short- and long-range national defense posture.

Among the most urgently needed and possibly stalled programs are the bipartisan congressional reorganization bill, which has passed the Senate, and which under Republican recommendations would include an investigative committee controlled by the minority party.

Others pending in the House include the opportunity crusade which Republicans would substitute for the mismanaged poverty war, and the Human Investment Act which also seeks to enlist private enterprise in job training programs.

Nothing has been finally done by this Congress on the subject of fair and equitable division of political time by radio and television, safeguards against unauthorized wiretapping with defined permissive limits in the public interest, prevention of national emergency strikes—except the stopgap action on the rail

strike—and streamlining the executive branch through another Hoover-type Commission, all Republican-sponsored proposals.

Considering that we are still the minority by a 31-vote margin, I am encouraged that Republicans in the House have been able to accomplish as much as we have in translating the mandate of the American people last November into actual accomplishment, both through our increased strength on committees and on the floor. Certainly the vital legislative process has been restored in the 90th Congress and its advantages over the rubberstamp record of the lopsided 89th Congress already are apparent. It remains obvious, however, that to really enact a constructive Republican program it will be necessary to win a majority in the House of Representatives next year. We are building a good record upon which to do just that.

The aforementioned outline of the 40-point Republican proposals follows:

DOMESTIC LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS IN JANUARY 1967 REPUBLICAN STATE OF THE UNION

1. Restore Investment Tax Credit.
2. Repeal Participation Sales.
3. Cut Non-essential Spending; Revise President's Budget.
4. Tax and Revenue Sharing; Block Grants.
5. National Commission on Urban Living.
6. District of Columbia Reforms.
7. Tax Credits for Higher Education Costs.
8. Improve Social Security and Increase Benefits.
9. Equalize Vietnam Veterans Benefits.
10. Revamp Poverty War Opportunity Crusade.
11. Human Investment Act to Expand Job Training.
12. Home Ownership for Low-Income Families.
13. Executive Branch Reforms—Hoover-type Commission.
14. Merit System for Postmasters.
15. Fair Farm Prices in Marketplace.
16. Study National Emergency Strike Laws.
17. Congressional Reorganization.
18. House Ethics Committee.
19. Investigating Committee Under Minority Control.
20. Clean Elections & Campaign Reform Law.
21. Repeal Long Amendment for Federal Financing of Major Party Campaigns.
22. $100 Tax Deduction for Political Contributions.
23. Electoral College Reform.
24. Fair and Equitable Political Time on TV-Radio.
25. Forbid Interstate Travel to Incite Riots.
26. Protect Lawful Civil Rights Workers.
27. Safeguards on Wiretapping & Eavesdropping.
28. Curb Air and Water Pollution.
29. Upgrade Law Enforcement as Career.
30. National Institute of Law Enforcement.

NATIONAL SECURITY PROPOSALS

31. Blue Ribbon Commission to Re-examine policies.
32. Modernize U.S. Navy and Nuclear Propulsion.
33. Counter Threat of Enemy Missile Submarines.
34. Revive and Rebuild American Merchant Marine.
35. Upgrade Independent Maritime Administration.
36. Develop Advanced Manned Strategic Bomber.
37. Develop Improved Manned Interceptor.
38. Strengthen Reserve and National Guard.
39. Eliminate Inequities in Draft.
40. Speed Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense.

CONGRESSIONAL CONFIDENCE IN ATTORNEY GENERAL SHAKEN

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, once again congressional confidence in the Attorney General of the United States is shaken.

If the impact of the vote of no confidence in the Attorney General registered so overwhelmingly in this Chamber last month in the so-called safe streets bill is doubted, then take a look at the Attorney General's latest low stature as the Nation's No. 1 defender of the law.

The Congress, in its role of legislator for the District of Columbia provided by law that persons must be bona fide 1-year residents of the District before becoming eligible for public welfare assistance—3 District of Columbia Code, 203. Significantly, 40 States have established residency requirements as a condition of eligibility for general public assistance. And, even more significantly, the Congress has sanctioned these State residency requirements by enacting a Federal law providing for a Federal contribution to State-administered programs where the condition of eligibility does not exceed a 1-year residency requirement—42 U.S.C. 602(b).

The District of Columbia's 1-year residency law recently has been called into question in a suit by Minnie Harrell and others, wherein her neighborhood legal service's attorney challenged the constitutionality of the 1-year residency requirement, arguing that it is both a denial of due process and an unconstitutional restriction of the right to travel.

District Judge Alexander Holtzoff ruled that these contentions as to unconstitutionality do not raise a substantial question of constitutionality and he thus refused to convene a Federal three judge court to consider the constitutional question sought to be raised.

Judge Holtzoff was, however, overruled by Chief Judge David Bazelon and Judge Spottswood Robinson, with Judge Edward Tamm dissenting. Then Judge Holtzoff was ordered by that decision to certify to Judge Bazelon that a substantial constitutional question was involved. Judge Bazelon, who has long been noted for his habit of judicial legislation and activism, then proceeded to name himself, Judge Fahy, and Judge Holtzoff to the three-judge bench.

In this present posture the three-judge court has certified to the Attorney General, as provided by Federal law—28 U.S.C. 2403—that the "constitutionality of an act of Congress affecting the public interest" is drawn into question. The argument of the issue is set for September 7.

As of this moment, our No. 1 defender of the public laws has not yet even responded to the suit, and neither has any lesser defender in the Attorney General's office been authorized by him to respond.

Abdication by the Attorney General of his responsibility to defend acts of Congress poses a grave question. Whom shall we trust to represent the people of this Nation, acting through their elected representatives, when those acts are called into question? Is it no wonder confidence in the Attorney General is at such a low ebb when taxpaying citizens of this country cannot rely on him to respond for them when acts they authorized, through their Congress, are challenged?

I ask you is it not a grave constitutional question, and is it not in the vital public interest to defend a law passed by Congess when that law provides reasonable requirements within the District of Columbia to protect the interest of the citizens therein?

Just as it is reasonable to impose residency requirements on the right to vote, to encourage intelligence as to local conditions in the voters' minds, is it not equally reasonable to establish minimum residency requirements for eligibility to receive public welfare assistance? Remember, there is a great distinction between the right to vote and the fact that welfare is a matter of legislative grace.

I can only say, with a feeling of shame and sadness, it is not surprising that the office of the Attorney General presently commands so little respect and confidence in this body.

Only 1 week remains to respond to a suit challenging an act of Congress. Where is the Attorney General?

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966, in accordance with section 6 of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Of the $900 million of property vested under the provisions of the act, only $67 million still remained under the Office's control at the close of the fiscal year.

The Office of Alien Property ceased to exist as an independent entity on June 30, 1966. Its remaining functions are being performed by the part-time services of Justice Department personnel under the supervision of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Division.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 31, 1967.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, the message,

together with the accompanying papers, is referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There was no objection.

NOISE POLLUTION REVISITED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, I reintroduced my bill H.R. 2819—H.R. 14602 in the 89th Congress—to establish an Office of Noise Control in the Office of the Surgeon General of the United States. At the same time, I introduced H.R. 2820 to authorize a program specifically for aircraft noise abatement alone.

My statement on the problem is found at page 788, and following, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1967.

As my colleagues know, it is my feeling that the problem of noise abatement in all areas—not simply for aircraft—is a burgeoning problem to be heard and acted upon while there is yet time to still the din.

My various statements on the subject are found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 7, pages 8745 through 8768; 9470 to 9477; volume 112, part 8, page 9679; May 16, daily pages A2629 and A2630; volume 112, part 9, pages 12191 to 12205; August 1, daily pages A4046 to A4049; volume 112, part 14, pages 18233 to 18257; volume 112, part 15, page 20388; volume 112, part 20, pages 27803 to 27824, and page 27874. In the 89th Congress, in addition to the statement on January 18, 1967, further analyses can be found commencing at page 1739 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 26, 1967; page 2582 of the RECORD of February 6, 1967; page 7280 of the RECORD of March 20, and page 10749 of the RECORD of April 25.

On Tuesday, September 12, at a luncheon meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel, there will be a convocation under the auspices of their Natural Resources Committee on this subject.

The announcement from Secretary James G. Watt of this committee follows:

The National Chamber will be sponsoring a luncheon in the Sheraton Room of the Sheraton Carlton Hotel. Congressman Theodore R. Kupferman (R., N.Y.), who has introduced legislation to launch the first comprehensive federal, state, and local assault on noise, will be the featured speaker.

The Congressman will present a broad outline of what might be termed the "noise pollution" problem. In addition to Congressman Kupferman, the luncheon program will include A. J. Evans of NASA, and Elwood Driver of the Department of Transportation. These men will review for us the research and development activities of their respective agencies in the field of noise abatement and control.

This program was arranged by Chamber Research Associate John J. Coffey.

In consideration of this forthcoming meeting, I thought that I would bring up to date, references to the noise problem throughout the world since my last talk at the Acoustical Society of America—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 25, 1967, at page 10749.

A commendatory letter in this regard follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1967.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KUPFERMAN: I wish once more to thank you for your stimulating address at the recent banquet of the Acoustical Society of America.

Many people in the field of noise control, both in the Society as a whole and in our own Section here, have expressed to me their gratification that the country has in the House someone who so enthusiastically supports their views.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN GREENSPAN,
Acting Chief, Sound Section, IBS.

New York State Assemblyman John M. Burns and New York State Senator Whitney North Seymour, Jr., introduced a resolution in the New York State Legislature in support of my Office of Noise Control legislation.

The resolution follows:

94 Seymour.—Whereas, The control, prevention and abatement of excessive noise is of great importance to the physical well being of the people in the pursuit of their daily tasks; and

Whereas, The problem of noise control and its abatement cannot be limited in its control to boundaries of state; and

Whereas, The compilation of noise control data can best be accomplished by the resources of the federal government; and

Whereas, There is presently pending in Congress a bill introduced by the Honorable Theodore Kupferman, M. C. from this state that would provide for a comprehensive program for the control of noise; and

Whereas, The legislature of this state believes it to be for the best interest of the people of the United States that such bill be enacted into law; now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the Assembly concur), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it hereby is requested to enact into law H.R. 14602, and be it further

Resolved (if the Assembly concur), That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States. (Same Resolution by Assemblyman J. Burns—A 124)

I was pleased to have the excellent labor publication Oil, Chemical & Atomic Union News, in their June 1967 issue, discuss my proposed legislation in an article by Jean Nikolas entitled "Noise Pollutes, Too":

NOISE POLLUTES, TOO

(By Jean Nickolas)

The 20th century may go down in history as the Pollution Era. And if the increase in noise pollution continues at its present rate—one decibel per year for the past 30 years—noise may outrank harmful fumes in the air and industrial organic wastes in water as the number one polluter.

Sound implausible? It isn't. Laws were finally enacted to control further pollution of our atmosphere and fresh water supply, but not before grave damage was done to some of our inland lakes and waterways. We have yet to take the first step to prevent any further increase in our counrty's over-all noise level—yet we are already considered the noisiest country in the world.

Permanent hearing damage can result from a steady overall sound above 95 decibels (a unit of measurement for the relative loudness of sound).

With 95 decibles of steady sound the danger zone, it is startling to note that the modern home dweller today is subjected to an average decibel level of 80. That the kitchen is considered the noisiest room in the home is perhaps not so startling. One noise expert says "the noise level in a modern kitchen is just below that of the cockpit of an old DC-3 airplane."

Today's modern home can have as many as 20 small motors creating varying noise levels ranging up to 70 decibels for the garbage disposal unit. An automatic dishwasher rumbles at around 60–70 decibels. The refrigerator creates 30 to 40 decibels of noise and it runs day and night. With the radio, air conditioner, vacuum cleaner, hi fi, TV, electric mixer, ventilating fans, telephone, doorbell and clanging pots and pans there is a cacophony of sound assailing the ears of the average housewife for all or part of every day.

And these sounds are all within the home. The home itself is not often soundproof and even indoors you can hear the power mowers outside, the screeching of automobile tires, honking horns, sonic booms from supersonic jet airplanes, sirens, the rattle of garbage cans and children yelling.

Noise and more noise.

Not all sounds are offensive to our ears, but even the loveliest of sounds—music for example—can be nerve wracking if it is too loud and goes on for too long. Experts warn that some sounds are actually dangerous to our health.

Medical men and experts in the science of acoustics have conducted some noteworthy studies on both animals and people on the health hazards of noise. Dr. Foster Kennedy, eminent brain specialist at New York's Bellevue Hospital, discovered that the same rise in brain pressure can be achieved with the bursting of a blownup paper bag as with morphine or nitroglycerine.

Sustained and unpleasant noise is suspected of causing many of man's physical ailments from insomnia to heart disease. Probably the best known ailment often attributed to noise is the nervous tension headache. These headaches are almost as widespread today as the common cold, but it is doubtful if our great grandparents knew the meaning of the term because noise was not a sustained part of our daily lives until the 20th century.

Scientists have conducted tests to determine the effects of long-term noise on the inner ear of the chinchilla. Microscopic study of sections of the cochlea (part of the inner ear) of the chinchilla after long-term noise exposure showed permanent cell damage. The greatest damage—with corresponding loss of hearing—was caused by exposure to the highest sound frequencies.

The National Sonic Boom Evaluation Office of the Stanford Research Institute has conducted tests on human brain wave activity during deep sleep. By means of electrodes attached to the head varying sounds of varying intensity and pitch are transmitted to the brain, and the sleeper's brain, heart and eye response recorded mechanically. The reaction of those tests varied. Apparently a sonic boom will merely disturb the deep sleep of some while it will awaken others.

One revealing experiment was conducted by Dr. Samuel Rosen, an ear surgeon. Dr. Rosen went to Africa to conduct hearing tests on Sudanese tribesmen who live far removed from 20th century noises. Tests on over 500 Sudanese from ages 5 to 90 revealed that the oldsters heard almost as well as the very young. Probably because they had never been forced to live in an asphalt jungle.

Rep. Theodore R. Kupferman (R.-N.Y.) is one legislator who would like us to do

something about our increasing noise pollution. He introduced a bill in the 89th, and again to the 90th, sessions of Congress calling for an Office of Noise Control. Kupferman proposes a comprehensive legislative program to control noise, including sonic boom, the well-known booming sound occasioned when an airplane traveling at supersonic speed breaks the sound barrier.

Congressman Kupferman's bill, the first of its kind, would also provide grants to aid state and local programs designed to control excessive noise. Kupferman says "If we had taken proper educational and remedial steps in this (air pollution) area ten years ago, the problem of air pollution might not have reached the critical proportions it has today. We are now at the same relative point with respect to the environmental problem of noise pollution."

Probably the over-all noise level in mechanized U.S.A. will get worse before it gets better. But all of us can start right now to bring peace and quiet into our homes. Try some of these suggestions from acoustical engineers:

Draperies, carpeting, upholstered furniture and bookshelves help cut the noise level in the home.

An acoustical ceiling in the kitchen (or playroom, family room, basement) would absorb almost 75 percent of the excess noise.

Windows should be tight-fitting and have anti-rattle hardware.

Window air conditioners should rest on vibration mounts. Rubber or felt mats under dishwasher and washing machine absorb vibration.

Put pneumatic door closers on all spring doors. Keep door hinges well oiled.

Plumbing should be kept in repair and valves and washers replaced when necessary.

Dr. Vern O. Knudsen, one of the foremost practitioners of the science of acoustics wears ear plugs on busy downtown streets. Perhaps this is going too far, but when the teenagers are having a jam session, they might be just the thing!

Citing Starrs, in its June 1967 issue, volume 1, No. 2, edited by Joe Rowland, and published by John Patrick Starrs, covered my talk before the Society of Medical Jurisprudence—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, at page 7280.

Citing Starrs said:

NOISE POLLUTION

In the May edition of Citing Starrs we covered some of the aspects of air and water pollution. Recently another form of pollution has been the focus of Congressional attention—noise pollution. In a talk before the Society of Medical Jurisprudence at the Einhorn Auditorium of the Lenox Hill Hospital in New York City, Theodore R. Kupferman (D 17th dist. N.Y.) discussed his proposed legislation on noise pollution (H.R. 2819) and its increasing concern to the community. The Congressman's talk covered the trauma of everyday noise, voice and hearing loss, aircraft noise control recognition by the courts of "noise pollution", the supersonic boom and lastly, the need for Congressional action in this area.

H.R. 2819 complements H.R. 92 proposed by Congressman Ogden R. Reid (R. 26th dist. N.Y.) and provides for a comprehensive program for the control of noise including the establishment of an Office of Noise Control within the office of the Surgeon General. It also provides for grants to States, local governments and non-profit agencies to research ways and means of control, prevention and abatement of noise.

To which the harassed city dweller with "ears more deaf than adders" says "Huh? What did he say?"

New York City has, under Mayor John V. Lindsay, awakened to the noise pollution problem. A task force was appointed under the chairmanship of Neil H. Anderson, executive vice president of the New York Board of Trade.

His statement to a New York City Council hearing follows:

STATEMENT BY NEIL H. ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE MAYOR'S TASK FORCE ON NOISE CONTROL, BEFORE THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL DURING HEARINGS ON THE REORGANIZATION OF THE CITY GOVERNMENT, LOCAL LAW 280, INT. #261, CHAPTER 56

I am Neil Anderson, Chairman of the Mayor's Task Force on Noise Control, which was established by the Mayor to study the problem of noise in New York City. The Task Force is now in the process of preparing a report of its recommendations for short- and long-range answers to this pressing problem. Members of the Task Force include doctors, psychologists, acoustical engineers, architects, journalists and public relations people.

Noise is an objectionable and often harmful element in our environment. As the community grows in every area, there is more and more evidence of the complexity and enormity of the noise problem and the need for a proper balance between our technological progress and environmental protection. The Task Force is optimistic about the possibilities and prospects of effective solutions to this problem, and realizes that its solution is a responsibilty not only of government, but also of industry, business and the individual citizen.

The harmful effect of noise has been documented in this City by the Noise Abatement Commission, organized in 1929 under the sponsorship of the New York City Department of Health. It published its Report entitled "City Noise" in 1930. The findings of that Commission were fully substantiated by the Report in 1960 of the Committee for a Quiet City. The appointment this year of the Mayor's Task Force on Noise Control indicates the continuing and urgent problem of noise.

As early as the 1960 Report, an all-inclusive noise control statute was advocated and a uniform statute has been proposed for municipal adoption. However, noise is not capable of legislative control except only after careful study of what is objectionable noise from any particular source and whether that noise is under the circumstances preventable.

The Mayor's Task Force on Noise Control is well aware that the automotive industry has quieter trucks, the tire industry quieter tires, and the air compressor manufacturers quieter mufflers. What this City needs are some brave rulings which will bring these developments into everyday use.

I wish to say that in general the Task Force supports the concept of consolidation embodied in the Environmental Protection Administration. However, if we are to view our environment in its totality and attack its problems in an integrated manner, let us not forget a major source of irritation—noise. To quote from the Report of the Mayor's Task Force on Air Pollution, submitted in June 1966. It is a fact that the physical environment is a whole condition in which each part is affected by every other part. It is this fact, when fully recognized, that can make life in cities infinitely more productive and congenial. Air pollution is but one aspect of the whole environment. . . . Noise is [also] a prime cause of irritation and tension in the modern city. And noise abatement is closely related to waste disposal and air pollution. The City of New York suffers, for example, from the stench, the dirt and the noise emitted by trucks and buses."

The Task Force is convinced that no major improvement can be accomplished in the quality of New York's environment until each element is regarded as an indigenous part of the whole environment. We believe in the principles of unity and coordination embodied in the Environmental Protection Administration, however, we feel that provision should be made in the Administration for noise abatement.

Specifically our recommendations include the following points:

1. The *Functions of the Administration* should be extended to include preventable noise. Therefore, I recommend the following change of language: ". . . the prevention of air and water pollution and preventable noise. . . ."

2. There should be added among the enumerated functions of the administration the following:

"Noise Control. With respect to noise control, the administration shall have the power and duty to regulate and control the emission into the open air of harmful or objectionable noise and other vibrations including but not limited to those emitted by street, subway, water and air traffic of vehicles, whether public or privately owned and whether used for business or pleasure; by demolition, construction, repair or maintenance of streets, buildings, manufacturing plants and public utilities and municipal plants; by the occupants or machinery of any building or other premises whether dwelling, or used for business, municipal or other purposes; and by all persons on the streets, in parks or other premises within the City. It shall enforce all laws, rules and regulations with respect to such emissions. It shall make such investigations and studies as may be desirable for the purpose of such enforcement and of controlling and eliminating harmful or objectionable noise and other vibrations and for such purpose shall have the power to compel the attendance of witnesses and to make their testimony under oath."

3. To the duties of the *Environmental Control Board* shall be added the following lettered provision under its jurisdiction to adopt and amend rules:

"(c) Regulating or prohibiting the emission into the open air from any source, whether fixed or movable, and whether on land or on water, of any harmful or objectionable noise and other vibrations including but not limited to those emitted by street, subway, water and air traffic of vehicles, whether public or privately owned and whether used for business or pleasure; by demolition, construction, repair or maintenance of streets, buildings, manufacturing plants and public utilities and municipal plants; by the occupants or machinery of any building or other premises whether dwelling, or used for business, municipal or other public purposes; and by all persons on the streets, in parks, or other premises within the City."

The obvious truth that environmental factors, such as noise, are affected by activities under the jurisdiction of other city administrations does not detract from the necessity of dealing with the problem in this most appropriate Environmental Control Administration. The general studies on objectionable noise levels, on a noise map of the City and on regulations against preventable noises must be handled by one group to achieve reasonable zoning effects and uniform maximum standards of noise from all sources within specific zones.

The Mayor's Task Force on Noise Control is in the process of concluding its Report on the problems of particular sources of noise which require, in each case, different attacks in order to be fair to all concerned. However, it is very clear that the organization of the effort in this City should be centered in the Environmental Protection Administration

under rules promulgated by the Environmental Control Board proposed in the statute.

Acting New York City Purchase Commissioner Marvin Gersten, in cooperation with Sanitation Commissioner Samuel J. Kearing, Jr., has followed up with the purchase of "quiet" trucks for sanitation purposes. See New York Times of Friday, August 18, 1967, which follows:

CITY SEEKS TO BUY 400 "QUIET" TRUCKS

The city administration asked the Board of Estimate yesterday for permission to buy 400 new garbage trucks that it said would be quieter and emit less pollution than any other trucks in use in the country today.

Approval of the board is needed because the specially designed construction to control noise and pollution would add about $102 to the cost of each truck.

While the request covers only the purchase of the truck chassis, the body itself is also expected to be materially quieter because the Sanitation Department said it was changing the design specifications for future bidders.

When the city sought bids on the new sanitation trucks, the only manufacturer that offered to meet the city's new noise and pollution requirements was the GMC Truck and Coach Division of the General Motors Corporation.

The GMC bid of $3,676,063.45 for the 400 truck chassis, however, was $43,426.90 higher than the lowest bid offered for the trucks without the added pollution-control quality.

In a letter sent to the Board of Estimate yesterday, Marvin Gersten, the city's acting Purchase Commissioner, urged approval of the GMC bid.

The Los Angeles City Council has approved an expenditure for soundproofing in the area of the airport, as reported in the newsletter of the National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, volume VIII, No. VIII of August 15, 1967.

CITY COUNCIL APPROVES REVENUE BOND ISSUE AND AUTHORIZES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR SOUNDPROOFING

At its meeting of 26 July, the Los Angeles City Council approved the request of the Los Angeles Department of Airports for authority to issue $75,000,000 worth of revenue bonds. The proceeds of the sale are to be used to further develop the Los Angeles International Airport, specifically the addition of 24R to the "north runway" complex, the acquisition of houses in a residential area east of Runways 24R/L, and additional passenger terminal area expansion. It should be noted that the planned runway development conforms with the airport's Master Plan as it was developed in 1946–1947.

Concurrently, with approval of the bond issue, the Council, chaired by President L. E. Timberlake, authorized the Department of Airports to immediately undertake a demonstration program to determine the feasibility of employing modern soundproofing techniques to improve the habitability of residential, school and church structures located in areas affected by high aircraft noise levels.

Undoubtedly acting with the belief that proper soundproofing of structures can sufficiently alleviate annoyance caused by aircraft noise, Councilman Timberlake's proposal for a $1 "anti-noise use tax" on each passenger and ton of cargo using the terminal was unanimously approved. According to Mr. Timberlake, the revenue would be used to finance soundproofing and provide funds for other noise abatement activities. There is considerable doubt concerning the authority of the local airport to levy such a tax. In 1962, the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office provided the City Council with an opinion advising that such a municipal tax applied to interstate commerce would be unconstitutional in that it conflicts with economic regulation of interstate commerce vested, in the case of the airlines, in the Civil Aeronautics Board. Nevertheless, there is every indication that the management of the Los Angeles Department of Airports will proceed with the demonstration project with the hope that if it should prove feasible from a cost-benefit standpoint, means to finance the project can be found.

NOTE.—In connection with the airport's need to finance such projects relating to airport development and access, Mr. Joseph A. Foster, Vice President of Airports of Air Transport Association, has recently announced that the airlines are considering the advisability of the imposition of terminal user charges to airline ticket sales (and presumably bills of lading, Ed.).

The American City magazine, edited by William S. Foster, in the issue of August 1967 at page 16 in the Washington Dateline column stated:

The sonic boom promises to become a national issue, warns Congressman Ted Kupferman (R, N.Y.). When the SST fleet gets into operation, the average American will have to put up with 20 booms per day. A new anti-boom group has the unpronounceable acronym of CLASB (Citizens' League Against the Sonic Boom). Formed by Harvard physicist William A. Shurcliff, it is campaigning against the "horrible harassment of sonic-boom noise." Congressman Kupferman has as one of his principal goals the curbing of urban noise in general.

I considered the problem of sonic boom in my first statement this year. Other consideration has been given to it by the New York Times in the article by Walter Sullivan on Sunday, August 6, 1967, at page 12E, which follows:

SST AND THE SONIC BOOM

(By Walter Sullivan)

Early in the era of jet flight, pilots found that, by diving their planes they could surpass the speed of sound (660 m.p.h. at 35,000 feet) and generate a pressure wave that would strike the ears of those on the ground like a cannon shot. It became a favorite stunt at air shows. In 1953, however, the destructive effect of such a "sonic boom" was demonstrated. A pilot, practicing for an air show, made a steep dive to 8,000 feet and produced a boom at an air base below him, damaging floors and door frames as well.

Last week a French farm family, with eight neighbors and hired hands helping in the harvest, gathered for the noon meal in a farmhouse near the village of Mauron in Brittany. Suddenly, according to accounts from France, a sound like a thunderclap was heard. Timbers shook loose and eight tons of barley stored in a loft fell on those eating, killing three and injuring one seriously. Apparently it was the first time that a sonic boom had been blamed for fatal injuries.

Wednesday, the same day as the accident in France, the President's Office of Science and Technology in Washington made public the results of an intensive study of sonic boom effects carried out last summer and winter over Edwards Air Force Base in California.

INTENSE PRESSURE WAVE

The boom is not a single event, produced by "breaking the sound barrier," as many believe. It is an intense pressure wave that follows the track of a supersonic plane across the landscape. Sound consists of pressure waves in the air that agitate the eardrum. They can be generated by a vibrating violin string, human vocal chords, a pistol shot or the action of a high-speed aircraft on the air.

When the speed of the plane is less than that of sound, the plane chases the sound waves that it generates but never catches up with them. At speeds above that of sound, waves generated by portions of the plane, particularly the nose and tail, build up, forming a cone-shaped surface of intense pressure with the plane at its apex. If this swift-moving cone touches the ground before being dissipated by distance, it strikes the ears as a boom. The nose and tail of a large plane produce twin booms about one-quarter of a second apart.

For the California tests, two typical wooden frame homes were built and heavily instrumented to measure pressures on their walls, windows and other parts. Similar instruments were installed on the long-span roof of the air base bowling alley. Volunteers were chosen from the base and from towns far enough away so that the inhabitants were not accustomed to sonic booms (which are heard four or five times daily at the air base).

Some were stationed in the test houses; others were in the yard outside. Observers were likewise stationed at 10 nearby farms to watch thousands of beef cattle, dairy cows, sheep, turkeys, chickens and pheasants. Then subsonic and supersonic aircraft made hundreds of flights overhead at speeds greater and less than that of sound. The observers were asked to score the relative "acceptability" of each event, whether it was a particular kind of boom or the sound of an ordinary jet in a steep climb.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose was to assess public reaction to the projected supersonic transports, or SST's. The results helped reinforce the view that the SST's now under development will not be allowed to operate over land at supersonic speeds. The plane is expected to fly at 1,700 miles an hour. The closest plane to the SST in operation today is the XB–70, the experimental supersonic bomber that is about 185 feet long. The SST's will be some 300 feet long. The XB–70 made 20 flights over the test area at altitudes ranging from 31,000 to 72,000 feet.

Some 85 microphones were spread over the landscape, and it was found that the boom produced by a plane flying at twice the speed of sound (roughly 1,300 miles an hour) at 60,000 feet could be heard on the ground at a distance of 25 miles to either side of the plane's track. At 37,000 feet and a somewhat slower speed the boom extended only 15 miles to either side, but was more intense.

The tests showed a boom can be annoying even when the plane is above 60,000 feet, where the SST's will operate. Apart from the birds, the farm animals paid little attention to the booms. More than 110,000 window panes were inventoried at the air base before the tests, and 700 were recorded as already broken or missing. Only three broken panes could be attributed to the test booms.

However, the postmistress at nearby Tehachapi was looking at her clock when a boom allegedly smashed the post office window and that of a department store. The time was 10:43 A.M. Radar records indicated that a supersonic bomber was close by at the time.

A peculiarity of sonic booms is their patchy behavior. They may be twice as strong in one spot as they are a few hundred yards away. This has been attributed to wavy layers in the earth's lower atmosphere that like a succession of lenses, focuses the sound on certain areas. Observations by ESSA, the Environmental Science Services Administration, explored this effect.

The Goodyear blimp Mayflower was stationed 2,000 feet overhead for some fly-bys to record booms originating much farther aloft. This confirmed that most boom dis-

tortions originate in the more turbulent lower 2,000 feet of air.

Those who have studied the preliminary results from these tests believe they rule out routine overland flights by SST's unless such aircraft can be designed to mitigate the booms substantially. This may ultimately be possible, and operating procedures may be devised that take advantage of atmospheric peculiarities.

UNACCEPTABLE NOISE

It has long been suspected that SST operations over inhabited areas might be unacceptable, yet airlines with routes that are largely over land have continued to place orders for such planes. Eastern Air Lines did so in the last few weeks. Some of the lines hope to extend their services overseas. Others believe they can profitably operate such planes at subsonic speeds over land, then go supersonic over water, as on the New York-Miami run.

SST's are now being developed in the United States and the Soviet Union and by a British-French combine. The California study was made for the White House by the Air Force, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Federal Aviation Agency, with help from the Stanford Research Institute and a variety of government agencies and private contractors.

The problem of sonic boom and noise in general was covered in depth by UNESCO in the July 1967 issue of their Courier magazine with many illustrations, which, unfortunately, cannot be reproduced here. The UNESCO press release on this follows:

TRAFFIC NOISE REDUCTION A CITY'S FIRST SOUND TARGET UNESCO COURIER SUGGESTS

In the control of noise a city's first effort to produce quieter living must be directed at reducing noise from traffic, according to an article in the *Unesco Courier*, a monthly publication of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, now available here.

In a recent survey of a British city, which included 1,400 people, noise was mentioned as often as slums, dirt, smoke, public facilities, government and the amount of traffic as a feature which people would change if they could. About one third of the total sample specifically mentioned traffic noise as one of its major irritants. Four to seven times as many people were disturbed by the noise of road traffic as by the noise of aircraft, trains or industry. Traffic noise appeared to be as important an annoyance as all other noises together, including the noises of aircraft, trains, industry, construction, children, radio and telephones, bells, alarms and pets.

The real trouble, the Unesco Courier article points out, lies with trucks, buses, motor cycles and sports cars. The average truck at 60 miles an hour is about twice as noisy as a steady stream of automobile traffic.

In some countries, notably the United Kingdom, legislation is under consideration that would require all new passenger-cars and trucks to have noise levels lower than 85 decibels. The article, by Leo L. Beranek, a leading U.S. acoustical engineer warns that unless control of noise is undertaken our advancing technological civilization will not only bring increased noise levels, but invade those last places on earth that are now quiet.

Scientific tests, according to the magazine, have revealed that a human being subjected to loud noises suffers changes in circulation and in the action of the heart. Even snatches of loud conversation are enough to affect the nervous system and thereby provoke constrictions in a large part of the blood circulation system, as well as changes in the secretion and composition of the gastric juices. Noises below 30 cycles per second, which are inaudible to the human ear can also harm the human organism, and such "infra-sound" is blamed for feelings of malaise and discomfort sometimes experienced by airplane passengers, according to the Unesco Courier.

Articles in this edition are "Down with Decibels!" by O. Schenker-Sprüngli; "The Architects of Silence" by Constantin Stramentov; "Cordoba (Argentina) takes noise Abatement by the Horns" by G. L. Fuchs; "Noise and Health" by Gunther Lehmann; "Treasures of World Art"—Nostalgia for nature (Henry Rousseau).

An advertisement in the New York Times of Friday, August 11, 1967, at page 15 discusses the problem of sonic boom. The advertisement was taken by the Citizens League Against Sonic Boom, Dr. William A. Shurcliff, director. I discussed this organization, whose office is in Cambridge, Mass., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 5, 1967, at page 8464.

The advertisement follows:

THREAT OF THE SST AND ITS SHATTERING SONIC BOOM

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING A WORLDWIDE THREAT TO CIVILIZED LIVING

1. What is a supersonic plane? One that travels faster than sound. The proposed Boeing supersonic transport is designed to fly at about 1800 mph, or about 2½ times the speed of sound.

2. Has the proposed SST any advantages over conventional jet planes? Yes, one: speed. On a flight from New York to London it would save about 3 hours.

3. Has it any disadvantages? Many. It would be extremely expensive (about $40 million each). It would require about 25 to 50% higher fare than the principal competing planes, the so-called jumbo jets. It would not be ready for use until about 1975, i.e., about four years after the jumbo jets are in use. It has a cruising range of about 2000 miles shorter than that of the jumbo jet, and in addition it poses new and staggering safety problems. *But its worst feature is the inevitable sonic boom.*

4. What is a sonic boom? A very loud, very sudden *bang*, something like the bang produced by a sizeable dynamite blast a block away. The bang is the result of an intense shock-wave produced by the SST as it hurtles through the air.

5. Where does this boom occur? It sweeps along behind the plane *all the way*, striking every house and every person in a path about 50 miles wide and thousands of miles long. Flying across the USA at 65,000 ft. altitude, a single SST could deliver a bone-shaking jolt to every man, woman and child in an area of over 100,000 square miles—as many as 20 million people.

6. How bad is the boom? In a five-month-long series of tests conducted in Oklahoma City in 1964 with supersonic military planes, government investigators found that a large fraction of the population hated the booms. 15,000 complained to authorities. Nearly 5000 filed formal damage claims. The proportion of persons who said they could never live with the boom grew steadily during the test period, and was more than a quarter of the population when a poll was taken near the end. *These flights were over one edge of the city only, not the center; were on a regular schedule; and the average boom intensity was little more than half of what the proposed SST would produce.* The boom strikes without warning; the effect is startling, disrupting; sometimes even terrifying. It produces muscular spasm and, often, sharp increase in rate of heartbeat. Harm done to babies, nervous people, heart patients, etc., has not been evaluated satisfactory. The boom can stampede cattle, cause mink to kill their offspring.

7. How about damage to houses? In the Oklahoma tests, a house was virtually split in two, and the owner was awarded $10,000 in damages by a Federal circuit court. Many other houses suffered damage amounting to several thousand dollars. In all, almost 5000 damage claims were submitted. An analysis of actual damage payments following sonic booms tests in Chicago and St. Louis indicates that a fleet of SSTs in routine use over the USA would be expected to damage windows, plaster, etc., to the tune of about $1 million *per day*.

8. Can scientists find a way of eliminating the boom? They have been trying for years. And have failed. The boom is a fact of nature, like gravity.

9. Has the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) banned supersonic flight over land? No. Not even over large cities. It worries about the economic prospects of the SST, and fears that a ban on overland flight would make these prospects even dimmer. The prospects of harassment of 100,000,000 people on the ground are seldom mentioned in FAA speeches and news releases.

10. What about profits: will they be large? Recently issued reports by the Institute of Defense Analyses and other professional analysts point to many circumstances under which the project could be a financial disastera gigantic *boom*doggle. SST fares would have to be so much higher than for jumbo jets that few travelers would use the SSTs, and few SSTs would be sold perhaps as few as 84, if overland flight is banned. The financial losses could be impressive. It is expected that the Government would not get its money back for 20 years, if ever. Meanwhile, the effect of the SST on balance of payments to foreign countries could be strongly adverse.

11. Who is paying for the SST program? In the main, the taxpayers are. The Government has already contributed hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars, and now the FAA is asking Congress for $142 million more. Eventually the sum may run to four or five *billions*—more than twice the cost of the wartime atomic bomb project.

12. Is there an alternative to the SST? Yes. The jumbo jets expected to be in service in 1971, about four years before the proposed SST. A jumbo jet will hold 400 to 1000 passengers, two or three times as many as the SST. Because of this greater capacity, the jumbo jet would require far fewer take-offs and landings per million passengers carried, thus reducing congestion and delays at airports. It is relatively cheap—about half the cost of the SST. Fares will be *much* lower. *The jumbo jet produces no sonic boom at all!* Its prospects are so bright that the aviation industry itself is glad to pay the development costs; there is no billion-dollar reach into the taxpayer's pocket.

13. Since Britain and France are already building an SST, must not the US build one too? The Anglo-French Concorde is running into increasing difficulty: costs have risen again and again; weight has increased; orders are disappointing; sonic boom tests have created strong protests from citizens. There is much talk of dropping the project entirely.

OUR CONCLUSION

The Citizens League Against the Sonic Boom concludes that the proposed SST has few of the hallmarks of a truly worthwhile project. Its saving in time is modest relative to delays in reaching the airport, checking in, waiting for runway clearance. Its drawbacks are impressive: the sonic boom, the huge expense, the greater clutter of airports, the uncertain safety. In our opinion the sonic boom alone is sufficient ground for halting the SST programs here and abroad. The SSTs would create a new kind of pollution—a world-wide sonic pollution. Hour after hour, day and night, week and holidays, it would inflict its startling bang on literally hundreds of millions of defenseless persons, with no

place of refuge. Aviation should be the servant of man, not his scourge.

OUR PLEA

We urge all who value peace and quiet to write now, before it is too late, to their Senators and Representatives, to the President, to their newspapers and TV commentators, urging that the SST program be halted. Write often, and urge your friends to write.

We invite you to become a member of this very active League. Send name, address (with zip code), occupation. No dues.

Also, we invite you to send contributions to help us alert people everywhere to this totally unnecessary threat to civilized living. Send checks payable to:

Citizens League Against the Sonic Boom, 19 Appleton St., Cambridge, Mass. 02138. Director: Dr. William A. Schurcliff, physicist. Deputy Director: Professor John T. Edsall, biochemist.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Professor John Borden Armstrong, historian; J. Henderson Barr, architect; William Brower, professor of speech; Dr. Walter C. Clemens, Jr., political scientist; Prof. Bernard D. Davis, Head of Dept. of Bacteriology and Immunology, Harvard Medical School; Murry N. Fairbank, mechanical engineer; W. H. Ferry, Vice President, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; Mrs. Ferdinand Fetter, housewife; David C. Forbes, attorney and trustee; Dr. John H. Gibbon, emeritus professor of surgery, Jefferson Medical College of Phil.; C. Edward Graves, conservationist and writer; John C. Gray, physicist; Dr. Herbert I. Harris, psychiatrist; Dr. Hudson Hoagland, Executive Director, The Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology; Mrs. Franz J. Ingelfinger, artist; Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, conservationist; Frank Lyman, physicist and industrialist; Dr. J. H. Meier, engineer; Mrs. Sara Owen, writer; Mrs. J. H. Parker, conservationist; Prof. F. V. Pohle, mathematician; Mrs. W. T. Pohlig, housewife; Dr. J. Reece Roth, engineering physicist; John M. Sayward, research chemist; Mrs. T. Mott Shaw, conservationist; John M. Swomley, professor of Christian ethics; Robert J. Varga, teacher; Dr. William Vogt, ecologist; Dr. Donald O. Walter, aerospace medical researcher.

My friend, the former Director General of the Aeronautical Research Institute of Sweden, Bo K. O. Lundberg, in 1963 in the publication "Report No. 94 on Speed and Safety in Civil Aviation" in anticipation of its development some 4 years ago, discussed the economic feasibility of the supersonic transport.

I asked for his current comment on the SST problem and that follows:

THE SST SONIC BOOM PROBABLY UNACCEPTABLE EVEN TO PEOPLE AT SEA

The boom tests over Oklahoma City in 1964 proved that supersonic flight over land of the British/French Concorde and the Boeing Supersonic Transport will be unacceptable. Although the average boom intensity beneath the flight path was never more than 1.6 pounds per square foot, considerable damage to buildings occurred and no less than 27% of Oklahoma citizens polled declared they could *not* "learn to live" with 8 daytime booms per day. No booms at night were produced (the really critical test) but practically all day-sleepers were awakened and the morning boom, at 7 a.m., was widely used as an alarm clock!

In over-land operation the SST's will produce an *average* or "nominal" boom intensity on the flight track of 2.0 psf in climb and 1.5 in cruise. These averages will often be greatly exceeded due to focussing effects of winds as follows from theory and was confirmed by the tests. And the SST "boom carpets" will be at least 70 miles wide and cover the major part of the U.S. and Europe if no boom restrictions are imposed.

Briefly, the "margin of safety" in the conclusion that civil supersonic flight over land is unfeasible is simply over-whelming: The tests indicate that sleep disturbance will be suffered by many even if the nominal boom intensity were reduced to 0.5 psf, implying such a small SST that practically no payload could be carried.

About a year ago the Federal German Government declared that civil supersonic flight over Germany will be prohibited if the boom causes "damage to health." The Swedish Government recently, on May 18, 1967, sounded an even stronger warning: SST operation will be prohibited over Sweden if the boom causes regular sleep disturbance or any damage to property. Other nations are likely to follow suit, implying a virtual blockade of the SST.

Consequently both the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Air Transport Association have already, by implication, condemned the SST: ICAO demands that "the SSTs must be able to operate without creating unacceptable situations due to sonic boom" (surely, regular sleep disturbance is unacceptable), and IATA demands that "economic operation at supersonic speed must be practicable over inhabited areas at any time of the day or night."

Yet the U.S. Congress is expected to grant funds for building prototypes of the Boeing SST—*on the totally unsupported hope that the sonic boom will be acceptable to people at sea.*

Building prototypes of the U.S. SST would most likely throw mankind—unheard—into the "Sonic Boom Age": It would encourage Britain and France to launch quantity production of the Concorde; this would, a few years later, result in quantity production also of the American SST. And once tens of billions of dollars thus are invested, an irresistible pressure will be exerted to fly supersonic also over land (first over "sparsely" populated areas and then over more and more densely inhabited land) because SST operation restricted to over-water and sparsely populated land indisputably would be grossly uneconomical.

No doubt a sonic boom of a given strength will usually be less disturbing on boats than on land. But, on what grounds is it believed that people on boats can accept booms *many times* stronger than the level acceptable to people on land? Surely, it would be ruthless to consider people at sea an insignificant minority.

The SSTs will produce a "nominal" boom of 2.5 psf in supersonic climb over water. Due to focussing effects the intensity will often exceed 5 or 6 psf. By reflection close to cabin walls the intensity could easily exceed 10 or even 15 psf. Such booms are exceedingly frightening and potentially dangerous to people with heart disease.

The disturbance, fright, and danger will, of course, be especially pronounced in areas with heavy concentrations of both SST and boat traffic, in particular south of Nova Scotia and New Foundland. Conservative calculations suggest that there will be, every year, many thousands of cases of people on boat decks being struck by booms exceeding 5 psf (disregarding wall reflection).

I wish to make a plea that boom tests on different types of boats—from sail boats to oceanliners—be conducted before the final decision on building prototypes of the U.S. SST. All nations and representatives of people at sea should be invited to send observers who should be subjected to the booms on the test vessels. As magnified booms are the most significant ones, the overflights should be at a low altitude yielding an average boom intensity of, say, 4.0 psf, whereby a considerable number of moderately magnified booms, of 5 to 6 psf, would be obtained relatively cheaply by a few hundred overflights. Besides subjective judgments of the acceptability of the booms, doctors should measure increases in heart rate, etc.

Clearly, adequate boom tests on boats are in the best interest of civil aviation in general and of the SST investors in particular. If such tests are not made before the Western world proceeds further on the supersonic road there is a staggering risk of an economic disaster: people at sea will certainly find ways and means of putting an end to supersonic over-water flight—once the activity has reached a scale such that the incessant boom thunder has become unbearable and there has been a number of cases of serious incidents or fatal accidents, such as heart attacks. That would imply that most of the many hundreds of SSTs then flying would have to be scrapped.

BO LUNDBERG,
Director General,
Aeronautical Research Institute, Sweden.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *May 24, 1967.*

In Nation's Business of August 1967, in their "Lessons of Leadership" series, in an article entitled "Accelerating the Jet Age" which is a conversation with William Allen of Boeing Aircraft Co., as found at page 62, the following question and answer in discussing SST:

Are you hopeful that the sonic boom problem can be solved?

The answer to that question lies beyond my competency. I am told that a sonic boom is a physical phenomenon that will exist when there is supersonic flight. The degree of intensity of the boom is affected by various factors, including the size and weight of the airplane, its design, the altitude at which it is flying, the existing atmospheric conditions and the nature of the surface over which the plane flies.

I would expect the principal solution to the sonic boom problem will lie in the manner in which the airplane is operated, the route followed, the altitude at which the sonic boom flights are conducted, and the approach and takeoff techniques.

The report of June 6, 1967, of our Committee on Science and Astronautics on the authorization bill, H.R. 10340, for appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Report No. 338, 90th Congress, first session, at pages 107 to 108, discusses noise as follows:

XB-70/SST FLIGHT RESEARCH PROJECT

The potential of the Air Force XB-70 aircraft as a research tool to obtain research information and advanced technology for design, development, construction, and flight test of the prototype supersonic transport has been recognized for several years. The NASA research portion of the XB-70 program began in fiscal year 1963 with installation of instrumentation in the two XB-70A aircraft during manufacture.

Current efforts will be directed toward analysis of the effects of vehicle size and weight; the effects of inertia combined with low aerodynamic damping at the higher operating altitudes of the SST; and the effects of structural elasticity and deformation on the basic aerodynamics of the vehicle. The highest priority tests during this phase are directed toward a better understanding of sonic boom phenomena and their effect on persons on the ground. These problems have and will continue to be the subject of major research efforts in analysis and effects on ground based facilities.

The initial cost of operating the aircraft for test purposes was funded by the Department of the Air Force. In the present NASA-USAF XB-70 Flight Research Program authorized by a NASA-DOD Memorandum of Understanding signed on May 28, 1965, the total cost of the program is shared equally

by the Department of the Air Force and the NASA.

AIRCRAFT NOISE REDUCTION

Two important aspects of aircraft noise alleviation are covered by the research to be carried out in this program area: (1) the research and development necessary to provide means for minimizing the noise radiated from the compressor and fan discharge ducts of turbofan engines such as are installed in presently operating commercial jet aircraft, and (2) research directed toward developing a more positive means for accurate flight path control which would be required in order to make use of steeper approach paths for landing thus increasing the distance of the aircraft from the ground in the vicinity of the airport and lowering the noise level. Both project elements were initiated in fiscal year 1967 and will continue in fiscal year 1968 and will involve wind tunnel testing, simulation, design, ground testing and flight testing.

Also in fiscal year 1968 the study and development of means of minimizing the noise radiated from turbofan engines will be in a phase of construction and ground run up testing of selected turbofan engine nacelle combinations utilizing acoustic treatment and choked inlet approaches.

QUIET ENGINE DEVELOPMENT

Basic research has shown that the elements of a turbojet engine can each be modified in design to permit substantial noise reduction with small penalty in performance. Information on the successful operation of such a propulsion system is completely unavailable. The interaction of the various components will differ substantially from any turbojet propulsion system now in use. The objective of the Quiet Engine project is to combine all of the low noise elements into a single operating system having approximately 20,000 pounds of thrust, and designed to operate at high subsonic flight speeds.

Based on theoretical and basic laboratory research, compressors, including both fixed and rotating components, burners, turbines, and nozzles, will be designed to permit maximum noise reduction with a minimum performance penalty. These elements will be constructed in operational form and size. They will be combined into complete propulsion system(s) and research conducted in the Propulsion System Laboratory at the Lewis Research Center.

In the report of July 13, 1967, of the Committee on Appropriations, No. 484, of the 90th Congress, first session, in connection with H.R. 11456, the Department of Transportation bill, we find the following statement at page 16, and following pages:

CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

Appropriation 1967	$280,000,000
Estimate, 1968	198,000,000
Recommended in the bill	142,375,000
Reduction below estimate	−55,625,000

In recommending the appropriation of $142,375,000 for fiscal year 1968, the Committee is recommending that the development of two prototype supersonic transport aircraft (SST) of the same design be initiated and that the program be conducted at the level recommended in the budget. Almost all of the reduction recommended is based on a difference as to the source of the funds for the program, not in the amount of funds provided for the program.

The Committee believes that development of large passenger aircraft which will fly at supersonic speeds is the next step in air transportation and that the step will be made whether or not the American SST program goes on. There are two other supersonic transport aircraft under development. The British and French are working together on the Concorde and the Soviet Union is working on the TU-144 supersonic transport. Whether the program funded in the accompanying bill goes forward or not, supersonic air travel will become a fact of life in the not too distant future. If the aviation industry of the United States, which has led the world for years, does not proceed to this next step in commercial aviation, not only will there be a loss in prestige, but sales to foreign airlines and the foreign exchange they would bring would be lost. Also, American commercial airlines would have to purchase aircraft abroad in order to meet competition with the result of worsening our foreign exchange balance.

Since aircraft manufacturing and operations require great technical ability, this is an area in which high cost American labor can compete effectively with foreign competitors.

There are uncertainties in the supersonic transport development program. There always are uncertainties in development programs. There are uncertainties involving the construction of the aircraft, uncertainties involving the economic feasibility of the aircraft, and uncertainties as to the effect on the ground of the sonic boom which will be created by the SST in supersonic flight. Each of these problems has been studied extensively. The Committee has been furnished with a large number of very voluminous studies involving these matters. Extensive testimony was taken in the hearings.

The preponderance of evidence indicates that the supersonic transport aircraft which is proposed is within the technical state of the art and can be constructed successfully. Mach 3 military aircraft have been flying for several years, including the YF-12-A and the XB-70. Titanium has been used in military aircraft since 1952. The next generation fighter-bomber aircraft soon to enter the operational inventory will have variable sweep wings. Prototypes are being flown now. There are unknowns and risks in the SST development program, and the task is far from easy, but with good performance by those involved, the development program should be successful.

Studies on economic feasibility are less positive since economic feasibility studies attempt, to a large extent, to foretell the future in an area in which many vital factors cannot be accurately anticipated. As a general statement, it can be said that air travel is increasing rapidly, not only in the United States, but throughout the world. It can also be pointed out that the early jet passenger aircraft quickly became popular with the air travel consumer when they first began replacing piston engine aircraft.

A basic factor in all modes of transportation is the time required to reach the destination. Enough people have preferred faster horses, faster trains, faster ships, faster automobiles, and faster aircraft to spur on the never completed quest for more speed. It appears reasonable to predict that the SST aircraft will be a sought after means of transportation just as other vehicles have been which markedly reduced the amount of time required to travel between distant points.

No one can predict with certainty whether peace or war will prevail in the world in the 1970's and 1980's. No one can predict with certainty whether the economic prosperity of the present will continue in the next two decades. These two factors will strongly affect the market for supersonic transport aircraft. Only the passage of time will let us be certain, but reasonable predictions can be made based on current trends, and these trends indicate that a supersonic transport aircraft will be marketable in sufficient quantities to pay back the cost of developing the aircraft and to provide a reasonable return for the investors involved, including the government.

It is not known at this time whether a supersonic transport aircraft such as the one under development can be flown over land areas at supersonic speeds. Considerable research has been conducted in an attempt to gain knowledge on which to base a conclusion. The studies made have primarily involved the use of military aircraft. Studies on the effects of sonic booms under varying conditions of weather and flight patterns and studies of ways to reduce the sonic boom effect from the SST aircraft are still underway. It may well be that the noise on the ground caused by supersonic flight will prevent the aircraft from being flown over populated land areas at speeds faster than that of sound. The FAA's evaluation of the economic feasibility of the aircraft has taken this into consideration, and has based the economic feasibility of the aircraft on the predicted market if only overseas flights are permitted. Even under these conditions, it is estimated that enough aircraft will be sold to return the costs of the plane's development.

Until prototype SST aircraft are constructed and flown, we will not know precisely the sonic boom characteristics of this particular aircraft. The market for the aircraft cannot be actually determined today. Studies and debates cannot answer these questions. If all development programs were delayed until such questions were answered, progress in technology would be stymied.

Public financing is common to all three SST aircraft now under development. The governments of the United Kingdom and France are investing $1.4 billion in the Concorde. There is no private financing in the Soviet Union so that government is providing all of the funding for the TU-144.

The estimated total cost for research, development, and initiation of production of the American SST is $4.5 billion. The government is committed to advance, according to the estimates, $1,242,000,000 for development. Under present agreements, the government has no financial obligation beyond the development of two prototype aircraft and one hundred hours of flight testing of those aircraft. It is thought that if the prototype aircraft are successful, private capital can and will finance the production program. Since production programs entail less risk than development programs and are closer to the point at which funds are earned, private financing will be less costly for production than for development.

The cost of the development program and the time lag before income begins are so great that the companies involved do not possess the financing potential required. The interest which private capital would require on the amounts involved over the long period of time for which funds are required would raise the cost of the aircraft considerably, perhaps to the point at which the aircraft would cease to be economically feasible. The government can borrow money at lower rates. Public participation in the financing of the development program, along with participation by the contractors and the airlines, and private financing of the production program appears to be the best approach to the problem. The investments by the contractors and the airlines serve to retain business incentives and the participation of the government makes the development program economically feasible.

The total funding requirement estimated for the supersonic transport program during fiscal year 1968 is $349,000,000. Approximately $99,000,000 will be available in carryover funds from fiscal year 1967, leaving a balance needed of $250,000,000. The U.S. airlines have agreed to contribute $52,000,000 of risk capital to the development effort and this $52,000,000 will be applied to the fiscal year 1968 program, leaving a new obligational authority requirement of $198,000,000.

Of the $349,000,000, $229,000,000 will be required for development of the airframe, $110,300,000 will be required for engine development, and $9,700,000 will be required for supporting research and development and administration of the program.

The contracts for the development of the supersonic transport call for the manufacturers to share in program costs. If the gov-

ernment should decide to terminate the SST program for its convenience, thus precluding the manufacturers from the opportunity of recouping their investments, the sum of the manufacturers' cost-share at that point would need to be repaid. It has been the procedure of the Federal Aviation Administration to budget for these contractual obligations of the government and to set aside funds provided for this purpose in a "pay-back reserve". The sum of $18,833,000 of the $198,000,000 requested for fiscal year 1968 is budgeted for the "pay-back reserve". In addition, $35,380,000 will have been set aside for the "pay-back reserve" from amounts previously appropriated.

The Committee directs the Federal Aviation Administration to apply the entire $54,-213,000, the total amount which would be set aside in the "pay-back reserve" by the end of fiscal year 1968, to the fiscal year 1968 program. This is in accord with action taken recently by the Committee on the Department of Defense Appropriation bill.

The Committee recognizes the obligations of the government to the contracts, but feels that since the government is always obligated to pay termination costs on contracts, and since the government would not and could not fail to pay amounts due contractors upon termination for the convenience of the government, these funds should be utilized for the program rather than set aside. The Committee is very desirous of maintaining close scrutiny over the costs of the SST program. The elimination of the "pay-back reserve," in addition to being a better utilization of financial resources during fiscal year 1968, gives the Congress a closer and tighter control over program costs of the SST. Further, the Committee does not believe that it is likely that the government will be required to terminate the program and believes that the accumulation of large amounts (which could total $156,000,000 at the end of the development phase of the program) for this purpose is unnecessary.

A further reduction of $1,412,000 is recommended in the amount estimated by the FAA to be required for 1968. The FAA included an additional 7½% above the program costs estimated by the contractors for those cost overruns which are always found in large development programs. The Committee believes that $1,412,000 of the cost overrun requirements should be deleted. Of course, the cost overruns will be either more or less than 7½% since cost overruns are by their very nature, impossible to accurately predict. The 7½% factor is based on experience with other aircraft development programs and is lower than actual cost overruns have been in many such programs, but to further emphasize its intention of carefully monitoring the cost of the program, the Committee recommends the $1,412,000 reduction.

In summary, the Committee believes that development of the SST is of sufficient importance to the country that the funds recommended should be appropriated. The value of the SST goes far beyond the saving of time of airline passengers. The jobs created by the production and operation of the aircraft will be important to thousands of Americans. The health of a major industry will be preserved. Foreign exchange will be earned, and the more than one-half billion dollar investment already made will be protected. The time is near for the next step in air transportation, supersonic flight, to become a reality. The United States must either be a part of this new era or forego its leadership position in air transportation.

The Eighth Annual Report of the Federal Aviation Administration for the Fiscal Year 1966 has the following at pages 78 and 79:

NOISE ABATEMENT

When turbojet aircraft were introduced into commercial service (1958), civil air transport took a big step forward in speed and reliability. The noise of jet operations, however, soon began to pose a problem, especially for communities near major metropolitan airports.

As jet traffic grew, both in frequency and locations served, the noise problem grew correspondingly, and various ameliorative actions were undertaken. These included, among other things, the development of preferential runway systems, minimum altitudes for aircraft operations, special aircraft arrival and departure routes, planned compatibility of land use with airport operations, and technological improvements in aircraft engines and airframes. Measures such as these have provided some relief. But the development and use of noise-abatement techniques and equipments have not kept pace with the problem crescendoing from the rapidly growing jet traffic.

The seriousness of the problem was reflected, during the reporting period, in its being the subject of a special study in the Executive Office of the President. A Jet Aircraft Noise Panel of the Office of Science and Technology (OST), led by OST's director, made the study and forwarded a report to the President on March 18, 1966, advising him that the Federal Government must take the lead in seeking solutions to the problem. Recognizing that much useful work has already been done to reduce the effects of jet aircraft noise, the Panel made recommendations stressing need for qualified data, both current and projected, from which standards and formulas can be evolved. Important applications of such data would include development of specifications for aircraft and engine manufacturers, community planning guidelines for land use compatible with airport operations, cost-effectiveness analysis of proposed noise remedies, and an equitable rationale for allocating the cost of noise abatement.

The President called for a "concerted effort to alleviate the problems of aircraft noise," and early in April the FAA Administrator announced the establishment of a Noise Abatement Staff to carry out FAA's part of this effort. This staff is working closely with the Office of Science and Technology, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the aviation industry.

One of the specific recommendations of the Jet Aircraft Noise Panel's report assigned to FAA for carrying out (in this instance, in cooperation with HUD) calls for a projection to 1975 of jet noise problems at the 25 or so major jet airports; subsequently, coverage is to be extended to all U.S. communities expected to have jet service by 1975. Another recommendation calls for an overall systems analysis of the developing jet noise problem at New York's Kennedy, Chicago's O'Hare, and the Los Angeles International Airports. This systems analysis is intended to result in practical programs lending themselves to Federal sponsorship to help the three communities cope with the aircraft noise problem. By year's end, FAA had prepared plans for fulfilling its responsibilities under the program and in line with guidance provided by the Interagency Program Evaluation and Direction Committee, a special White House body composed of Government officials and industry advisers.

The introduction of jet air carrier service at Washington National Airport on April 24, as mentioned earlier, required special measures to keep noise disturbance to a minimum. Special arrival and departure procedures were devised, based on the Potomac River as the natural flyway for these purposes. The climb profile of jet aircraft departing Washington National is adjusted so that noise from the aircraft will be the least amount compatible with requirements for safe operations.

The possibility of improving the profile for landing aircraft is the objective of a flight-test program being conducted by the Agency; this program is investigating the operational feasibility of a two-segment approach designed to keep the airplane and its jet noise as high as possible (within safe operating limits) above the communities surrounding the airports as it makes the earlier part of its approach.

The Agency's research and development effort continued during the year on the problem of reducing compressor and exhaust noise.

The Federal noise-abatement program will result in a quieter environment for airport vicinities. Maximum relief will depend on active cooperation of all concerned—Federal, State, and local governments, the aviation industry, airport operators, and the affected communities.

Lewis S. Goodfriend, the well-known acoustical expert, is the editor of Sound and Vibration, which name is self-explanatory. In the April 1967 issue, in addition to technical articles on the subject, there is an excellent article commencing on page 8 on "Objective and Subjective Measurement of Truck Noise" by Ralph K. Hillquist of the General Motors Corp.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE MEASUREMENT OF TRUCK NOISE *

(By Ralph K. Hillquist, General Motors Corp.†)

Truck passby noise is best evaluated by techniques involving band analysis and subsequent conversion to empirical loudness or annoyance measures, however more cumbersome they may be. As a monitoring or enforcement tool, A-weighted sound level is shown to be a satisfactory direct measure. It represents the optimum of existing weighted sound levels and provides quite adequate approximation to the subjective appraisal of truck passby noise.

Control of the noise emitted by motor vehicles has become a matter of increasing concern not only to the various vehicle manufacturers and their suppliers, but also to legislative bodies and law enforcement agencies. In the trucking industry in particular, efforts toward self-regulation of vehicle exhaust noise began about 15 years ago. This early work resulted in a standardized test procedure for determining truck passby noise and an arbitrary but acceptable loudness limit of 125 sones at a distance of 50 ft, now documented as SAE Standard J672.[1]

The use of a band-analysis technique has been supported by the automotive industry because of the better definition of the noise spectra involved and closer agreement with subjective reaction than was afforded by single meter readings. With increased interest in the enforcement of noise-limit statutes, however, simpler methods for determining vehicle loudness are being demanded. Thus, testing has been conducted by many groups to investigate the adequacy of direct meter readings for this purpose.

The Noise and Vibration Laboratory of the General Motors Proving Ground has been involved with this problem since its inception, principally through activity with the Vehicle Noise Committee of the Automobile Manufacturers Association (AMA). In addition to making the necessary measurements to determine compliance with the SAE Standard and performing development work on exhaust systems for the truck-producing divi-

* This paper was presented to the 72nd Meeting of the Acoustical Society of America.

† Noise and Vibration Laboratory, General Motors Proving Ground, Milford, Michigan 48042.

[1] "Measurement of Truck and Bus Noise—SAE Standard J672," in *1965 SAE Handbook* (Society of Automotive Engineers, Inc., New York, 1965), pp. 887–889.

sions of General Motors, this laboratory has also undertaken several programs to investigate the relation of various objective measures of truck passby noise with subjective appraisal of this noise. The most recent of these programs, also conducted for the AMA, is the subject of this article.

TEST PREMISE AND DESIGN

Experiments designed to relate subjective reaction to some physical experience with an objective measure of it are necessarily comprised of two parts. The first involves acquisition from the participants of some quantity, be it a magnitude; a selection, or whatever, that is representative of their subjective response to the stimulus. The second is the determination of the objective measures, and thence the correlation of these with the subjective data.

In earlier experiments of this type conducted by our laboratory and other groups, subjective evaluations of single-truck passbys were made by small groups of jurors using various absolute, relative, or categorical scales. Using the absolute scale of say 0 to 10, where 0 represents a pleasant-sounding or totally inoffensive truck noise (silence, perhaps?) and 10 represents the other extreme of loudness or annoyance, the juror simply assigns a value to each passby heard. For a relative scale test, on the other hand, each passby noise is assigned a value by the juror that represents its loudness or annoyance with respect to some standard baseline truck (or trucks). Categorical scale testing involves the choice from several preconceived descriptions (acceptable, offensive, intolerable) for each of the noises heard.

The first two of the test types provide subjective data having reasonable sensitivity and scaling of values, features not obtained by the categorical tests. Unfortunately, however, they, too, have a wide variance or spread of data, because of the difference in subjective response of the jurors involved. Inherent also in these tests are the nonlinearities of the scale of each juror, as well as scale drift or slope change as a function of time, test exposure, short-term remembrances of preceding noises, and the like. These, of course, are not unique to tests of this type but are rather a characteristic of humans in similar situations.

To overcome these drawbacks, or at least to exercise some control on the subjective variance, an experiment using paired-comparison techniques was investigated. With a larger number of jurors making a preference choice between two stimuli, i.e., two passby noises in close succession, subjective sensitivity and scaling were anticipated but with less vagary and variation. The subjective data obtained would not be absolute, but rather a scaled or weighted ranking of the stimuli involved. Data on an absolute scale were not considered essential, as correlation between subjective and objective scaling was sought. That is, the objective was not to find a limit or a value for delineating *acceptable* or *objectionable* truck noises, but rather to determine which of the objective measures scaled these noises in best agreement with subjective opinion.

A relatively large number of stimuli was also considered desirable. Recognizing that the total number of intercomparisons (i.e., combinations of pairs) is essentially one-half the square of the number of stimuli, one of two alternatives had to be followed, in order to keep the amount of subjective labor within bounds. The most obvious was to use only a small number of stimuli; for example, 25, resulting in 300 intercomparisons. If all pair combinations were not employed, however, intercomparisons of a larger sample size were possible without an attendant increase in the total number of comparisons made.

Forehand knowledge of the approximate results of the experiment could also be put to use in its design. That is, if the objective was to order or rank the stimuli, a preordering based on the same criteria could determine which stimuli pairs needed to be subjectively evaluated and which could be assumed to follow the preordered pattern. For stimuli with nearly identical characteristics, this would not be possible; for the range of truck noises to be used, however, this was felt to be valid. In essence, then, the subjective appraisal of truck noises having widely separated characteristics (e.g., loudness) was assumed beforehand, and jury consideration was required only for those intercomparisons involving trucks with similar characteristics. This was the premise upon which the test was founded, in large part justified by the experience and results from prior tests.

Thus, an experiment having 100 passby noises, preordered as required, involved in 648 paired comparisons, was designed. Note that this is about one-eighth of the comparisons required for all possible combinations. Each of the stimuli was intercompared with about 12 neighboring stimuli in the preranking (e.g., the truck noise preranked as No. 25 would be compared to each of those ranked from No. 19 through No. 31). Several duplicated comparisons were also scheduled to provide a check on juror consistency.

TEST EXECUTION

Although most realistic, an actual or simulated highway location for the subjective judging of real trucks would have been quite impractical for this test. Thus, reproductions of magnetic tape recordings made of truck passbys under actual highway conditions were used as the auditory stimuli. To obtain the recordings, our crew spent several days at a test site meeting the requirements of the SAE procedure, midway up a long uniform grade on a section of limited-access highway.

These recordings were carefully scrutinized, and all but 130 or so were rejected for use because of excessive or unusual tire noise, rattling of chains or loading ramps, gear changes, and, in one instance, a surprisingly loud refrigeration unit on the trailer. For these remaining trucks, A-weighted and N-weighted (the frequency response of an N-weighting network approximates the inverse of the 40-noy equal-noisiness contour [2]) sound levels were determined and the trucks tentatively ordered, based on the sum of these two measures. Further elimination was based on the desirability of a broad even distribution, centered about 85 dBA, and on the uniformity of apparent passby speed, so that the growth and decay characteristics of the sound intensity envelope were similar throughout the sample. The final 100 trucks (of which 46 were gasoline-engined and 54, diesel-powered) were then subjectively evaluated and adjusted, as necessary, to provide the final preranking, in order of decreasing preference (i.e., best to worst).

Presentation tapes were then prepared by copying from the original recordings. Each pair was recorded so that one truck followed the other much the same as they might on the highway. The schedule of presentation was randomized to some extent, to avoid patterns or an imagined routine to the jurors. The same truck was not repeated oftener than every fourth comparison. Order within the comparison was alternated, so that the *louder* came first every other time. Gradual transitions were made from the quieter trucks to the louder ones, and back again, so that the comparison variation was not overly severe from one to the next. Each comparison pair was 12 to 15 sec in length, with 5 to 8 sec between pairs.

To make the subjective appraisals, 20 jurors were selected from our laboratory staff. These were formed into two groups of 10 each. Of the 20, 15 were male, 5 were female; 10 were college graduates. Average age was just over 27 years. None had any serious hearing abnormality or impairment.

Some of the jurors had had previous experience in tests of this type or in subjective evaluations of motor-vehicle noise, whereas for some this was a totally new experience. All were informed of the nature of the task before them and the intended usage of the results.

The tests were conducted in a large semi-anechoic room (24 x 45 ft in size), hopefully representative of a free-field, outdoor environment. This indoor location was used because of its convenience and better control of the noise and comfort climate, distractions, and other environmental parameters. An Altec "Voice of the Theater" loudspeaker system was used for reproduction, having two horns for frequencies above 500 Hz (one for each of the two channels recorded) with the signals below 500 Hz being combined and reproduced by a central low-frequency unit. The result was a surprisingly clean reproduction of the truck passby, including the illusion of left to right motion, with good fidelity of the recorded sounds. Playback levels were adjusted so that the jurors heard the truck at actual recording level.

The jurors were seated in chairs arranged in two rows of five, approximately 30 ft from the speakers. Earlier work indicated that a 30 ft spacing is about right to obtain the proper feeling that a truck is passing by 50 ft away. Located in the listening area were four microphones, distributed so that their summed signal represented the average signal heard by the jurors. This signal was recorded during the test and these recordings were used for subsequent analysis, so that all measures were made of the noise as heard by the jury.

The jurors were instructed to choose from each pair the truck that they *most preferred* and vote for it. Each was left to his own interpretation of *preference* and of the test location being simulated. No qualifying or biasing statements were made inferring that loudness or annoyance be used as a criterion. *No-choice* (equal preference) votes were allowed.

The presentation tapes were placed so that about 3 comparisons a minute were made. No replays were allowed. Short breaks were taken after every 36 comparisons. At every other of these interruptions, each juror shifted to the next adjacent seat location. In this way, nine of the ten locations were occupied by each juror during the test, this being another randomizing effort. To avoid undue fatigue, each jury worked in two sessions of about four hours each, on successive days.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The availability of an IBM 1620 digital computer prompted the techniques used for the reduction and analysis of the data obtained during the test sessions. Several programs were written specifically for processing the raw subjective data (the jurors' votes) and providing output information on the ranking and scale factors of the 100 trucks, juror performance with duplicated comparisons, vote distributions, and similar items. A scheme utilizing the summation of votes cast for each truck was employed to determine the subjective scaling associated with the ranked ordering of the trucks (i.e., the weighted-scale factors locating each of the trucks on a subjective scale whose extremes are the *most preferred* and *least preferred* trucks thus determined).

A vote matrix of order 100 was generated from the preference votes made by the jurors; each element v_{ij} represented the votes for truck i in preference to truck j. *No-choice* votes were counted as one-half for each of the two trucks. The principal diagonal of the matrix was of course zero. The subjective scale rating SR_i was found as

$$SR_i = \frac{100}{V} \sum_{j=1}^{100} v_{ij}$$

where V is the maximum possible number of votes (i.e., the product of the number of jurors and one less than the total number of stimuli). Ranking of the stimuli was

[2] K. D. Kryter and K. S. Pearsons, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 35, 866–883 (1963).

found by arranging the individual scale ratings in ascending numerical order, with scaling within this ranking provided by the scale rating values. For appearance, the subjective scale ratings were adjusted to give terminal values of 0 and 100.

From the recordings made during the jury sessions, sound levels having A, B, C, DIN 3 (this is a European weighting, specified in DIN 5045; it is no longer in general use) and N weightings and the levels for the preferred-frequency octave bands were determined. The peak observed value of the rms signal during the passby was used for these levels. The 500, 1000, and 2000 Hz band levels were combined to provide another direct measure, somewhat akin to a Speech Interference Level. Loudness levels by the ARF (Beranek-Armour equivalent-tone method, specified in SAE J672) [3,4] and Stevens Mark II [5] and Mark VI [6] methods and perceived noise level [2,7] were computed for all the trucks. Logarithmic scale units (e.g., phons) were used for these computed values to be consistent with the sound-level data (specified on the logarithmic decibel scale). Including the 1000 Hz octave band level, 11 different objective measures were obtained for correlation with the subjective data.

The truck-noise stimuli covered a range of *73 to 97 dBA, or 50 to 240* ARF sones, with a mean and median value of about 85 dDA or 125 sones. Representative spectra for several trucks as originally recorded and as heard by the jurors showed excellent agreement.

Correlation and regression analyses were made between the various objective measures and the subjective scale values. Regression coefficients, variances, and correlation coefficients were computed in the *least-squares* sense, using a linear regression model. For some data, various exponential and power function models were attempted, but the fit obtained was worse than the linear fit in all cases.

TEST RESULTS

A tabulation of the coefficients of correlation and determination and the normalized variances for the various objective measures should be reviewed. The correlation coefficients are an indication of the agreement of the objective and subjective data and also of the variations attributable to the scale of the measure involved. These values do not differ appreciably from one another, it would appear, but they do indicate a ranking of preferential measures with some scaling. The coefficient of determination is the square of the correlation coefficient, and it is a measure of the proportion of the elements of variance in the objective measure data that are also present in the subjective scale factors. These coefficients emphasize the differences between measures, albeit with no greater statistical significance, and point out the increasing uncertainty of prediction of subjective response for many of the measures considered.

The normalized variance values are the computed variances for the various methods (i.e., the square of the standard error of estimate) divided by the variance for ARF loudness level, thus giving a measure of the spread of the respective data in relation to the method now in use. These variance data indicate the reliability and accuracy of predicting the subjective response to a truck passby noise from an objective measure of it.

Both correlation and variance information suggest that the empirically derived sensation measures (i.e., ARF loudness level or perceived noise level) more adequately agree with subjective appraisals. A-weighted sound level appears to correlate as well with the subjective data, although exhibiting a greater variance (at a 99 percent confidence level).

Correlation of the objective data indicates that an A-weighted sound level of 85 DB is equivalent to an ARF loudness level of 102.9 phons (125 sones) with a standard error of estimate of about 1.5 dB. Based on this finding, one may predict with reasonable certainty that 98 percent of trucks meeting the 125-sone specification will have noise levels no greater than 88 dBA.

In comparison to previous tests, better correlation of the objective and subjective data, with somewhat less variance, was experienced in this test, suggesting that the subjective data obtained were more precise. The rank ordering of trucks obtained showed few differences from the preranked order. Composite vote distributions were typically as desired, approximately even for trucks adjacent in the ranking, and unanimous or nearly so for trucks widely separated. This would bear out the original premise of the experiment.

Studies of the juror and jury behavior were also made. Although each of the two juries had different backgrounds and experience with this type of testing, their individual results were essentially identical. For this reason, the subjective data were combined for all subsequent analyses.

Of most importance is the behavior on duplicated comparisons, as this gives insight to the repeatability of consistency of the subjective appraisal. Fourteen pairs of paired comparisons were included in the experiment for this purpose. In some of these, the order of stimuli within the pair was the same, and in the others, the order was reversed. For the individual jurors, the number of correctly repeated votes ranged from 6 to 11 of the 14 possible pairs, with a mean of 8.3. The score for the composite or total jury was 9, suggesting that a group is more consistent in its subjective reaction to noise stimuli than in an individual.

The composite of vote distribution shows the first truck of the pair was preferred about 58 percent of the time, the second about 31 percent of the time, with no selection made the remaining 11 percent. This grouping appears to be disproportionate, inasmuch as an equal distribution of *quieter* truck first and *louder* truck first in ordering the comparisons was made. This result would suggest that, unless the difference in stimuli is great, the more recent of a pair is predominant in the juror's mind and perhaps is judged as less preferable on this basis. (Such behavior has been observed in other experiments using paired-comparison techniques; in a study involving jet aircraft noises, the second of a pair of identical sounds was judged to be noisier on the average by an equivalence of 2 dB L_p.) [8]

The variance for the mean of the individual jurors on the composite subjective scale factors was also computed. Normalized by the corresponding variance for ARF loudness level, this juror variance is 2.2, about the same as the poorer correlating direct measures, as shown earlier. This variance, viewed with the other juror performance data just presented, suggests that the reliability and consistency of the subjective appraisal of an individual observer cannot approach that of the various objective measures.

	Correlation coefficient	Coefficient of determination	Normalized variance
ARF (SAE J672) loudness level	0.96	0.93	1.00
Perceived noise level	.95	.90	1.43
Stevens Mk VI loudness level	.95	.90	1.44
A-weighted sound level	.95	.90	1.47
DIN 3-weighted sound level	.94	.88	1.71
N-weighted sound level	.94	.88	1.78
Stevens Mk II loudness level	.93	.87	1.86
0.5/1/2 kHz octave band level	.93	.87	1.91
B-weighted sound level	.92	.85	2.21
1 kHz octave band level	.89	.79	3.04
C-weighted sound level	.86	.74	3.78

My constituent, Dr. Herman Goodman, has called my attention to an article in the May 15, 1967, issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association, where at page 35 they discuss "A New Pollutant? 'Chronic Noise Syndrome' Predicted":

A NEW POLLUTANT?—"CHRONIC NOISE SYNDROME" PREDICTED

The decibel level and wave forms may be identical, but there is a difference between "sound" and "noise."

The ambulance's screaming siren gives the motorist useful information: "clear the road." This is sound.

When the same intense sound wakes a light sleeper or baby it becomes noise.

Chronic noise also may affect health in subtle psychological and perhaps physiological ways, a number of scientists now believe.

"One day, I believe, we will recognize a chronic noise syndrome," comments Samuel Rosen, M.D., of New York City. "At an unexpected or unwanted noise the pupils dilate, skin pales, mucous membranes dry; there are intestinal spasms and the adrenals explode secretions.

"The biological organism, in a word, is disturbed."

Like many others, Dr. Rosen reasons that the constant irritation of environmental noise cannot be ignored. "The ear has no lids to protect it."

NOISE PATHOLOGY

But the evidence for noise pathology—apart from that produced acutely—is scant. Those concerned about "noise pollution," whether apartment dwellers or clinicians, find themselves data-poor crusaders.

A recent New York symposium, sponsored by the American Institute of Physics, reviewed the problem of this newly-recognized "pollutant," evidence for damaging effects, and the avenues for future research. Dr. Rosen reported his findings in an interview with *JAMA* MEDICAL NEWS prior to the symposium.

It has been 19 years since a U.S. court established precedent by awarding a drop forge worker compensation for occupational presbycusis. Most industries now protect their employees against chronic noise levels in the dangerous range, exceeding 85 to 90 decibels (db).

But each day U.S. residents hear noises exceeding this level on an acute basis. A Chicago subway train passenger may receive 90 to 100 db during his trip. The environmental noise level in a typewriter-filled office area is just under 80 db. Most acoustical scientists concede that the ambient level of environmental noise increases at least one decibel per year.

For many persons the noxious level is distant; for others it is as close as the radio in a neighbor's apartment. Individual sensibilities make a great deal of difference, at least psychologically.

What about subtle physical damage to chronic noise? At the Central Institute for

[3] L. L. Beranek, J. L. Marshall, A. L. Cudworth, and A. P. G. Peterson, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 23, 261–269 (1951).

[4] F. Mintz and F. G. Tyzzer, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 24, 80–82 (1952).

[5] S. S. Stevens, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 28, 807–832 (1956).

[6] S. S. Stevens, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 33, 1577–1585 (1961).

[7] K. D. Kryter and K. S. Pearsons, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 36, 394–398 (L) (1964).

[8] K. D. Kryter, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 31, 1415–1429 (1959).

the Deaf in St. Louis, chinchillas and guinea pigs exposed to brief, intermittent periods of above normal—but supposedly tolerable—noise levels have developed swollen cochlear membranes and obliteration of inner ear hair cells. This effect has not been seen in humans, perhaps because of post-mortem changes.

The electroencephalographic patterns of sleeping subjects are radically altered by sound levels that do not awaken them, Stanford Research studies indicate.

Among the best-quoted suggestive evidence is the study of hearing levels in 10 nations gathered since the 1950's by Dr. Rosen and colleagues.

PRESBYCUSIS LEVELS

Levels of presbycusis can be correlated with the environmental sound levels of various populations, says Dr. Rosen. Blood nutrition to the ear appears involved in the process.

A relatively "noise-free tribe of aborigines in southeast Sudan provided a sharp physiological contrast to cultures where noise levels are higher, such as in America. The Mabaan tribesmen were surrounded by a village background noise level below 40 db. Rare festivals provided the highest noise levels, about 110 db.

Tribesmen at age 75 had hearing levels as high as those 25 years old, recalls Dr. Rosen. The physiological response to loud noises also was unique among the Mabaans.

Plethysmographic measurements of capillary blood flow changes indicated rapid constriction of the blood vessels with a loud, unexpected noise. The flow was quick reestablished, however.

IMPAIRED NUTRITION

The New York businessman, in contrast, has the same rapid capillary constriction, but recovery is much slower. This would suggest generally impaired nutrition, including that to the ear, during the reflex action.

The relationship is complicated, however, notes Dr. Rosen, who is a pioneer in stapes surgery and on the faculty of Columbia-Presbyterian Medical School. The Mabaans also have an extremely low incidence of coronary disease, varicose veins, and low serum cholesterol levels.

The blood vessel system of the tribesmen—for dietary, genetic, and other reasons—would thus seem generally more elastic.

Subsequent studies have been conducted among Egyptians, Lapplanders, Germans, Finns, Yugoslavs, Bahamians, Cretans, and Russians.

In all populations the correlation between cardiovascular disease and presbycusis has persisted in tandem with environmental noise levels, the investigator said.

The relationships between audiometric data, plethysmographic responses, and coronary symptoms among the occupants of two Finnish mental hospitals strengthened this concept, he said.

LOW-FAT DIET

Patients in a hospital where the diet was low in fat had better hearing, quicker constrictive recovery, and less evidence of coronary disease than occupants of a neighboring facility. Matched subjects in the second mental hospital had been fed on the standard high-fat diet familiar to the nation.

"Our hypothesis remains that in those areas where the cardiovascular system is in good condition, nutrition to the ear is also good," says Dr. Rosen.

"How much the repetitive mild insult of noise with periods of recovery will damage this situation is difficult to evaluate. It certainly would not do any good."

Although the psychological annoyance of noise is just as difficult to quantify, recent events have spurred research in this area. The national plan to introduce a fleet of supersonic transports (the "SST") into civilian aviation has led to numerous studies on the effect of the sonic boom.

A National Sonic Boom Evaluation Office, under technical direction of the Stanford Research Institute and the President's Office of Science and Technology, is coordinating the studies.

The reason is that the sonic boom will be the best-shared sound in history.

In a transcontinental SST flight, notes N. E. Golovin, PhD, people located within a corridor 30 to 50 miles wide below the flight path might hear the boom. This could bring the sound to 10 million persons during a flight across the United States, says Dr. Golovin, who is with the Office of Science and Technology.

There now exist accepted techniques for evaluating human reaction to noise. These are being used also in judging noise levels from existing aircraft. Future aircraft, he adds, will be certified on noise criteria as well as safety.

"At this time, the problems of noise pollution are not yet understood clearly enough to be resolved through regulation or other forms of executive action . . . ," says Dr. Golovin. Even those most concerned about the problem would agree.

What are the other alternatives? "At the root of all our problems," says Tony Embleton, PhD, "is the vast amount of mechanical energy we have at our disposal."

NOISE REDUCTION

There are mechanical methods to cut noise, but these must be balanced against possible losses of economic or work benefits. If a noise abatement device cuts the speed of a jet, the decrement must be considered. Sound-proofing of apartments increases the construction cost of a typical unit by 10 percent and this affects the rent.

If reduction at the source is not practical, noise sources can be surrounded by absorbent material or simply isolated from people.

While economic criteria may impeded noise abatement, it also can be turned to aid it, suggests Dr. Embleton, a member of the National Research Council of Canada, "A quiet product is a salable one."

PRESENT PLAN

If health considerations can be documented, chronic noise may be reduced more rapidly. "But right now, we'll be doing well to keep present noise levels from rising," the panelists agreed at the New York symposium.

The ear is perhaps more susceptible to damage than any other human organ, says Hallowell Davis, MD, emeritus director of research, Central Institute for the Deaf. But it also is surprisingly adaptable and resistant.

It is after all the "inner man" that makes the distinction between noise and sound—not his hearing mechanism.

Comment around the country includes the following:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING, AUTOMOTIVE ENGINEERING LAB,
Ann Arbor, Mich., July 24, 1967.

Representative THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: In the Detroit Free Press of Saturday, July 15, there was an excellent article, a copy of which is attached, outlining the efforts of certain New York citizens to reduce noise. This article makes reference to your efforts and those of a Citizens for a Quieter City, Inc. group.

During the last several years we have had activity in the city of Ann Arbor to enact an effective noise ordinance. This has resulted in an ordinance having a maximum vehicle noise limit under specified test conditions of 90 decibels. Our problem finally settles down to a difficult one of enforcement by the police. In general we have not made much progress in making Ann Arbor noticeably quieter.

I would like to request that you send me any information that you have concerning the Citizens for a Quieter City, Inc., and how I may contact this group. I am interested in participating in activity of this sort, particularly as it bears on our problem in Ann Arbor and the State of Michigan.

It appears to me that this is one more example where the states have almost completely abdicated their responsibility and it is going to be up to the Federal Government to do something about the great amount of unnecessary noise with which we all live. I regret that this must become another area of Federal activity, but I confess I see little alternative.

I will appreciate any information you can provide on this subject for my use.

Yours, sincerely,

JAY A. BOLT,
Professor.

[From the Detroit Free Press, July 16, 1967]

NOISE FOES WAGE WAR ON CONSTRUCTION DIN—NEW YORK GROUP AROUSED BY "DECIBEL FATIGUE"

NEW YORK.—Tense, nervous, ill-at-ease, irritable, jumpy, anxious? Can't sleep? Can't concentrate? Can't relax?

You may be suffering from decibel fatigue, the constant bombardment of city sounds—honking horns, jackhammers, banshee sirens, grinding garbage trucks, battering air compressors, clunking trucks, traffic roar—which Dr. Vern O. Knudsen, physicist and former chancellor of the University of California at Los Angeles, call a "slow agent of death."

Noise can not only raise your blood pressure, make your heart pound, push into neuroticism and deafness—it can kill you, he says. Researchers have killed mice with 175 decibels. And the noise level in many large cities is rising at the rate of one decibel a year. If not checked, Dr. Knudsen warns, it will, in 30 years, become "lethal."

A decibel is a unit of sound-pressure named for Alexander Graham Bell. A food blender whirls up 93 decibels of sound; a pneumatic jackhammer pounds out 94; a subway train screeches around a curve at 104; a loud power mower 107; a jet plane takes off at 150. "Ninety decibels bombarding several hours a day can cause an irreversible hearing loss," says Dr. Knudsen.

"Softer noises take a severe toll in illness, jangled nerves, loss of sleep, concentration and serenity."

Noise has always plagued city dwellers. About 50 years before the birth of Christ the Romans complained so loudly about the noise from the hotrods of antiquity that Caesar banned all chariot traffic at night.

Yet today in America few cities have enforced vehicle noise abatement laws. (An exception is Memphis, titled "quietest city in the United States.")

And New York state is the only one to apply the "decibel" definition to motor vehicles—88 decibels (three decibels louder than the level at which the U.S. Air Force recommends use of ear protectors to prevent hearing loss).

Construction and demolition noise is generally exempted from daytime control, considered a "temporary nuisance" and the "price of progress."

Last March a group of New Yorkers, harassed by the din of about 1.5 million automobiles, 124,718 trucks, 6,491 buses and 6,500 motorcycles plus 10,000 yearly demolition and building projects and 80,000 street repair projects, decided to add to the general uproar and raise their voices to launch a "quiet, please" campaign.

It grew out of the outrage of a Sixth Avenue theater manager, whose apartment and office were bombarded by the wrecking balls, 103-decibel giant air compressors, and jackhammers of a three-year construction project to extend a subway under Sixth Avenue.

Robert Allan Baron, complaining all the way from the corner policeman to the Com-

missioner of Health to the Mayor, found no one, including the United States Department of Health, had any power to muffle the noise.

Baron quit his job, went to Baden-Baden, Germany to attend the IVth International Congress for Noise Abatement, returned with model legislation from 22 European countries, and enlisted the support of Congressman Theodore Kupferman whose noise abatement bill submitted when he was City Councilman had been silenced in committee.

Deciding that only citizen pressure could lower New York's decibel level, Baron, along with Jerome Nathanson of the New York Society for Ethical Culture and Dr. Samuel Rosen, noted ear surgeon, formed the Citizens for a Quieter City Inc., and staged a conference.

"Most cities are 24-hour sonic nightmares," says Nathanson, CQC president. "Yet most city noises are unnecessary and can be eliminated or substantially reduced at relatively little cost, with today's techniques and devices."

CQC supports a proposed city building code designed to reduce the "acoustical garbage" seeping from one apartment to the other, by soundproofing walls and floors, quieting of machinery, and limitations on noises transmitted through ventilators and ducts.

It advocates silencers and mufflers to be attached to jackhammers, air compressors and other construction equipment; or enclosing such equipment with a noise barrier on construction sites; portable soundproof cladding for pile drivers.

It also urges limiting of construction hours from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. and restricting unnecessary noise; enforcing horn blowing regulations; and cracking down on noisy trucks (including the city's garbage trucks which "gnash loudly between gigantic metal teeth, dawn-cracking city dwellers out of their last hour of sleep").

Requiring (as in some European cities) all garbage cans to be encased in rubber.

Running freeways through sunken "groove ways" to absorb traffic noises . . .

Burying garages, wherever possible, underground to muffle excess automobile noises . . .

Controlling jet planes, helicopters and other aircraft over cities.

"Industry has recognized that excessive noise is an occupational hazard with boilermakers, riveters, pilots, aircraft maintenance workers, and men exposed to gunfire," says Nathanson. (Claims for hearing losses in *these occupations* are about $2 million annually.)

"Businesses spend millions reducing sounds in noisy offices and factories.

"If we recognize the health dangers of noise pollution, and put it in the same category as air and water pollution, all of which can be solved with techniques we already have, we can do much to make our cities more livable.

CQO has resolved to keep on making noise until New York becomes a quieter city.

They don't intend, however, to get as tough as Queen Elizabeth was in 1560 when her subjects complained about the night noise caused by the widespread practice of husbands beating their wives.

She promptly passed an edict prohibiting males from beating their women after 10 o'clock in the evening.

WCBS-TV EDITORIAL

Subject: Noise.
Spokesman: Michael F. Keating.
Broadcast: September 6, 1966.

A lot of us returned to New York on Labor Day after a summer vacation and—did you notice what a racket is in this town? The honking sirens; the squealing of automobile tires; the roaring of the trains, and so on. Around the airports is added the screeching of the jets. After a week at the beach—where the only noise is the surf—you notice on returning that this is a very noisy place in which to live.

Now, everyone assumes that cities must be noisy. And obviously New York is going to be noisier than the beach in Maine. But the question is: Do cities have to be as noisy as they are?

Some people think not, and that's why President Frank O'Connor of the City Council, Majority Leader David Ross and Councilman Robert Low have called for a City Council inquiry into noise and its possible reduction. And that's why Congressman Ted Kupferman of Manhattan has suggested that the federal government sponsor research into what he calls "noise pollution."

We're all for these steps, because, if we can cut down the racket, life will be a lot more civilized here. After all, a quiet beach is a nice place to visit, but it's not practical for many of us to live there.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 27, 1967]

HUSH, DAMMIT!

(From a St. Louis Post Dispatch editorial)

We propose a rousing round of silence for Representative Theodore R. Kupferman of New York City, who again has introduced a bill in Congress calling for some quiet.

Being a Manhattanite, Mr. Kupferman knows whereof he speaks, softly we trust, when he says that noise abatement is as important as pollution abatement.

Having endured for years a daily anvil chorus of garbage cans, jack hammers and unmuffled mufflers, Kupferman wants to establish a Federal Office of Noise Control which would assist states and cities in doing something about the cacophony that batters the nation's ear drums.

We read of Kupferman's action not 10 minutes after our windows had been afflicted with an advance case of the jitters by a distant sonic boom, and just about the time a lad roared up in his father's Jukebox Eight and sounded the teen-age mating call for 38 deafening seconds before the scraggly-haired girl up the street came giggling out the door.

For Kupferman's bill we would like to shout hurrah, but no one would hear us. We'll settle for a whispered bravo.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 18, 1967]

BILL WOULD CREATE NOISE CONTROL OFFICE

Rep. Theodore R. Kupferman (R-N.Y.) will reintroduce legislation today to establish a Federal Office of Noise Control.

The bill would provide for grants to aid state and local programs aimed at controlling excessive noise, particularly from jet aircraft and for research into "sonic booms" that can be created by travel at supersonic speeds.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 1, 1967]

SILENCE, ANYONE?—NOISE FIGHTER SOUNDS OFF ON D.C. DIN

(By John Fialka)

It's said that one man's music is another's noise, but to Rep Theodore R. Kupferman's long-suffering ears anything over 90 decibels is probably "noise pollution."

The hum, rattle and roar of New York City—which some people find exciting—bothers Kupferman, a Republican who took over Mayor John V. Lindsay's Manhattan congressional district in 1966.

It all started in 1962 when a man "going crazy" because a construction crew had teamed up three air compressors under his window, when a judge kept awake by the whine of his neighbor's air conditioner, and when a lady bothered by transistor radio listeners on a bus all went to see their city councilman.

Rep. Kupferman, then their councilman, has kept busy on the problem ever since. He has introduced the first national legislation on the noise problem, and has harassed noise makers in New York by traveling around with a sound engineer and an audiometer.

"Compared to New York this is a country town," he said, shouting over the noise of passing traffic in front of the Longworth House Office Building recently.

Nevertheless, he says, Washington has its noises that, in time, may approach the fabled din of Fun City.

Behind the Rayburn Building, for example, he found a construction project where an air compressor—one of his favorite targets—was roaring away.

"I'll bet that's 100 decibels, easy," shouted his aide, James J. Kaufman, as the congressman posed beside the ear-splitting machine, sticking his fingers in his ears.

A photographer had to resort to hand signals to tell him not to smile. Construction workers looked on puzzled.

"The whole point," Kupferman explained, after walking some distance away, "is that these things can be silenced now and should be because people are being damaged." For $200, he added, a silencing device could have been installed on the compressor that would have brought the noise level down considerably.

Although most of the major legislative advances in controlling noise have been in Europe, Kupferman cites Dulles Airport as a "striking illustration" of how zoning laws can be used to curtail jet noise by creating a buffer zone of rural land around the runways.

"The jets are really a major problem," said Kupferman as he walked back to the Capitol, "I've had letters from people who claim the sonic boom is causing cracks in the Grand Canyon."

Although sound does cause property damage, the damage Kupferman usually complains about is human damage. "In the cities our ability to hear is gradually being deadened," he said, pointing out that the noise level in major cities has risen a decibel a year for the last 30 years.

He cites studies that show that persistent noise can cause total or partial deafness and impair people's ability to perform even simple tasks.

The studies show that sudden noises, like the roar of a motorcycle in a quiet suburban neighborhood, can cause an upset stomach, hypertension and various nervous disorders.

One psychiatrist has even pointed out that when a sudden noise awakens a person, his dreams are interrupted. In some circumstances this could produce a "dream deficit" the psychiatrist said, that could lead to neuroses and even psychoses.

A decibel is a unit for measuring the relative loudness of sounds. The sound of a jet engine approaches 130 decibels, about the maximum bearable to human ears. A whisper is measured at 20 decibels. The rattle of a subway train, about 95 decibels, is at the level where sustained intensity can produce permanent deafness.

[From the Greenwich Village (N.Y.) Villager, Mar. 30, 1967]

OUT OF THE WOODS

(By Woody Klein)

"Nothing has changed. You just can't do it in this town. The forces of mediocrity and monotony will always bring things down to the same level."—Former Parks Commissioner Thomas P. F. Hoving.

This uncharacteristic statement from the former star of the Lindsay administration was published in *The New York Times* earlier this month in the bottom of a story the day that Hoving stepped down.

The headline was more optimistic: A Look

At The City's Parks Reveals That Much Has Been Accomplished But Much Still Remains To Be Done. "Hoving's Happenings," it was reported, had left a major mark on this city.

Nevertheless, Tom Hoving's momentary sober reflection—noticed and reported by *Times* reporter Ralph Blumenthal—made me think that beneath all the effervescence of some public officials is a kind of creeping skepticism.

Any public official with major responsibilities who is honest with you will admit that with all that happens in a busy 15-hour working day, he still wonders if any real changes are occurring in New York.

The same thing can be said of the legislative arm of government, too. City Councilmen, Congressmen, State Senators, and Assemblymen—they must wonder, too, if all of the bills they pass actually change anything.

Take noise control. Congressman Theodore R. Kupferman, of the 17th district, has done more in Congress in the past year on noise legislation than anyone.

But the noise is still unbearable in New York.

Take air pollution. Councilman Robert Low has done more in this field, along with Commissioner Austin Heller, than has been done for decades. New York has some of the strongest anti-pollution measures in the country.

But the air pollution is still dangerously high.

Take poverty and unemployment. Human Resources Administrator Mitchell Sviridoff has put together a team of officials second to none in the nation. And he has a far-reaching program.

But there seems to be no noticeable difference in the conditions among the poor.

The pattern can be repeated in every field in which municipal government is working.

Regardless of the political leadership, the money spent on programs, the laws passed and the excitement engendered in the press by men such as Tom Hoving, the public asks the inevitable question: Is there really change?

This writer is occupied in a field—housing and development—in government in which it is difficult to measure progress. For decades now we have had a housing shortage in this town. Can this be changed in a year or two?

I think the answer to this sober, realistic question which public officials like Tom Hoving express honestly must come from a change in attitude on the part of the public.

No matter how vigorous a Mayor may be, how personable and talented his commissioners and administrators, no matter how able the legislators elected to office, little can be done without the public's full and active support.

Resistance to change in New York is seen every day, among the labor unions, the business community, the academic leaders, the settlement group fraternity, even among the city's 300,000 civil servants themselves who often cling to the status quo.

John Lindsay has tried to do something about stepping up the glacier-like progress in New York. In his inauguration speech of 1966, he referred to this town as the "Proud City" and invited all New Yorkers to be proud of their home town and to participate with government.

Those of us in the Lindsay administration would like to believe that spiritually there has been an awakening in the municipal government of the need for reform.

Physically, change is slow. It will only come if the public really wants it and is willing to work and make sacrifices for it.

[From the Suncoast Signal, vol. 9, No. 5, January 1967]

EMPTY BARRELS MAKE THE MOST NOISE
(A FRENCH PROVERB)

Man's hearing, nervous system,—even his sanity—is menaced as much by noise as by such phenomena as radiation, polluted air and residues from pesticides. In common, the immediate effects of these modern horsemen of the Apocalypse are difficult to measure. "Noise is energy travelling thru space which on striking the ear is converted into unwanted sound". The decibel (db), a log ratio between 2 sound pressures, measures noise in terms of acoustic pressure, power and intensity.

Ordinary conversation is 6 db and acceptable noise tolerances are 35 db in a classroom, 55 in a restaurant and 60 in a sports arena. At 80 db one can barely hear the voice on the telephone. At home the kitchen is the noisiest room, where simultaneous operation of the fan, dishwasher and garbage disposal unit blasts the housewife's nerves at 100 db, 30 db less than the roaring of a jet at take off. Man's noise tolerance is about 90 db for a short time (danger level) after which he experiences physical discomfort, and beyond 130 db, noise becomes intolerable. Noise level in cities has risen approximately 1 db a year for the past 30 years, according to Congressman T. R. Kupferman (N.Y.), whose Federal bills to alleviate noise pollution deserve everyone's support.

According to Dr. L. E. Farr (U. of Texas) chronic exposure to noise reduces our sleep and contributes to nervous fatigue, emotional disturbances, gastro-intestinal upsets and headaches. Dr. J. Buchwald (N.Y.) noted that chronic interruption of man's sleep by noise, particularly the time spent in dreaming (20%), results in daytime delusions, hallucinations and nightmarish memories. Noises from trucks, sirens, riveting or blasting need not to be taken for granted. An effective silencer costing less than $200.00 can be attached to the air compressor of the street driller that effectively absorbs most of the blasts, but the attachment is not used because there's no law to enforce this!

Otologist S. Rosen (N.Y.C.), and P. Olin (Helsinki) noted that in S.E. Sudan the Mabaan tribe age more slowly, exhibit practically no coronary (heart) disease and maintain near maximum hearing even to age 70. It is a country where man-made noises are rare and the Mabaan's survival depends on his acute hearing. Since 1951 U.S. Industry forfeited approximately $15 million in loss-of-hearing suits among employees!

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News, Jan. 23, 1967]

NOISE POLLUTION: IT'S BECOME AGONIZING TORTURE

(By Edward O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—"Ring, ring the bells without interruption until the criminals turn first insane, then die," the Chinese used to say 2,000 years ago. They had found that noise was a more agonizing method of execution than hanging.

Today humans in urban society around the world are saturating their environment with noise, and scientists are coming to the conclusion that noise pollution should be dealt with as firmly as air and water pollution.

Last April, a new House member from midtown Manhattan, Republican Theodore R. Kupferman, proposed creation of the Office of Noise Control within the Public Health Service to bring the federal government directly into the problem for the first time.

The new office would be a clearinghouse for information and research, working with other federal agencies, state and local government, industry and anyone else who believes that the endurable limits of unwanted sound may be upon us.

The Kupferman bill did not pass. "Congress remains deaf to the problem," he explains. It takes time to win acceptance of a new idea at the Capitol, but just as the need for strong measures to control air and water pollution was finally seen, it also seems inevitable that in the next few years, a similar attack will be made on noise pollution.

According to Kupferman, the noise levels in American cities have risen about one decibel per year for the last 30 years. The maximum level bearable by the ear is around 130, but chronic exposure to much lower levels, or to especially upsetting kinds of noise, may produce serious physical or psychological damage. He is again urging Congress to take now the preventive steps on noise pollution that should have been taken 10 or 20 years ago on air and water.

Noise control is staggeringly difficult for many reasons. There is no running away from noise. The National Park Service made known a few days ago that prehistoric Indian cliff dwellings in the remote Southwest have been damaged by supersonic booms from military aircraft.

Since the psyche is involved, human reactions to sounds are unpredictable. The editors of the New Yorker Magazine threatened to move their offices unless the landlord turned off the elevator loud speakers and gave them relief from Jerome Kern. They won, but the landlord is probably still wondering what all the fuss was about.

Kupferman himself, as a member of the New York City Council, tried without success to outlaw the playing of transistor radios in public without an earphone. Countless apartment residents have found themselves trapped in a sea of noise flooding in on them through dry-wall partitions, low ceilings and thin floors, hollow doors, air conditioning and heating ducts, and back-to-back medicine cabinets that also serve as marvelously effective speaking tubes to the folks next door.

Airliners are in a class by themselves. Some companies boast of the whisper-line quiet in their passenger cabins and then fill the void with their own Jerome Kern or a movie. For people on the ground unfortunate enough to be living or working beneath the new giant jets, all that can be said is that the Federal Aviation Agency is aware of their plight and agrees that "noise is the most intense and worrisome problem now facing the aviation industry."

Like most other problems, correction of noise pollution is far from hopeless. Much can be achieved through building codes, zoning, local anti-noise ordinances, wider application of acoustical engineering, and in general through close attention to a growing plague that has been largely overlooked.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1967.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: We refer to your recent inquiry in behalf of Miss Millicent Brower concerning sonic booms heard in New York City.

The Air Force wishes it were possible to accomplish the air defense mission without disturbing private citizens. At the present time, there is no known method of dissipating the pressure wave that is produced when an aircraft exceeds the speed of sound. Notwithstanding, scientists are trying to find ways to eliminate, or at least reduce, the audible disturbance caused by the sonic boom. In the meantime, all feasible and practicable measures are being exercised to minimize the distress to our citizens without jeopardizing the air defense capabilities of the United States.

Required aircrew training and test flights are being performed by Air Force aircraft in many areas of the United States. These flights are closely monitored and flown according to Air Force directives designed to minimize sonic boom disturbances. For example, supersonic flights are restricted to altitudes above 30,000 feet so as to limit the attendant sonic booms to overpressures that are considered harmless to persons and

structures. Unfortunately, this does not eliminate the audible sound of the sonic booms. Every effort is made to avoid major metropolitan areas, however, a supersonic flight of only 100 miles in length could expose an area in excess of 5,000 square miles. For this reason, on occasion a sonic boom may be heard in a city such as New York without an actual overflight.

There may be a possibility that the Air Force caused the reported flight disturbances in the vicinity of New York City; however, the absence of dates and times makes it impossible to confirm the report or to identify the specific aircraft and their home units.

Your interest in this matter is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. LINGO,
Colonel, USAF, Congressional Inquiry Division, Office of Legislative Liaison.

[From the Saturday Review, May 27, 1967]

NOISE POLLUTION: A GROWING MENACE

(By Millicent Brower)

Progress is being made in the fight against air and water pollution, but a third jeopardy—noise pollution—has only recently begun to gain attention. The ever increasing and unchecked din that envelops all of us has escalated to a roar; a noise-harried public is beginning to ask what can be done.

Noise is no longer merely an annoyance. It is expensive. Hearing loss resulting from exposure to excessive noise has long been a concern of industry, where claims made by workers now mount to $2,000,000 annually. Noise-induced hearing loss is a recognized occupational hazard with boiler-makers, riveters, pilots, aircraft maintenance workers, and men exposed to gunfire. Experiments have been made in reducing sound in previously noisy offices and shops; results are inconclusive, but there seems to be a relationship between a quieter atmosphere and greater productivity, as well as less absenteeism.

Writers long have been among those most affected by noise. Schopenhauer railed against the noise of coachmen's whips; Marcel Proust worked in a soundproof studio. Playwright Peter Weiss, bothered by traffic noises in the street below his Stockholm apartment, rented a quieter studio for writing. In Israel, the government has erected a sign near the home of Nobel Prize winner S. Y. Agnon: Quiet Agnon is Writing.

But the greatest tragedy is the adverse effect of noise on health. In the United States alone, 11,000,000 adults and 3,000,000 children suffer some form of hearing loss. Noise is not typically associated with one of the two main types of hearing loss—conductive deafness, in which something interferes with the conduction of sound to the auditory nerve. But a certain proportion of cases of the second type of deafness—nerve deafness—are clearly related to exposure to excessive noise. The loud noises damage the hearing mechanism to a point where the sensory nerve function is depressed. Hearing loss results, and in all probability the changes are irreversible.

Presbycusis, which is hearing loss accompanying old age, is common in civilized countries, and recent studies show that presbycusis apparently occurs to a greater degree in noisy environments. Because the hearing loss usually begins in the higher frequency sound ranges, beyond the range which is critical for speech discrimination, it often goes undetected until it progresses into those areas affecting understanding of speech.

Two physicians, Dr. John D. Dougherty of the Harvard School of Public Health and Dr. Oliver I. Welsh, chief of the Audiology Unit of the Veterans Administration Outpatient Clinic in Boston, made a study of loss of hearing in the high frequencies. Their report was published in the *New England Journal of Medicine*. In the process of hearing, they explained, sound waves are transmitted to the inner ear's cochlea, a shell-like chamber which is lined with hairlike sensors. High-frequency sounds are analyzed by the ear at the front of this chamber, while the low-frequency sounds are dealt with all along the path of the inner cochlea. Consequently, there is persistent wear in that one small area where the high-frequency sounds impinge; this area wears out first. The two physicians also noted marked tissue changes in the hair cells during noise exposure. According to Dr. Dougherty, "the hair cells regenerate themselves after noise exposure; but after long-term exposure, it is entirely likely that they will wear out altogether."

Dr. Dougherty has noted increasing deafness in the general population. "There is incriminating evidence that community noise levels are causing hearing loss," he says. Even the average kitchen is guilty, he believes; the whirring and whinning of kitchen machines is too loud for comfort and health. Also on Dr. Dougherty's guilty list in the rising decibel count are autos, trucks, buses, subways, power lawn mowers, and outboard motors. Sirens and police whistles, too, are dangerous to hearing, he asserts, because they affect the sensitive high-frequency range.

As yet, Drs. Dougherty and Welsh point out, individual hearing loss in noisy environments cannot be predicted, although it is known that some ears are more prone to hearing loss than others. Certain decibel levels, however, have been generally recognized as a threat to hearing. Long-term exposure to decibel readings over 80 is known to cause hearing loss. Temporary deafness can be caused by short exposure to levels between 100 and 125. Listening is painful between 125 and 140. Beyond that, at 150, the ear can be damaged enough to cause permanent hearing loss even with short exposures. "Acoustic trauma," also mentioned in the doctors' research, is loss of hearing resulting from a sudden burst of noise, such as gunfire, or a firecracker going off near the ear. Hearing acuity diminishes; the loss may be temporary or permanent. Skeet shooters, gunnery instructors, soldiers exposed to gunfire—all have a high incidence of permanent hearing loss. Doctors advise persons who must spend a considerable portion of their time in noisy environments to wear ear protectors. Dr. Dougherty goes even further: He advises limiting the amount of time spent in noisy surroundings. In his opinion, it's all right to put the wash in the machine, but don't sit there listening to it get clean.

A dedicated foe of noise, and a man who terms noise "one of our most severe health hazards," is Dr. Samuel Rosen, consulting ear surgeon at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York City. In an effort to determine the effects of noise on man, Dr. Rosen studied the Mabaans, a tribe in the Sudan, where the noise levels are extremely low. The Mabaans are a peaceful people, living in the stage of development of the late Stone Age. Undisturbed by civilization until 1956, the Mabaans use neither guns nor drums. The loudest noises they might hear are a neighbor's beating a palm frond with a stick, the roar of a wild animal, thunder, and their own shouting and singing at festivals, which occur only a few times a year.

Dr. Rosen found the Mabaans to be generally healthy; there is no obesity, and little incidence of caries. When they do get sick, they get malaria, dysentery, pneumonia, pulmonary tuberculosis, yellow fever. Venereal disease is minimal. There are the usual childhood diseases. All illnesses are still treated by the local witch doctor. In the Mabaan culture there is a total lack of hypertension, coronary thrombosis, ulcerative colitis, acute appendicitis, duodenal ulcer, and bronchial asthma—ailments common in Western civilization.

Sound-pressure levels are measured in decibels, named after Alexander Graham Bell. For long-term exposure to any sound of 85 decibels or above, the U.S. Air Force recommends use of ear protectors to prevent hearing loss. Here are decibel readings for various sounds:

10—Breathing.
20—Whisper.
40–50—Low street noise.
60–70—Conversation.
81—Rush-hour traffic outside Grand Central Station, New York City.
93—Food blender.
94—Pneumatic jackhammer.
99—Auto in tunnel.
104—New York subway train rounding curve.
107—Loud power mower.
111—Loud motorcycle.
117—Jet airplane passenger ramp.
130—Machine gun.
150—Jet plane at takeoff.
175—Jet rocket launching.

Audiograms and electrocardiograms, blood pressure and blood chemistry tests were given to 541 Mabaans, aged ten to ninety. The first important discovery Dr. Rosen made was that the ten-year-old and the ninety-year-old Mabaans have exactly the same blood-pressure levels; the blood pressure of the Mabaans remains unelevated throughout life. The tests also showed normal cardiograms and low cholesterol levels. In Americans considered normally healthy, blood pressure levels increase progressively with age, especially after forty. Another finding was that the systolic blood pressure of the Mabaan men is consistently lower than that of the women; here the pressure is higher in men up to age forty-five, after which the pressure of women exceeds that of the men. The second important discovery Dr. Rosen made was that the Mabaans suffer very little hearing loss in the high frequencies with advancing age. The hearing of the elderly Mabaans was far superior to older people in civilized countries; and the Mabaans had superior hearing to any other group of humans ever tested.

In still other tests on the Mabaans, Dr. Rosen studied the effects of noise on blood circulation. Previous tests had been made at the Max Planck Institute in Dortmund, Germany. Loud noises in the 95 to 110 decibel range were played to volunteers whose fingers had been wired to record the reaction of the arterioles. The loud noises caused definite constriction of the tiny blood vessels.

The Mabaans were similarly tested during a five-minute period of a loud noise. Vasoconstriction occurred; in some cases, it lasted for twenty-five minutes after the noise ceased. The constriction of the blood vessels resulted in a diminishing of cardiac output; a compensatory effect was bradycardia, in which the heart slows down to gain momentum for a big push of blood through the system. Another change noted: The pupil of the eye greatly dilates during a loud noise burst.

Comments Dr. Rosen: "Every time a person hears a loud noise, the precapillary blood vessels constrict. With prolonged noise exposure, whether intermittent or continuous, the contraction goes on along with the noise. But this contraction may continue after the noise stops and may become permanent. This contraction alters the supply of blood throughout the system; less blood goes to the nerve of hearing; this malnutrition causes hearing loss. It is possible that such continuous noise could ultimately cause elevation of the blood pressure."

Dr. Rosen also finds a relationship between the constriction caused by noise and cardiovascular illness. The United States, he re-

minds us, has the highest incidence of arteriosclerotic heart disease in the world. "Noise is a factor," Doctor Rosen believes. "There are many other causes. Studies made all over the world indicate that high blood pressure, excessive smoking, overweight, high cholesterol levels, and high-fat diet favor the development of arteriosclerotic heart disease."

Dr. Howard Bogard, who is chief psychologist at the Queens Hospital Center, told a New York State hearing on jet noise of several ways in which noise can seriously affect mental well-being: "A person who is under personal stress and who is subjected to a barrage of noise will be further aggravated by the noise; his ability to cope with his personal problem will be lessened. The noise could trigger this person into a neurosis. Without the noise, he might be able to deal adequately with his problem. . . ."

Dr. Bogard characterizes noise as "an intruder . . . the uninvited guest at the party. Noise is disturbing; it interferes with concentration and communication; it disrupts rest and sleep. When a person hears an unwanted noise, the person has a massive feeling of impotence and frustration. He thinks, what can I do? About many things, he can do something. About an unwanted noise, he cannot. . . . Loud, unwanted noises push everything in your consciousness out. The noise takes prominence over everything else. You cannot study and concentrate when there are distractions. Intermittent noises cause intermittent distractions. It is certainly not neurotic to dislike noise."

Why aren't we more conscious of such insidious effects of noise?

European countries have already recognized noise as an environmental pollutant. England prepared an exhaustive report on noise and has adopted a national noise reduction code; noise abatement laws are also in effect in France, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries. Moscow bans horn-blowing, and General de Gaulle, on the New Year, outlawed transistor radios in public places in all of France. To date, however, noise abatement programs have been limited in this country. But in scattered areas there are signs of an awakening.

On the national level, Congressman Theodore R. Kupferman has made a forward move in national noise reduction by introducing a bill, H.R. 14602, that would establish an Office of Noise Control within the Office of the Surgeon General. The bill would allocate funds for control, prevention, and abatement of noise, and for research.

In New York City, Councilman Robert A. Low has introduced resolutions in the City Council calling for the banning of transistor radios in public places, and for hearings on noise. New York City already has drawn up a building code that regulates noise in new apartment dwellings. The code, not yet approved by the City Council, calls for the reduction of airborne noises traveling from one apartment to another through wall partitions or floors or coming from a public hallway; for the quieting of machinery such as central air conditioning; and for limitations on noises transmitted through ventilators, shafts, ducts, and outlets, as well as noises emanating from a neighboring building. The new code has its limitations, but it is hoped that it will reduce the amount of acoustical garbage seeping from one apartment to another.

Mayor John Lindsay, strongly determined to do something about noise, established a Task Force on Noise Control several months ago. The Task Force currently is preparing recommendations for the Mayor. Already it has made one substantial change: The police, after a meeting with the Task Force, agreed to discontinue using a new "banshee" siren which has a very irritating pulsating sound. The noise not only bothered the public but also proved ineffective—drivers did not know from which direction the sound was coming. In Task Force discussions it has been suggested that the ultimate solution to the siren problem might be an electronic signal device in each car which would light up to warn the driver of the approach of an emergency vehicle. Besides doing away with the nuisance of sirens, the device might also cut down on the high accident rate of emergency vehicles.

"This city has an obligation to protect its citizens against all forms of violence, including assault by decibels," says the Mayor. "In a modern industrial civilization, I suppose we have to be prepared to tolerate some increase in the sound level, but I see no reason why this city or its people should have to put up with battering, shattering noises."

Trucks, on tollways and public highways are limited by New York State Law to a decibel count of 88. This law is enforced along the Thomas E. Dewey Thruway at Larchmont by state police who are stationed at toll booths and use a hand decibel meter. Truck noise has been reduced, and fleet owners are quieting their own trucks. Acoustic experts recommend that truck noise be federally regulated because of heavy interstate traffic. Neither the truck law nor the new building code is tough; but these codes point the way. In time, the decibel count for trucks will be lowered and the building code will be made more stringent.

Aircraft noise remains a big problem. Last year a Presidential panel suggested that perhaps the Federal Aviation Agency should be given the authority to set maximum noise levels allowable for aircraft. This seemed like a good idea until the FAA recommended setting a level of 105 perceived noise decibels for a jet plane three miles from takeoff—a level which would inetrfere with normal activities such as conversation and phoning. The very active town of Hempstead, Long Island, and residents around Kennedy and LaGuardia fields have taken a firm stand against FAA authorization of such a high noise level and have suggested 85 PNdb. as acceptable.

Recently, jet aircraft engines have been developed that generate less noise, although they are not yet in use. These new quieter jets will cost money; if the public wants quiet in the skies, it must exert pressure on the aircraft industry and the government to get it.

Another area where relief from noise is urgently needed is in construction. A quieter pile driver has already been invented; and similar less noisy equipment could be developed. Silencers and adequate mufflers could be attached to present equipment, or it could be isolated or enclosed. Another look should be taken at laws such as one which allows unlimited construction noises between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. in New York City and elsewhere. Why should millions of people be awakened by drills and jackhammers at 7 a.m.?

Echoing in our noise future, too, is the sonic boom, that double thunderclap that creates a fifty- to eighty-mile noise carpet beneath the supersonic jet. The boom breaks windows, cracks plaster, and causes what doctors term a "startle" reaction in humans.

In the opinion of Dr. Dougherty and others, we must begin to act on such problems now, and opinion leaders such as the press must help. News media, for example, could rate every consumer machine, whether an automobile or a home machine, not only on its style and efficiency but on its quietness. Community planners could carefully piece noise-producing businesses away from residential and highly populated areas. In line with this view, residents of midtown Manhattan who live adjacent to the Pan Am Heliport have asked for removal of the site to a nonresidential East River location and for routing of copters over the waterways. To further mitigate noises in communities, Dr. Dougherty urges that citizens attempt to have legislation passed that will limit the amount of sound generated by a horn, motor vehicle, or any noise-producing machine. Limits in the subways should be set for the levels of noise inside the cars, as well as outside.

Machines are getting bigger, and power is getting more powerful. In urban areas, the noise level rises one decibel each year. According to the logarithmic ratio of progression, that means that in ten years New York City and other cities will be twice as noisy as now.

Are you prepared for that?

[From the Medical Tribune, Mar. 18, 19, 1967]

EARS JOIN EYES, LUNGS, AND SKIN IN POLLUTION—LEVEL OF NOISE IN INDUSTRIAL CULTURES ENDANGERING THE HEARING OF THEIR CITIZENS, ACOUSTICIANS SAY

It's hard to tell when the environment is being subtly polluted if you have no stern base line of ambient purity.

The difficulty of apprehending small increments in toxicity is compounded by the public's tendency toward apathy for any issue that doesn't threaten immediately to alter its schools, streetcar fares, or prices on luxury items.

So it was that the condition of rivers went unquestioned until after most of the fish floated belly up. And air that blistered house paint, eroded marble, and made stockings run went virtually unchallenged until whole communities rebelled against endemic conjunctivitis.

Apathy's aftermath had to be a compromise. Having earlier accepted technologic progress, we now say we will accept a certain level of progress' pollution—so many parts per billion, and no more.

Since we didn't realize, or much care, how the air and water were being mucked up as recently as 25 years ago, it seems possible that other aspects of the environment are being unrecognizably sullied today.

Experts across the country are rising to identify just such a new pollutant. The noxious agent, they say, is noise.

In New York, the mayor has appointed a task force on noise control. The panel's job is to establish maximum levels to protect New Yorkers from unwanted sound in their homes, at work, and in public places.

In more than a half dozen U.S. cities, new building codes are being drafted with an architectural ear cocked toward the clamor that is not now shut out of most apartments.

On television's noncommercial educational channels, viewers from Bangor to San Diego are being shown a filmed science program that identifies noise as a principal, but largely uncontested, pollutive assault on our lives. The film, produced by National Education Television, features one of the country's pioneer acoustical physicists urging that "society should declare war on noise."

This particular expert is Vern O. Knudsen, Ph.D., former chancellor of U.C.L.A. and one of the consultants called to help remedy the troubles that sapped the sonic vigor of New York's new Philharmonic Hall. Dr. Knudsen, self-acknowledged "nut on noise," habitually wears earplugs of his own design when he ventures from the insulated calm of his U.C.L.A. laboratory building. The stoppers are calculated to attenuate, but not completely block, the stridency of life on the streets and freeways.

In the television film, Dr. Knudsen warns viewers—in much the same tone that cancer researchers use about cigarettes—"We don't have to wait for all the answers to do something" about noise.

The adjuration points up a principal difficulty of dealing with noise as a pollutant. Laboratory tests can demonstrate that a lot of noise can hurt a lot—make us deaf. But does some noise hurt some? No one yet knows. Noise below the measurable threshold

for physical injury may be annoying. Its potential for damage, however, is disputable. Acousticians are limited to hushing the more obvious incursions on our aural well-being.

Among the various investigations under way to help quantitate the noise pollutant are such as conducted by Dr. Samuel Rosen, of Mount Sinai Hospital in New York. Having seen, in the course of his otologic practice, a measurable erosion in the hearing acuity of many of his older patients, Dr. Rosen wondered if some of it might be attributable to long life amid noise.

For a comparison he went to a quieter civilization, a village of primitive Mabaan tribesmen in the African Sudan. There the daylong average sound intensity is only one-tenth the hum of a refrigerator. And there audiometer tests showed that 90-year-old men could hear nearly as well as 10-year-old boys.

At the Central Institute for the Deaf in St. Louis, Dr. James Miller and associates shatter the calm of caged chinchillas by exposing them to hours-long barrages of mixed frequencies up to 80 db. in intensity. The chinchillas, whose inner ears are more surgically accessible than those of most other laboratory animals, are pretrained to hurdle a fence at the sound of a pure tone. At the end of their noise exposure they are given a jump-for-yes audiometer test. Their subjective response is later compared with the objective measurements of electric potentials along the three turns of their cochlea. A map of deadened response to auditory stimuli can then be drawn for comparison with micrographs of the cochlea.

What these measurements show is that when noise deafens it wipes off the cochlear hair cells. The thoroughly noise-damaged chinchilla cochlea has a smooth membrane from which no hair cell will ever sprout again.

Can the effect be extrapolated from chinchillas to citizens? The investigators believe it can, with allowances for different injury thresholds. Man apparently is about 20 db. tougher in many frequencies. So if three days of 80 db. deafens a chinchilla, perhaps it would take 100 db. to injure a man to the same extent.

But 100 db. of mixed noise is readily available to some men in their work. The riveter of steel plates gets more than that, according to industrial measurements. Not for *three days without* cease. But how about several hours a day, five days a week, say for 10 years?

Many state labor departments have set 80 db. as the maximum allowable long-term noise level for industry. Above that, an employer has a hard time disclaiming responsibility in a deafness compensation action.

Yet 85 db. is not too far above the peak in a major New York City subway station rush hour. Can something be done about it? "We know how to make it quieter," says William A. Leek, president of the Acoustical Materials Association. "We have the technology, but public apathy is holding it back."

One noise, however, seems to pierce apathy in civilization's centers all over the Western world. Airplanes may have become the first universal disturbers of the peace. Hardly a major airport near a residential area has not felt the effects of householders roaring in reply. The aviation industry rightly fears that today's noise-limiting restrictions on take-off paths and power levels over suburbia bodes even greater public disquietude when supersonic transports are introduced.

SSTs presumably can fly over oceans without causing undue fuss about sonic boom. But flights over land can have a big, unappreciative audience on the ground. Governments with a stake in SSTs are worrying about it. The U.S. Federal Aviation Agency already has experimentally boomed the populace of Oklahoma City to test its irritability quotient.

Stanford Research Institute, on Government contract, has recruited volunteers to sit indoors and out at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., and listen to aircraft noises. The volunteers are being asked, in effect, what kind of noise pollution they like best. They listen to the roar of a low-flying subsonic jet, then the boom of a high-flying supersonic jet. They are requested to mark on a scoresheet which noise is more "acceptable."

At a recent New York press conference, the Acoustical Material Association's Mr. Leek ventured an opinion that the typical hyperamplified discotheque offers sustained intensities above 85 db.—the maximum allowable in industry. Granted that the customer chooses this auditory exposure, the esthetic contradictions in the newly characterized pollutant are discernible. At the same press conference, Wallace Waterfall, secretary of the Acoustical Society of America, summed it up: "One man's noise is another man's music."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 3, 1967]

SOUND CONDITIONING

The next luxury for city people, after air conditioning, may well be sound conditioning of dwellings.

Many people like the idea of one or more "quiet rooms" in their homes. (A "quiet room" is one that reduces outside noises but of course does nothing to control the do-it-yourself noises produced inside.)

A survey of 10,000 home owners in 17 American cities made recently by Market Facts, Inc., found that two-thirds of those interviewed were interested in having noise control built into their next house.

We are happy to learn that quiet can be provided in bedrooms of new dwellings at a cost that is not prohibitive. Now it is to be seen if families are ready to spend money for this new comfort. It will probably take time and promotional work on the part of the noise-reducing industry to develop a market.

In Great Britain, where a governmental agency provides "noise grants" to aid people who undertake to soundproof several rooms in their homes, there has been a slow response. The British Association for Control of Airport Noise has received only a small number of requests for assistance although it has funds to subsidize the noise-reducing efforts of some 40,000 householders.

But this situation can change quickly. After a few sonic booms in the night we expect to see a sudden rise in demand for residences with sound-conditioned bedrooms. There is need for continued research in this field to be ready for this day.

[From Life, Jan. 27, 1967]

ALL THOSE NOISES THAT ASSAIL US

This is the noisiest age in human history. The volcanic eruption of Santorin in 1400 B.C. was no doubt louder than anything heard since, but it was a one-shot explosion followed by a merciful silence. Jet-age noises are continuous and *crescendo*.

Everyone's air, streets, factories and kitchens are full of increasingly powerful machinery. Decibels mount with power unless special measures are taken to offset them, which they rarely are. The war against noise has barely begun. A big battle now shaping up involves the supersonic transport, whose shock waves could bring millions of Americans within range of a sonic boom which, even at 65,000 feet, sounds like a nearby shotgun. The participants in the battle will be the Federal Aviation Agency, which wants noise control, and the builders of the SST, who are interested in payload. Unless efforts to soften its roar are successful, SST may be prohibited from flying over land.

Even without SST, noise is already a public problem as serious as other kinds of pollution. Since 1962, when the Supreme Court decided that airport operators are responsible for noise damage to their neighbors, they have been swamped in claims. U.S. building codes, despite FHA pressure, have all but ignored the noise problem so that our thin-walled apartments are far ore reverberant than those of the acoustically vigilant Europeans. Silence costs money and few Americans seem willing to pay for it. Noise control in industry dates only from 1948, when workmen's compensation for gradual hearing impairment first became legally collectible. But two thirds of all cases of deafness in working males are still caused by occupational noise, the worst offenders being riveting (130 decibels), metal cutting, drop-forging, blasting, weaving and paper shredding. When noise approaches 140 decibels—the so-called "threshold of pain," about the level of what you hear on the runway near a jet take-off—it can impair your hearing. An average alarm clock is 80 decibels and a Manhattan discothèque has been clocked at 105.

This mounting racket is bad enough. Even more ominous may be the acceleration of "psychic noise," defined as any unwanted signal. If a nearby conversation interferes with yours, it is noise to you regardless of its sense or decibels. Psychic noise is snow on the TV as well as static on the radio. No other age has ever thrust so many auditory and visual images so promiscuously at the human brain with such terrifying frequency and competitive clamor. The daily deluge may contain the most astounding and useful information, or it may be trivial and mendacious. In either case it is noise if you don't want it. How can a man be selective about all these warring signals and sift out what he needs when he needs it? This may define the problem of mass sanity in the "global village" of universal instantaneous communication predicted by Marshall McLuhan (LIFE, Feb. 25, 1966).

The problem may require the widespread rediscovery of the personal value of silence. Most religions throughout human history have insisted that man needs regular intervals of silence for his spiritual health. Religious mystics describe these in technical words like recollection, contemplation, "centering down," or what St. Theresa called "the orison of quiet." A secular translation would be the tapping of deeper levels of consciousness. Even in our age of noise and crossed signals, some artists and scientists as well as religious mystics still practice "recollection" in quiet for their own surer guidance.

We especially recommend this practice to our political leaders. They spend much of their lives at the center of noise cyclones, and turn for relief not to silence but to helicopters or shouting crowds. Are too many fateful decisions proceeding from noise-filled minds? As the Cave of the Winds on Capitol Hill opens for business again, one wonders what would happen to the quality of government if every congressman, when tempted to make a speech or board a jet, should instead go to a mountain top.

The more strictly public problem, that of sheer decibels, can be solved by public effort. In 1937 a Memphis newspaperman was awakened from a nap by an auto horn and wrote an editorial launching an antinoise campaign that led to an ordinance. Its enforcement won for Memphis 16 annual National Noise Abatement awards in a row. By now many municipalities have passed some sort of noise ordinance. But only constant hounding by indignant citizens can keep these codes up to date against new noise sources and also keep the authorities interested in enforcing them. So every citizen has just two recourses against the universal assault on his nerves: (1) seek silence, (2) get sore.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,

June 19, 1967.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: Your office was kind enough recently to send me some of your statements on the community noise problem, and this help is very much appreciated.

Because of your interest in this growing form of environmental pollution, I thought that you might like to see an article on industrial noise which we prepared for *The American Federationist* magazine. I hope that you find it interesting.

Sincerely yours,

JACK HARDESTY,
Information Officer, Occupational Health Program.

[From the AFL–CIO Federationist, May 1967]

NOISE ON THE JOB

(By Dr. Murray C. Brown)

(NOTE.—Murray C. Brown, M.D., is Chief of the Occupational Health Program, U.S. Public Health Service.)

The world is full of sound. The alarm clock that wakes us. The car we drive or the bus we take to work. The voices of people around us. We become accustomed to sound. In fact, when we do not hear familiar sounds, we feel that something is missing. When this sound is unwanted, we call it noise.

Workers are particularly affected by unwanted sound, since they may have a triple exposure on the job, in the community and at home. Noise on the job, however, causes the most severe problems.

The incidence of hearing impairment due to noise in our contemporary environment is a growing problem. In our modern world of technology, with vast and complex machinery being used in a wide variety of industries, noise as an adjunct to work is a reality that must be faced. Nor is noise confined solely to the so-called heavy industries—it is also a problem in farming occupations and even in white collar work, traditionally regarded as comparatively noise-free.

Estimates of the number of Americans who work in environments potentially damaging to their hearing range from 6 million to 16.5 million—the exact figure is not known. Perhaps another million could be added if the total included noise conditions not necessarily damaging to hearing but strong enough to create interference with speech and possible disruption in work efficiency.

Many communities are becoming noisier due to a spillover of factory noise, their proximity to busy airports and, very often, to greater volume of traffic on the nation's expanding highway network. In urban areas, increasing population density, combined with a larger volume of in-town traffic and city-core rebuilding activity, raises the possibility that even greater numbers of people will be confronted by additional noise-nuisance problems. The problem has become serious enough, in fact, for some communities to take action to curtail airport and aircraft activities and otherwise restrain potential sources of noise.

To compound the problem of noise for the average person, his home, too, has become noisier. This condition is caused, at least in part, by the accelerated use of power appliances such as garbage disposals, dishwashers, lawnmowers and workshop tools. While not in the same category, a booming hi-fi set and, it must be admitted, shouting children at play also contribute to the overall noise level in many homes.

WORKSITE THE MAIN SOURCE

But the main source remains the worksite. Studies have identified some of the industries whose noise conditions are deemed unsafe to workers' hearing. A few of them are: glass bottle manufacturing, heavy construction work, wood products, metal products and heavy machine fabrication, textiles, papermaking and paper products and transportation services.

In four industries alone (petroleum, steel, mining, automotive transportation), an estimated 6 million persons are exposed to noise conditions potentially damaging to their hearing. If those who work in highly mechanized farm and agricultural occupations, printing and publishing, furniture and fixtures were included, the total would be much higher.

Compensation costs for industrial hearing losses could be enormous. One acoustics expert has estimated there are 4.5 million workers with enough hearing loss to qualify them for a compensation award under some existing workmen's compensation statutes.

THE EAR MECHANISM

How does noise affect the ear? How long an exposure to noise does it take before the human hearing mechanism begins to be adversely affected? Although the ear is a complex organ, a few basic details may help explain its vulnerability to damage by excessive noise.

The human ear is divided into three parts—the external, middle and inner ear. The functions of the external and middle ear are chiefly to gather and transmit sound to the inner ear in which the receivers of sound sensation are located.

Sound is funneled inward through the external ear canal to the eardrum. Incoming sound waves strike the eardrum and set it into vibration. The middle ear, behind the eardrum, is an air-filled cavity containing three small bones.

The handle of one of the bones (malleus) attached to the eardrum moves with the second bone (incus) which, in turn, is joined to the third (stapes). The footplate of the third bone fits snugly against the oval window, one of the two covered openings between the middle and inner ears. The opening, called the round window, lies just below the oval window and acts as a pressure compensator. These three bones, in effect, form a chain which carry the sound-produced vibrations of the eardrum through the middle ear to the oval window at the beginning of the inner ear.

The two intra-aural muscles, also located in the middle ear, are connected to two of the three middle-ear bones. The onset of intense sound causes these muscles to contract, which in total effect reduces the amount of sound energy conducted to the inner ear. This reflex action is believed to be protective, since it lessens the potentially damaging effects of high intensity sounds on the hearing mechanism of the inner ear.

The middle ear also contains a passageway leading from the middle ear cavity to the back of the nose and throat—the Eustachian tube—which equalizes air pressure on both sides of the eardrum, facilitating the eardrum's response to sounds. The vibrations carried by the middle ear bones cause the oval window partition between the middle and inner ear to act like a plunger, setting up fluid motion in the inner ear. This, in turn, produces vibrations in certain of the basilar fibers which are also part of the inner ear. As a result, tiny hair cells attached to the basilar membrane move up and down, some cells stimulated more than others.

Touching against an overhanging membrane, these cells trigger nerve impulses. Each different sound pattern thus produces a different pattern of nerve impulses, depending on sound frequency. The impulses are then transmitted through the auditory nerve system to the part of the brain where the hearing centers are located. These impulses are interpreted as sounds of various pitch or loudness and are given meaning.

WHAT DOES NOISE DO?

When any part of this complexly-engineered sound system breaks down, hearing loss, either temporary or permanent, may occur. The resulting danger is classified into three basic types: conductive, perceptive (neural) and functional.

Conductive hearing loss results from trouble in the external and/or middle ear which prevents the normal amount of sound energy from reaching the inner ear. This condition, at its minimum, may be caused by excessive wax forming in the external ear canal. A much more serious form is the hardening of tissue around one of the ear's bones. Whatever the cause, however, conductive-type hearing disabilities respond to treatment and can be corrected.

Perceptive deafness defines those disorders of the inner ear and/or in the auditory nerve system and ranges from disturbances in the fluids of the inner ear to degeneration of the hair cell receptors and nerve supply. This type of hearing loss does not respond to treatment by surgical or other medical procedures.

Functional deafness refers to hearing loss that has no organic basic but in which a person does not fully utilize his hearing capacity, although there is no actual damage to his hearing mechanism.

Noise exposure can cause either conductive or perceptive hearing loss. Sometimes the disability may be a combination of the two. Noise-induced hearing loss of the conductive, kind, called acoustic or blast trauma, may be caused by an explosion which ruptures the eardrum. In such instances, the inner ear may not be damaged, but the bone-chain may be dislodged.

Noise-induced hearing loss of the perceptive type is produced by prolonged exposure to excessive amounts of industrial noise. The site of this disorder is the inner ear and, in these cases, the eardrum or bone-chain is rarely affected.

INDUSTRIAL NOISE

Initial exposure to excessive industrial-type noise creates a temporary loss in hearing which is recovered after a short interval away from noise. The extent of the temporary loss depends on the kind of noise responsible and is, for any person, a repeatable phenomenon that is more or less consistent. However, repeated or prolonged exposure to excessive noise, for months or years, reduces the chance of the ear recovering all of this "temporary" loss and the residual or non-recovered portion of the loss becomes a permanent hearing impairment.

Intermittent noise is often a characteristic of the industrial environment. A noise heard only during alternate minutes creates about half the temporary loss that it would if it were continuous. Workers around jet aircraft do not suffer hearing loss as quickly as might be expected since intermittence of the exposure is partially protective.

Hearing impairment for certain sounds seems to reach a maximum after ten years' exposure and then remains constant. However, it is wrong to assume that anyone who has worked in a noisy environment for ten years is not vulnerable to further hearing loss. The exact correlation between temporary loss and permanent loss is far from clear. Noise that does not cause temporary loss rarely, if ever, produces permanent impairment; temporary loss and permanent impairment run parallel on differing timescales.

Susceptible persons develop hearing impairment comparatively rapidly and are frequently aware that noise unduly disturbs them. They may complain of head noises, nausea or vertigo after a day's work. Susceptibility probably reflects one end of the scale of sensitivity rather than an innate fragility of the hearing mechanism. It may be transient or remain for life.

Of the numerous problems posed by excessive noise exposures, the most serious is

hearing loss. However, quite apart from this, noise can create many other changes in a person's physiological state, including his circulation, respiration and digestive fluids in some instances—each reflecting a generalized stress reaction. While these types of changes are typically caused by intense sounds of sudden onset such as sonic boom, these alterations of bodily functions also appear under sustained high level or even moderately strong noise conditions.

SPEECH INTERFERENCE

One effect of noise best understood is interference with speech communication, which is obviously important in industry. Such conditions would be typical in large data processing offices. Generally, noise deemed hazardous to hearing interferes with speech, although the opposite may not be true. Speech interference caused by noise is basically a masking process and is found at moderate levels of background noise. Speech that is only in part masked by discontinuous noise may be complemented by gesture, a detail contributing up to a third of total intelligibility.

Although it is often stated that noise adversely affects output, efficiency and morale, these effects are not easy to assess quantitatively. Excessive noise may affect occupational accident rates by impairing a person's accuracy of movement, his perception of auditory signals or clarity of vision. However, many people work under extremely noisy conditions for many years without damage that can be related to this exposure. Nor is it always simple to distinguish the effects of noise from those caused by emotional or environmental factors. The behavioral results of noise are probably not a major health problem.

Various factors must be considered in determining whether exposure to a particular noise level has created, or will create, hearing loss. These include the overall noise level, plus its frequency composition, duration and distribution of exposure through a person's working day and working life, individual susceptibility, presence or absence of ear disease and the efficiency of protective measures.

Some generalization can be made about the nature of a noise exposure condition and the risk of noise-induced hearing loss. They are:

1. Other things being equal, high-frequency sounds are more harmful than low-frequency sounds.

2. Intermittent exposures to noise are not as harmful as continuous exposure at the same overall intensity.

3. Noises with strong pure-toned frequencies or strong narrow band energy are more harmful to hearing than noises having a smooth spectrum.

At any worksite, a need for action is indicated if speech communication is difficult, or where employes experience head noises or persistent hearing loss after exposure. Even in the absence of such obvious indications, it might be necessary to check the noise level.

It is not easy, however, to define what constitutes safe exposure to noise for general application, since kinds of noise and exposure timings vary considerably. One good rule of thumb in making a prejudgment about a noise hazard is whether there is difficulty in understanding loud speech at a distance of one foot between a talker and listener.

NOISE CONTROL

Control of noise should be directed toward seeing that every employe is safe, whatever age or susceptibility. While modern techniques frequently allow economical and effective noise reduction, complete noise control in factories may still be comparatively expensive and therefore get a lower priority than protection against other health hazards regarded as more obviously dangerous.

Economy and noise-reduction go parallel, since noise wastes energy and poorly maintained equipment gets noisier with wear. It may sometimes be possible to lower noise by changing a machine, process or material, as, for example, the substitution of welding for riveting, rubber for metal or slow-acting pressure for high-velocity impact.

Noise may be reduced at the source by lubrication or by the use of dampers or insulators to prevent the transmission of vibration. Just as rugs in the home cut down noise, sound-absorbing materials are also used in industry—a method particularly effective where the spectrum of the noise is known so the proper material can be used. These methods are most feasible when the desired noise reduction is not great and when the worker is not too near the source of the noise. However, in many situations they alone will not inhibit sound to a safe level.

Another control method is sound insulation, which is different from absorption. This technique uses barriers between the noise source and the area to be protected. Partitions where used should be heavy and form an airtight seal across the noise pathway. Sound may likewise be reduced by the use of mufflers and resonators.

However, in some plants the use of personal protective devices is the only practicable method to reduce risk. An ear-protector, ideally, limits the amount of sound reaching the ear drum. The four main types are: plugs, semi-insert plugs, muffs and helmets.

Acceptance of protectors is no problem when exposure to noise levels is high enough to cause pain; they are often neglected at lower levels of noise. Moreover, concern about only the immediate work environment is not enough. Take, for example, the aircraft groundcrew and maintenance workers who believed they had no noise problems—all their planes were propeller-driven. However, they ignored the fact they were working next to an airline whose aircrafts were jets.

HEARING LOSS PREVENTABLE

Although occupational deafness is largely preventable, it remains a real and serious threat in many work environments. And, as such, appropriate noise control programs are needed as well as an awareness on the part of the worker and employer of how it can cause considerable harm if left unchecked.

Certainly, the reduction or elimination of excessive noise in the workplace merits no less consideration and concern than do the more obvious occupational health hazards. In the modern world, which is continually growing smaller, one of the most pressing needs—on all levels—is for improved communication. And good hearing is admittedly a vital link in the process that informs, instructs and binds society together.

[From the New York Times, June 5, 1967]

HOSPITAL DIN BUILDING TO A CRESCENDO

(By McCandlish Phillips)

It is 1:45 A.M. in the hospital and all is quiet—until an aide drops a utility pan that strikes the corridor floor with a sharp, metallic report, loud enough to awaken most patients.

Some, whose rest is troubled by physical discomfort, will not quickly find sleep again. Even then, they may shortly be awakened by another noise—a heavy elevator door slamming shut, a cleaning crew clanking mechanical equipment, a medicine cart being rolled through the hall on a rackety wheel.

"Shhhh!" That, in not quite one word, is the message some patients want desperately to get to hospital personnel. At least a few hospital administrators are trying to get the same message through to their staffs. Recently some hospitals have been cutting down their noise levels through a combination of techniques—new, the use of electronics, and old, the use of oil on doors, wheels and everything else that squeaks.

Hospitals, with their 24-hours daily cycle, are not merely busier than ever, they also seem to be noisier than ever—far too noisy, some believe, for effective convalescence.

"Hospitals are relatively noisy places. You wouldn't want to send your mother here with a coronary," a staff physician at a voluntary hospital in Brooklyn said flatly.

A Federal study, conducted in eight hospitals in the Northeast for the Public Health Service, came up with the distressing disclosure that "hospital patient room areas are noisier than most residential sleeping areas in cities or suburbs."

Among the noises complained of by patients questioned in a New York Times survey of hospitals were the murmur and whine of air conditioners, the whoosh of window fans, the baritone hum of roof blowers, the thunk of elevator gears and brakes, the squeak of cranks on adjustable beds, the laughter of employes in corridors, the crying of babies, the blaring of television sets, the static-thickened voices from ambulance radios left on outside, the moaning of other patients and the banging of drawers by aides.

In many hospitals, public address systems, broadcasting nearly constant calls for staff members to every nook, strike patients' ear drums like oral shrapnel.

Of 61 sounds found to be disturbing to patients in the Federal survey, 50 originated within the hospitals studied, only 11 came from outside sources (traffic, jet planes, trains, activity in parking lots, even chirping crickets).

In New York, the interior din mixes with a great roar from traffic or construction outside. Surveys here show that 10 to 15 per cent of patients suffer acute distress, edginess, loss of rest or pain because of noise.

Modern hospitals with thin walls, echo-chamber stairwells and acoustically brilliant glazed-tile corridors amplifying noise as grievously as marbles shaken in a tin can must share in the assessment of modern buildings made recently by Leo L. Beranek, writing in Scientific American: "acoustical torture chambers."

VISITORS ADD TO DIN

In addition there are more people—patients, employes and visitors, all potential noisemakers in hospitals today. Hospitals that used to be strict in limiting visiting hours and numbers of visitors hours have become much more relaxed.

At times wards and rooms are crowded with visitors whose demeanor is roughly that of people going aboard ship to see relatives off on an ocean cruise. "The visitors tried so hard to be gay, they were terribly noisy," said a patient recently released from a hospital in Manhattan.

Some hospitals are doing virtually nothing about noise, except living with it. Others work hard to identify its sources and remove them, sometimes at heavy cost.

Starting this week, in the latest move in its noise reduction program, the Lenox Hill Hospital will alter all of its television sets so that the sound of "The Invaders"—and other programs—will no longer come blasting from set speakers, but will flow, muffled, from under-the-pillow speakers to ears that desire it.

Voice paging has been cut. When a physician enters the hospital he picks up a white radio unit, thinner than a package of cigarettes, and slips it into the upper breast pocket of his white coat.

"Only my unit beeps when they want me," a physician said. A moment later it beeped, giving a high but not shrill signal, thin as a silver threat.

"We used to have a metal wagon that a porter would roll along the hall, banging metal waste baskets against its sides to empty them," said Milton W. Hamilt, executive vice president. "Now we use plastic baskets, each fitted with a disposable plastic liner." The porter silently drops the plastic liner into his rolling bin.

"MISS SHUSH" DISMISSED

At Mount Sinai Hospital, "Miss Shush" was abruptly dismissed last week as solicitor of silence in the corridors after five years of constant, if steadily less effective, service.

Her face appeared on discreet posters showing a nurse with one finger to her lips. "It was effective for a time, but ultimately it became part of the wall and people began to ignore it." Milton Sisselman, associate director, said.

A splashy new poster, which went up Friday in every elevator, corridor and waiting room, uses nine languages—Spanish, Italian, Chinese, Hebrew, French, Russian, German, Greek and English—and seven colors— using a hot-tempered pink—to appeal for "quiet please."

At the Brookdale Hospital Center, Linden Boulevard at Rockaway Parkway in Brooklyn, the Peace and Quiet Committee has spent $106,000 in less than six months on a noise control campaign.

On Thursday, a team began "taking the noise pulse" in critical areas of the hospital's five main buildings in a month-long sound measurement survey. Sensitive electronic recording instruments will register noise levels in patients' rooms, corridors and in work and assembly areas.

"Quiet, please" directives, designed to "make everybody noise conscious," went out to all employes. Telephone bells were muted. An "oiling program" was begun, and "everything that has a hinge" or a potentially squeaky moving part has been lubricated, according to Frank DeScipio, the administrator.

VISITORS LIMITED

The number of visitors was cut to "two or three visitors at one time to any patient."

Every piece of rolling stock in the hospital—food carts, therapy carts, supply carts and rolling tables—was standardized to take one size caster, for the easier replacement of broken wheels.

When the public address system was monitored, it was found that an average of 412 voice paging calls were made daily between 9 A.M. and 5 P.M.

Starting this Wednesday, Brookdale expects to achieve "an almost total reduction in the use of our biggest noise factor"—the paging system—by substituting it with the low frequency pocket-receiver system, which is expected to be in full use by June 30. "Then we will have utter silence," Sid Golden, associate administrator, boasted.

Later this month, the hospital will try "zoned music" as a way of further smoothing its aural atmosphere. The music will not be piped into patients' rooms, but it will be filtered softly through the corridors or beamed into one or several areas as time and uses suggest appropriate.

The Federal study report found 49 sounds that jolted patients into wakefulness at night: Employes talking in halls, telephones shrilling, new patients coming in, shades flapping in wind, floor polishing machinery, doors slamming. The report was based on a survey by Goodfriend-Ostergaard Associates, consulting engineers in acoustics, of Cedar Knolls, N.J.

"A sound frequently heard, particularly at night, is the sharp scrape of a chair being moved at the nurses' station," the report said.

The practice of delivering merrily clinking pitchers of ice water to patients at 5:30 A.M. was but one that gave rise to a suggestion that hospital routines be restudied and revised.

Most inside noise has its source at the floor, acoustical engineers find, and a few hospitals in the West are carpeting their corridors to absorb noise.

Some hospitals are experimenting with a "split-level" pattern of sound in air-conditioning systems, adjusting units to hum on one tone during the night and a slightly higher one in the day. That way, patients do not get a one-tone drone all day and night.

Others may try what has been called "acoustical perfume"—an unobjectionable background sound purposely generated to blend out unpleasant noises.

"Noise itself is a purely subjective term," said Dr. Howard M. Bogard, chief psychologist at the Queens Hospital Center. "What is noise to one person is not noise to another."

Lewis S. Goodfriend, the acoustical consultant, said that one patient "condemns a hospital for being noisy, while another says it is the quietest he has ever been in."

"It depends a lot on where your bed is," remarked a staff member at the Associated Hospital Service (Blue Cross) of New York who had lately been hospitalized.

"If you're near the elevator and the receiving station, and the nurses stand there talking and they break down the food trays there and the person in the bed next to yours would be miserable if he couldn't listen to WMCA 24 hours a day, except when six or seven kids come in to visit—then it's noisy. But I had a room way down at the end of a hall, and it was like a tomb."

At Long Island Jewish Hospital, a patient said: "There is a lot of horseplay among the doctors and interns and patients. If you're feeling well, you like the feeling of contact with the outside world. But if you're feeling awful, you don't."

An elderly person who was recently a patient at Beth Israel Hospital said: "I had next to me a patient who had an accident. She was in agony, always calling for help. Four weeks I went through this. It was a little too much for me."

Typical of patients' reaction to noise were the comments of Miss Barbara Kraus as she recalled a stay at Lenox Hill Hospital.

"I always thought I could sleep through anything," she said. "I slept through air raid tests in the last war. They're building the Ford Foundation across the street from me, and that doesn't bother me. But the minute I came out of the ether, noise suddenly became the most dreadful problem. I suffered agony from March 16 when I was operated on, to March 26, when I got out, because it never abated.

"You can go crazy in the crossfire of the radio and television sets, with conversations shouted from one end of the hall to the other—patients yelling to patients, staff to staff, patients to staff. They had somebody knock on the door and sell you newspapers—that drove me out of my mind.

"And it was much worse at night. The man across the hall from me was listening to television—'The Late, Late Show.'"

Miss Kraus described the nursing staff at Lenox Hill as "marvelous, they'll do anything to help you." She found her $71-a-day private room on the seventh-floor in the Wollman Pavillion "a very cheerful place, more like a hotel room than like a hospital." She speculated, however, that noise had been a deterrent to her swift recovery.

"As far as we're concerned, the lady is justified in her complaint," Mr. Hamlit, the executive vice president of the hospital, said. His hospital is situated between the New York Central tracks under Park Avenue (the place shudders and rumbles when they pass below) and the Lexington Avenue subway, whose sidewalk grating release high-pitched screeching of iron brakes that does disturb patients near that end.

"Noise is not a common complaint," he said. Mr. Hamlit is a member of Mayor Lindsay's Task Force on Noise, and so is Dr. Wilbur James Gould, director of otolaryngology at Lenox Hill, the man who removed the small polyp from President Johnson's vocal cord last November.

"When one sensory mechanism becomes hypersensitive—just as when you have a headache—the others become more sensitive, too, to noise, to touch," Dr. Gould said. "Sound is sometimes an illness producer or an illness aggravator.

"Two of the primary objectives of a hospital, no matter what the illness is, are bodily rest and mental rest. If there is an hour of rest that is lost to a patient, then to that extent it interferes with the progress of the patient."

As many hospitals do, Beekman Downtown asks discharged patients to evaluate hospital conditions. On 585 questionnaires returned from June to December last year, there were only nine complaints about noise. However, these comments were unsolicited, since there is no question on noise in the form.

A survey by the Brookdale Center showed that "approximately 15 per cent of patients questioned objected to the noise."

Mount Sinai Hospital conducts a continuous survey, using a form with 13 questions. One asks, "Was the hospital quiet enough for you to sleep and rest?"

[From the National Enquirer]

LEADING SCIENTISTS AND DOCTORS SAY: NOISE POLLUTION IS DRIVING YOU CRAZY

(NOTE.—Like an invisible demon, nowhere yet everywhere, noise tortures us by day and haunts us by night. In the sprawling cities of America, rumbling traffic, roaring jet planes, clattering subway trains, pounding pneumatic drills and wailing sirens assail us endlessly.

(Alarmed at its proportions, the Enquirer decided to conduct a nationwide investigation of the growing menace. Medical authorities were consulted; studies on how noise affects people were sifted and analyzed; Government officials were interviewed and books on medicine, history and law were scoured. And here, exclusively for Enquirer readers, are astonishing results.)

(By Hugh McPherson)

Noise is on the brink of becoming man's worst enemy. It hurts everyone—unless they are already deaf.

So grave is the evil of noise in modern society, in fact, that The World Health Organization of the United Nations now ranks noise-induced "mental pollution" with the dangers of water and air pollution.

Yet little, if anything, is being done about it in this country despite these proven facts:

There is an indisputable link between noise and mental illness.

There is more noise in America than any country in the world.

There is more deafness in America than any other country, with one of every 12 persons suffering from impaired hearing.

There is more mental illness in this country than in any other.

Noise fatigue accounts for more accidents in American industry than any other factor.

The potential cost to the nation of noise-induced hearing loss is greater than that of any other occupational disease.

And studies show noise can kill living matter of any kind.

In blunt language, Dr. Zhivko D. Angelucheff, a Fellow at the Academy of Medicine and Sciences in New York, told the Enquirer he summarized the problem this way:

"We in the United States produce a greater amount of noise than any other country in the world, and we do the least about it.

"Our reward is the highest ratio of deafness and mental illness cannot be denied."

Dr. Angeluscheff also warned there is proof that noise can kill.

Ocean plankton, for instance, undergoes drastic changes within 5 to 10 seconds of exposure to noise. And within five minutes, plankton dies.

In another study conducted by Dr. Angeluscheff on an Oklahoma farm, 10,000 chickens were subjected twice a day for six months to the sonic booms of jet planes passing overhead at an altitude of 35,000 feet.

At the end of six months, 6,000 of the 10,000 chickens were dead.

The survivors had lost most of their feathers, had stopped laying eggs, suffered ruptured reproductive organs and had bled internally.

The danger to man, similarly is terrifying.

Soon, supersonic airplanes traveling 1,800 miles an hour will be cutting swaths across the nation, trailing shock waves 100 miles wide to encompass and torture victims on the ground.

Jet noises, according to Dr. Julius Buchwald, a New York psychiatrist, are already mangling men's nerves, producing hallucinations and suicidal impulses among those on the borderline of emotional stability.

One woman living near Kennedy International Airport in New York threatened recently to blow up the airport's control tower to free herself and her family from jet noise.

And more and more people will be brought to the brink of mental instability by noise.

The World Health Organization's director, Dr. M. G. Candau, warns that nervous disease, insomnia (the inability to sleep), accidents and insanity will surely increase as a result of increasing noise.

Experiment and studies bear him out.

In France, a group of soldiers was subjected to a loud noise for 15 minutes—and all became color-blind for an hour afterward. In Germany, experimenters found that prolonged exposure to noise caused stomach inflammations.

In New York, a study showed that people awakened from sleep repeatedly by noise suffered "dream deprivation" and developed severe emotional problems. And other tests showed that noise-fatigued people drove cars wildly, burned themselves with cigarettes, cut themselves shaving, had twitches and suffered nervous breakdowns.

But perhaps the most astonishing study was conducted by New York ear doctor Samuel Rosen in the African Sudan, where a primitive tribe known as the Mabans were found living in an almost noiseless culture.

Dr. Rosen, a surgeon at Mt. Sinai Hospital and the New York Eye and Ear Infirmary and a Columbia University professor, found a relationship between noise and deafness, heart attacks and length of life.

According to Rosen, the tribe lives in an area with the lowest level of noise of any place on earth. Its people have neither guns nor drums, and know only the sound of their own hushed voices.

Dr. Rosen discovered that the tribesmen:

Had the keenest hearing he'd ever tested.

Had no trace of heart trouble.

And had lived, without nervous disorders, to great ages.

By contrast, the industrialized noise in America today is a demon of our own creation—and its evils are often explained away as "the price of progress."

But what price progress? What price noise?

More than 15,000,000 Americans are registered with agencies as having hearing impairments.

More than 170,000 men over 50 are eligible for workmen's compensation—your tax dollars—because of hearing trouble.

The United Nations estimates that noise costs American industry more, in terms of fatigue, accidents, delay and lower production, than any other occupational hazard.

And of all the hospital beds in the United States, 50 percent are reserved for the mentally and emotionally sick.

How much noise is dangerous? Scientists use the decibel as the measuring stick of loudness.

And, they say, a sound over 60 decibels is harmful especially if prolonged.

A reading of 100 to 125 decibels can cause temporary deafness. And at 150, the inner ear may rupture, causing permanent deafness.

Tests show that an ordinary food blender, at home, registers 93 decibels. Jet planes, subway trains, power lawn mowers and countless other machines torture us with greater noise levels.

History records that noise torture is nothing new. For 2,300 years ago in China, the law prescribed this punishment for criminals:

"The offender should not be hanged. But flute players, drummers and noisemakers should play without stop until he drops dead, because this is the most torturous death that man can devise."

In a later, more refined, Chinese torture, the victim was tied under a huge clanging bell. His ears took such a pounding that he went screaming mad and soon died in convulsions.

But though the evils of noise have been known for centuries and are now reaching a crescendo of danger, little is being done in the United States.

Many European countries have begun to tackle the problem. Some have anti-noise laws—and enforce them.

Germany, Switzerland and England have scientists who specialize in noise abatement and are doing wonders with improved vehicle mufflers and insulation devices.

In Switzerland, jackhammers with mufflers are in use on some construction jobs—and they can hardly be heard.

England has mobile sound laboratories that go everywhere to help cities with noise problems.

But in the United States, only a few cities even recognize the problem of noise. One of the exceptions is Memphis, Tenn., which repeatedly wins awards as America's "quietest city."

In Memphis, police squads are equipped with sound-level meters and scour the town looking for noise. When they find it, the law backs them up.

Fines of $50 are meted out to motorists who toot their horns—and those fines are collected.

All cars must go through muffler inspections three times a year in Memphis, and summonses are handed out for playing radio and TV sets too loudly.

But in most American cities, the public is not aroused—so neither are the politicians.

America's top citizen protester is Robert Alex Baron, a 46-year-old New York theater manager who has taken two years off from his work to fight noise pollution.

In his midtown Manhattan apartment, he was plagued by the roar of blasting, drilling, riveting and pounding below his window, where the city was constructing a subway spur.

Besides that din and the rumble of traffic, a 33-story building started going up across the street.

"It got so bad I had to wear earmuffs in my apartment," Baron says.

Indignant and angry, Baron organized 80 neighbors into the Upper Sixth Avenue Noise Abatement Assn. to fight for anti-noise laws.

He wrote letters of protest to newspapers, magazines, police, health officials, transit executives and Federal agencies. He got publicity. He made speeches. He went on television. And he went to Germany to attend an international meeting on noise abatement.

Finally, the campaign started to pay off.

U.S. Congressman Theodore Kupferman, a New York Republican, introduced an anti-noise bill in Congress last April 21.

The bill, H.R. 14602, would establish a Federal Office of Noise Control and would provide Federal funds to state and local governments to study means of controlling noise.

So far, the legislation is still bottled up in Congress.

The New York State legislature is considering a bill that would direct the State Health Commissioner to study the effects of noise on health.

Recent legislation in California requires the use of ear-plugs in factories producing high noise levels.

Engineers say noise can be reduced by sound-absorbing materials, silencing shields and sound barriers.

But without broad public support, laws are unenforceable even if they do get passed. Noise is getting worse—still nothing is done. Says Baron: "Time is running out."

But he may be wrong. Time may have already run out.

About 50 years ago, Dr. Robert Koch, winner of the Nobel Prize for Medicine, predicted: "The day will come when man will have to fight merciless noise as the worst enemy of his health."

That day has come. The Koch prophecy is today at the brink of terrifying fulfillment.

NOISE DRIVES A MAN BERSERK

The trailer court in Los Angeles was like a battlefield.

Police, crouching behind their cars, exchanged fire with a mad sniper inside one of the parked trailers.

A passing motorist was killed.

So was the sniper, 42-year-old Donald Harkin, who died a suicide. He blew the top of his head off before the police broke into his trailer.

"The man suddenly went noise-crazy," Dr. Theodore Curphey, the county's Chief Medical Examiner, said on December 29.

"We found a rambling 10-page note near his body, and it said he could no longer stand the highway noises, particularly the loud honking of horns. He also couldn't stand the slamming of car doors.

"His note also said the noise made him mad at the world and he hated everybody."

Harkins started firing his .30-caliber rifle shortly after 5 p.m., on December 15.

Everyone nearby ducked. Some were nearly hit. A passing motorist, Vernon Travis, 57, caught a bullet in his chest. His car veered into a garage and smashed. He was dead.

Arriving, police poured bullets into the crazed man's trailer. Then they lobbed tear gas shells through one of its windows. A few minutes later, they charged in and saw him lying in his blood, a victim of his own gun. They also found the note.

[From the New York Times, June 23, 1967]

EXCESSIVE NOISE TERMED UNSUSPECTED HEALTH PERIL

(By Richard D. Lyons)

ATLANTIC CITY, June 22.—Excessive noise can be an "unsuspected triggering agent" for physical ailments such as ulcers and allergies, as well as mental illness, a professor of environmental medicine said today.

The professor, Dr. Lee E. Farr of the University of Texas School of Public Health, Houston, said too little attention was being paid to the effect of sound on health.

Doctors, in particular, are "turning their backs" on the noise problem, he said, al-

though the problem is becoming more acute with urbanization of the nation and overcrowding.

"Noise in the city usually contributes to the health problem by an erosion of emotional well-being," Dr. Farr said, observing that excessive sound can lead to "somatic manifestations" such as stomach problems, including ulcers, and allergies, such as hives.

Dr. Farr told the American Medical Association's annual meeting in Convention Hall that the noise needed to bring on these effects "need not be intense."

"Even though a sound be of such low intensity as to be just over the threshold of perception, it still can evoke all the emotional response a louder sound might provoke," he said, "particularly at night."

LITTLE ADAPTATION

While many people are annoyed by sound levels, they do too little to learn to live with them, he noted.

"Just wearing ear plugs would help, yet few people do," he said. Most people do their apartment or house hunting on weekends and when sound levels are lowest, the professor said.

"It may come as quite a shock to them to discover on moving in that the noise levels in the neighborhood during weekdays and late at night are far different," he went on.

People who generate sounds, Dr. Farr said, are generally unaware how annoying they can be to others. For example, he said, wives who turn on vacuum cleaners after their husbands have come home from a hard day at the office are acting irresponsibly.

"Since people react to noise emotionally, such a situation usually leads to frayed nerves and outbursts of rage by the husband," he said.

Noise does not have a constant over-all effect, he explained, saying that "the sound that drives a person wild one day has no effect the next."

He said the time had come for city dwellers to take civic action to avert immersion in noise by such means as banning auto horns and changing building codes so that more residences are sound-proofed.

Dr. Farr pointed out that the National Association of Home Builders in Washington, D.C. had assisted a builder in Birmingham, Ala., to "sound condition" houses and that they had sold more rapidly than those in which noise-absorbers were not installed.

Charles McMahon, a spokesman for the association, said in a telephone interview that 11 sound-conditioned houses were built in Birmingham two years ago. He said they were sold more quickly than similar homes in which the antinoise features were not installed, despite the fact that the sound-conditioned homes cost from $600 to $800 more.

Mr. McMahon said special equipment included a "super-quiet toilet," sound-proofed air-conditioning and heating units, sound-absorbing tiling and staggered stud construction in walls.

JULY 12, 1967.

ROBERT G. FICHENBERG,
Executive Editor,
The Knickerbocker News,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR MR. FICHENBERG: My good friend Congressman Dan Button, knowing of my interest in the problems of noise pollution, has brought to my attention your editorial of June 29 entitled "Booming Times" and the article concerning the arsenal near Saratoga Lake.

Your concern with the problem of noise and its effect on the environment is to be commended, and I shall include it in my next statement for the Congressional Record in support of my bill H.R. 2819 to set up an Office of Noise Control in the Office of the Surgeon General of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
Congressman,
Seventeenth District, Manhattan.

[From the Albany (N.Y.) Knickerbocker News, June 29, 1967]

BOOMING TIMES

Near Saratoga Lake these days the often played drama of the individual against the organization is being played again. This time it is individual property owners against the Watervliet Arsenal, the General Electric Company and the State of New York, although their real foe is the noise being caused by GE tests of arsenal guns on state-owned property.

First one property owner spoke up to protest the invasion of his property and his home and the destruction of his peace and tranquillity by the hour-after-hour banging of gun tests. Since the one property owner made his complaint known, he has been joined by others in the vicinity.

Our sympathies lie with the individuals. Noise is as much a form of pollution as is the pollution found in our air and waters. Noise enters our homes without our permission, without a warrant.

Should the individuals fighting against the invasion of their homes by noise need further support for their cause, we would call their attention to the report of Dr. Lee E. Farr, who told the annual convention of the American Medical Association that excessive noise can be "an unsuspecting triggering agent" for physical ailments and mental illness.

We wish those individual property owners in the vicinity of Saratoga Lake every success in their battle against the noisemakers.

GUNFIRE SHATTERS QUIET OF RURAL SARATOGA—ARSENAL TESTS INTRUDE ON PEACEFUL LIVING

(By Carol Schlageter)

SARATOGA LAKE.—To Mr. and Mrs. Edward Werner of Saratoga Lake, who are among the sponsors of the Saratoga Performing Arts Center, the sound of the cannon in the "1812 Overture" is probably an enjoyable one.

But at their home—in which they've invested about $100,000 in anticipation of a pastoral retirement—they're getting the sounds of cannon fire every three or four minutes for a period extending as long as from 9 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. daily.

"The concussion and the noise just seem to hit us full-blast up here," commented Mr. Werner. "The entire house shakes."

What is all the racket about?

The Watervliet Arsenal is concerned with developing and producing weapons, particularly since the United States is involved in the Vietnam war. And a back-yard test center—such as the one at the Malta Test Station near the Werner residence—is a great advantage in allowing speedy development.

LEASED FROM STATE

The arsenal has hired the General Electric Co. to do the testing, and GE in turn leases the test site from its owner, the State Office of Atomic and Space Development.

If not for the local test site, the arsenal's newly developed guns would have to be shipped out of town—say to the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland—for testing. And there, explained Edward Ryan, chief of the arsenal's development laboratory artillery unit, each weapon would wait its turn in a long lineup caused by an "extremely tight" test schedule. He added that because of the local site, tested parts can be brought back to the arsenal for immediate inspection and evaluation as to whether they're doing their duty.

But meanwhile, not quite two years ago the Werners, formerly of Florida, purchased the Saratoga Lake House, formerly the estate of Thomas Luther. They built a guest cottage and improved the grounds.

And they settled down to some quiet living, explained Mr. Werner, "In the midst of all this delightful ballet, music, scenery and air. Then there was this intrusion."

Their home, says Mr. Werner, boasts a view that not even the scenery of Switzerland can eclipse. The view is framed by broad picture windows and "these are in trouble" as they tremble from cannonfire, he adds.

REMOTE AREA?

The retired textile man says the resort territory's reputation as a "peaceful area" is at stake.

"Surely there must be a remote area somewhere," he commented.

But to officials, the test area is basically a remote one. The test site is surrounded by a one-mile, uninhabited buffer zone, one spokesman explained. And beyond that perimeter, he said, is a sparsely populated two-mile circle. He said testing of the 155 mm weapons also was conducted last summer at the site, apparently without complaint.

The 155 mm guns are fired over about a 100-foot range into a reinforced concrete tunnel filled with sand. They are fired downhill to eliminate danger of overshooting the target. And sand-filled shells—not live ammunition—are used.

Meanwhile, Mr. Werner reports that, since the latest testing began about three weeks ago, wildlife has been driven from Luther Forest.

And, he maintains, if the "intrusion" continues, the Werners also will be forced to abandon their home.

[From Chemical and Engineering News, magazine, Apr. 17, 1967]

SYNTHETICS SEEK PLACE IN NOISE ABATEMENT—EFFORTS TO CONTROL URBAN NOISE OFFER NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHEMICAL COMPANIES

Experts at the Acoustical Society of America meeting in New York City this week are hearing new evidence on the ravages of noise—evidence that could spell opportunity for the chemical industry. The scientists' physiological studies and a rising legislative concern point to a heightened campaign against sonic excess. And synthetic acoustical materials could have a solid role to play should such a campaign lead to more rapid growth in the market for acoustical materials.

So far, synthetic acoustical materials have achieved only a toe hold in comparison with conventional cellulosic (wood fibers) and mineral fiber products. However, large chemical producers are working actively in the field, and a leading acoustical consultant sees plastics gaining a competitive chance in the market in the next decade.

SOUND DEADENING

The market for acoustical materials in the U.S. has already climbed from just over 150 million sq. ft. in 1950 to 875 million sq. ft. today, according to the Acoustical Materials Association. This New York City group represents 95% of the acoustical materials industry. Chicago's Insulation Board Institute concurs, estimating an increase of 45% in sales of sound-deadening insulation board last year *vs.* a 24% increase in 1965.

B. F. Goodrich, which introduced Deadbeat acoustical material last fall, expects the total market for acoustical products to reach $875 million by 1970. Architectural acoustical products would account for about 44%. The latter, plus products for reducing shock and vibration, should come to about $530 million in 1970, Goodrich predicts.

To take a big part in this market, chemi-

cal producers will have to meet competition from entrenched wood products and mineral fiber companies. Indeed, the two older classes of materials have grown strong fighting each other. Since 1950, according to the Acoustical Materials Association, mineral fiber products and chemically treated cellulosics have jumped from 25 to 75% of total consumption, with wood fiber materials accounting for most of what's left. The main reason has been the superior fire resistance of the mineral fibers.

Michael J. Kodaras, author of the pioneer noise-control section of the proposed New York City building code (C&EN, Nov. 28, 1966, page 28), sees no prohibitive difficulties for plastic materials in meeting code requirements. However, the long-time acoustical consultant adds, technical problems abound in design of polymeric sound-muffling materials. This is so simply because chemical companies are relatively inexperienced in this field.

B. F. Goodrich's Deadbeat is an elastomer resulting from three years of research on mass transit. Goodrich says the product substantially reduces the squeal of wheels on rail curves and has potential in cutting noise from business machines, appliances, and automobiles.

Goodrich is also testing an acoustically absorbent wall covering. In addition, the company is exploring development of rigid foam materials for absorbing sound between rooms and floors.

Another company involved in acoustical foam materials is Monsanto, which sells a laminated styrene sound-dampening board for use in walls and floors. The company says the material competes in price with conventional products and has distinct advantages in weight and ease of handling. Though the styrene-based product has not penetrated the residential market, it has received good acceptance in the institutional field.

Companies such as Du Pont, Union Carbide, Dow, and Allied are among those who do not now market synthetic materials specifically as sound absorbers. However, in some cases they have research and marketing facilities for conventional acoustical products which are used by the construction industry.

Pending the further appearance of purely synthetic materials, chemical companies can still profit from higher volume for traditional sound absorbers. Wood products and various mineral fibers contain organic binders such as phenolic resins. Fire-protected cellulosics are impregnated with borate compounds.

In addition, acoustical materials have recently come out with vinyl and other plastic membrane coverings. The new surface greatly improves washability. The Acoustical Materials Association describes most synthetic overlays as sound-transparent and highly resillient. In one case, the film stretches over the porous base tile or board but adheres only at the edges and is free to vibrate under incident sound pressure. In a second case, the surface film adheres over the entire substratum but has enough resilience to vibrate freely.

Companies making plastic-faced materials include Armstrong Cork, which uses Du Pont's Mylar polyester film on several types of ⅝-inch material with a Class I flame-spread rating. Companies using vinyl coverings include Baldwin-Ehret-Hill, Celotex, Gustin-Bacon, Johns-Manville, Kaiser Gypsum, Owens-Corning Fiberglas, and Simpson Timber. The largest number of vinyl-covered materials have Class A flame-resistance and Class I flame-spread ratings.

Strong factors behind further development of acoustical materials are recent studies on the physiological effect of noise and closely related legislative proposals to dampen environmental sound levels. Last month, Dr. Samuel Rosen, New York City ear specialist, summarized his extensive research on noise in the U.S. and abroad for New York City's first conference on noise control. The conclave was held at New York University. It was sponsored by Manhattan Borough president Percy E. Sutton and a voluntary research and education group, Citizens for a Quieter City.

"Noise," Dr. Rosen says, "can not only damage hearing. It can affect the blood pressure and functions of the heart and nervous system . . . if the noise exposure is intense enough and long, we begin to get deafness from the involvement of the nerve of hearing. There is no known hearing aid that is suitable for this irreversible type of deafness."

Moved by such reports, city councils and higher legislative bodies in the U.S. are considering bills to record the sonic burden on urban residents. What may become the most comprehensive measure in this country is New York City's proposed noise-control statute. It is still lodged with the rest of the new building code in Mayor Lindsay's office.

The New York City proposal outlines performance criteria for building materials in four broad areas:

Airborne noise between adjacent apartments, hallways, and other areas.

Impact noise between apartments.

Structure-borne noise originating in machinery and equipment.

Noise reaching apartments from equipment located on adjacent buildings.

In the latter two categories, consultant Kodaras says, the New York City code actually goes beyond model codes currently in use abroad. The foreign regulations, centering on airborne and impact noise, predate U.S. efforts by as much as three decades. Mr. Kodaras does not excuse the relatively late start of noise-abatement measures in the U.S. But he cites the forced housing boom in Europe after World War II and more centralized foreign government as partial explanations for the head start overseas.

The first entry in noise-control codes came from Germany, which in 1938 specified allowable noise transmission for walls. Since then, codes have appeared in Canada (1948), Britain (1944), Sweden (1946), Norway (1948), and the Netherlands (1952).

The mere existence of a noise-abatement code does not guarantee effective control. In Great Britain, for instance, the code has been only advisory, not legal, force. Where legal authority exists, enforcement varies considerably—from good in Belgium and the Scandinavian countries to average in Germany and other central European nations and weak in France.

In the U.S. Congress, Rep. Theodore R. Kupferman (R.-N.Y.) has pressed a campaign to curb noise in this country. His H.R. 2819 was introduced late last year and again in this session. It would establish an office of noise control in the Surgeon General's office and provide grants to aid state and local noise-control programs. Receiving no action last year, the bill is not expected to fare any better in this session of Congress.

[From the New York Daily News, Apr. 25 1967]

WE HOPE TO HELP LOWER THE BOOM ON STREET DIGGING NOISE WITH OUR NEW "COOKIE CUTTER"

The rat-tat-tat of the pneumatic drill may someday be just a memory when it comes to certain kinds of street digging . . . that is, opening up small excavations to install or repair cables and pipes. We're trying out a new kind of machine that can do the job faster and quieter. It's our new truck-mounted Road-Bor machine, affectionately tabbed the "cookie cutter."

This borer cuts out "cookies" up to five feet in diameter and as much as 15 inches thick, right through asphalt and concrete, with only a third as much noise as a pneumatic jackhammer. During trial runs, the "cookie cutter" sliced through reinforced-concrete slabs five inches thick in an average of eight minutes. With pneumatic jackhammers it takes an average of 27 minutes to cut a hole the same size.

In New York City, where over 90% of the electrical distribution system is underground, a machine like the "cookie cutter" can save us—and you—a lot of time and trouble.

Right now, we've got only one of these cutters. We're giving it a careful and thorough on-the-job test. It's the first of its type to be used in the New York area. If the cutter lives up to expectations, we'll be getting others to help us with our "spot-hole" excavations.

Con Edison is always looking for new, improved ways to assure New York and Westchester the best possible service. We're for anything that will help cut down the noise and time in doing street jobs in New York.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 17, 1967]

NOW HEAR THIS!

At a time when the nation is just beginning to listen, with alarm, to its rapidly rising noise levels—which are threatening to rival air pollution as a peril to humankind and to drive us all daft—it ill behooved the White House to install 25 outdoor speakers along the east fence in order to provide waiting tourists with chatty (and canned) information about the place.

Good grief! Does no one value silence anymore?

We can hear it now—the pickets paling as the caterwaul begins: "Fency meeting you here," says the fence to the startled tourist above the muffled muttering of traffic on the Avenue. "Welcome to the home of Presidents, burned by the British in 1814. . . ."

Something there is that doesn't love a garrulous fence, that something being The Washington Daily News. A fence should be seen and not heard. That's what we're railing against.

[From Town of Hempstead News, May 4, 1967]

Hempstead Town Presiding Supervisor Ralph G. Caso urged today that Congressional appropriations to build a supersonic prototype plane include the proviso that the noise and sonic boom be limited to specified levels. He also urged that decibel and vibration ceilings be included in standards of certification.

In letters to Senators Javits and Kennedy, Representatives Tenzer and Wydler and Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd, Caso wrote, "With $1,144,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to be expended over the next four years, the public has a right to demand guarantees that the SST will not destroy the living conditions of millions for the sake of a comparative few.

Caso stressed that throughout the prolonged national debate on the supersonic aircraft, no one has raised the noise and shock-wave questions as deterrents to the program's advance.

"We stand in danger of producing a monster that leaves a carpet of shock waves the full length of its flight, so that the most isolated areas of the country will suffer this newest and most threatening type of pollution," he warned.

Flying at speeds of up to 1,800 miles an hour, the American version of the SST will be 306 feet long, with four 60,000-pound thrust engines. Built to compete with the smaller, somewhat slower models being produced by the Russians and jointly by the French and British, the American supersonic is expected to be ready for test flights by 1970 and in commercial use in 1974.

"It will be futile then," said Caso, "to find we can't live with the SST after billions have been spent on it. The time to establish standards of acceptability is now, when monies for construction are being appropriated."

The September 1967 issue of the Sport Fishing Institute Bulletin, No. 188, at page 2, has an article entitled "Noise-Caused Ills" which follows. The address of the SFI is 719 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

NOISE-CAUSED ILLS

An item in a recent issue of Tundra Times (Fairbanks, Alaska) reported that Dr. Lee E. Farr, University of Texas, believes that our noisy society is harmfully loud. Dr. Farr points out that long-lasting noise at too high a level can cause nervous fatigue, damage the digestive system, increase allergic sensitivity, and increase susceptibility to migraine attacks or other forms of psychosomatic illness.

It follows that one antidote to such ailments is to be found in various forms of outdoor recreation—by getting away from it all. An ideal means is through fishing—the traditionally contemplative (rather than competitive) sport. This is where competition with one's fellows in the midst of urban din can be discarded and trembling nerves become relaxed and rested. In this connection, it is interesting to note that Professor Lawrence L. Suhm, Director of the University of Wisconsin's Center for Leisure Resources Development, has warned that failure to cope with leisure time may seriously damage an individual's physical and mental health.

According to Professor Suhm, a direct relationship exists between losing one's principal job functions and developing physical and mental disorders. A person's health deteriorates, Suhm points out, when his use of leisure time is characterized by decreased physical activity, social isolation, sensory deprivation, lack of mental stimulation and lack of adequate motivation. Suhm described the effect of increased leisure time upon health in a recent issue of Industrial Medicine and Surgery, stating: "It is not the increase in leisure time which adversely affects health but rather the tragic failure of our society to provide adequate personal or environmental resources for leisure."

Differentiating between free time and leisure, Suhm emphasizes that "free time is time freed from the necessity of maintaining one's existence. Leisure is freedom from imposed obligations upon one's time. To convert free time into leisure, one must have the ability as well as the opportunity to exercise his freedom." Children, sick people, the unemployed and prisoners, for example, have much free time but little leisure. Those most affected by increases in leisure time are blue-collar workers and old people.

Shorter work weeks, automation and longer paid vacations have helped greatly to increase the working man's leisure time. However, blue collar workers and old people are not the only ones who have more time on their hands. Young people also have increased their leisure time through a combination of prolonged schooling and a later entry into the labor force. A recent report says the average person today has 22 more years of leisure time during his life time than his great-grandfather had. Adult men have 31 hours of leisure time per week and women over 35 hours of leisure.

In analyzing what do people do with all this leisure time, Professor Suhm concludes that nearly 75 per cent is spent in the home. Of this, some 18 to 20 hours per week are spent watching television and six hours are spent reading, mostly newspapers, leaving only an hour for all other at-home activities. Of the eight free hours away from home, five are spent visiting friends and relatives. Remainder of the time is divided among church attendance, concerts, sports participation and volunteer community activities.

According to the University of Wisconsin news release that related Professor Suhm's findings, evidence also comes from the medical profession that lack of preparation for extensive leisure time often leads to severe organic and emotional breakdown. A psychiatrist, Dr. Alexander Reid-Martin, has found that many gastro-intestinal tract problems caused by neurosis have actually become worse during holidays. Professor Van R. Potter of the UW McArdle Laboratory for Cancer Research has warned that people must continually use their physical and mental capacities if they want to stay healthy, whether in leisure or non-leisure living. When we carry a heavy load our ability to carry loads increases, he says. But when we have no loads to carry, our ability to carry loads decreases.

This demonstrates, in part, how the human organism adapts. Muscles, organs, senses and reflexes not used by the demands of daily living tend to deteriorate, sometimes with astonishing rapidity. Thus, there is great need for public education to prepare people for wise use of increasing leisure time. Outdoor recreation, particularly year-round aspects such as sport fishing, provides a vital means for Americans to maintain their physical and mental well-being increasingly in the future.

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Los Altos Hills, Calif., Jan. 31, 1967.

Representative THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN: I have been appointed to the West Coast Air Line Pilots Association Noise Abatement Committee and in this capacity I am writing your office for any and all information your office can forward me in helping us alleviate and prevent the noise pollution problem.

I have in my possession the August 4, 1966 issue of The Congressional Record wherein you included much pertinent and informational data on this most serious noise abatement problem. It is the best series of articles I have read on noise pollution.

At the present time the Regional Planning Committee of San Mateo County, Calif., is conducting hearings on the 600 million dollar proposed Pacific Air Commerce Center south of the fourth busiest airport in the United States, the San Francisco International Airport. This complex will include the zoning of bay fill property which will include residential property housing for approximately 5000 people.

The Air Line Pilots Association has strongly opposed the inclusion of residential property within close proximity and peripheral areas of jet airports. Local zoning boards throughout the world heretofore have ignored sound decibel noise residential zoning ordinances for new residential property. We hope to introduce and "bird dog" this type of legislation.

I would appreciate any data your office may have on decibel jet noise soundings in peripheral airport areas. The jet noise emitted when the aircraft is vertically 500 ft., 1000 ft., 1500 ft., 2000 ft., 3000 ft., etc. overhead. The decibel noise pollution data when the aircraft is at the same aforementioned altitudes but measured from ¼ mile, ½ mile, ¾ mile, one mile, 1½ mile, 2 mile, etc. This data would be of great assistance to me and the Bay Front Task Group.

The problems of jet noise pollution to the residential owner has usually been created by myopic zoning boards. The air line pilot is saddled with the blame inasmuch as he is at the controls of the sound problem aircraft. This would not be so if residential property owners did not live underneath or within the confines of aircraft flight paths.

A man's home is his castle, no matter how large or small. He can stand and put up with more noise pollution at work than he can relaxing with his shoes off, TV turned to his favorite sports event, windows open and his favorite beverage in hand.

Let zoning commissions protect the future resident home owner from peripheral noise and not construct residential property in known jet noise areas which will ultimately increase resident's complaints and create more new problems for residents and airlines.

Thanking you in advance and hoping to hear from you soon, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN X. STEFANKI,
Chairman, UAL Council 34 Legislative Committee.

STOP THE BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM AS A NECESSARY FIRST STEP TO GET PEACE NEGOTIATIONS STARTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year, I have on various occasions urged that the United States stop the bombing of North Vietnam as a necessary first step to get peace negotiations started. I am more convinced than ever today that such a step offers the only chance of bringing the Vietnam conflict to an end in the near future.

I have also been among those who have urged that the administration make renewed efforts to get action from the U.N. Security Council that might contribute to a peaceful solution of the conflict.

I rise today, however, in part to express alarm at some of the proposals which are currently being discussed with respect to a possible bombing "pause," as contrasted to an indefinite cessation, and with respect to a U.S. effort to lay the Vietnam issue before the coming U.N. General Assembly without making any change in our current policies with regard to the conflict. If we are prepared to stop U.S. bombing of the north, then there would be great value in making use of the General Assembly session to maximize the effect of such a move. If we are not prepared to stop the bombing in the north, then I believe that submitting the Vietnam issue to the U.N. General Assembly would be a mistake.

I see nothing to be gained by another bombing "pause," which implies the early resumption of bombing if nothing happens. In my judgment, such a pause would not bring Hanoi to the negotiating table. I say this because I am in agreement with the administration's view that at present Hanoi believes it is on the winning side and has no desire to negotiate. Hanoi would, therefore, in all likelihood again reject negotiation during a bombing pause—as it has in the past—as being inconsistent with its announced position that it will not even consider negotiations until and unless the bombing has stopped permanently.

Not only would a bombing pause thus serve no good purpose, but would in my view actually do harm. First of all, it would no doubt be used by Hanoi to expedite the flow of men, equipment, and supplies to the south as was done during the Tet pause last winter. Second, I am afraid that the failure of another pause to produce negotiations would be used by

those who favor further escalation of the war in the north as an excuse for such escalation. I am therefore opposed to another bombing "pause."

I also see nothing to be gained, and considerable risk of harm, in the United States submitting the Vietnam issue to the U.N. General Assembly at its forthcoming session, if this submission is unaccompanied by any change in our conduct of hostilities. It is clear that the great majority of the members of the United Nations are opposed to our policy of bombing North Vietnam, believing that it is an obstacle to peace.

The point of view of most nonalined nations has been repeatedly expressed by Secretary General U Thant when he has said that halting the bombing of the north is a necessary prerequisite to any negotiations.

Accordingly, it is wholly unrealistic to expect that any resolution adopted by the General Assembly would support our present posture. The possibility of useful action in the Security Council is also slim, as reported yesterday in the Washington Post. The Soviet Union's attitude would be the key, and the Soviet Union has consistently maintained that negotiations are impossible so long as U.S. bombing of the north continues.

I was greatly impressed by Secretary McNamara's courageous statement of August 25 before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee on what he called "the conduct of the air war in North Vietnam"—reprinted at 24533 and following. This statement demonstrated with abundant facts and figures that expansion and intensification of the bombing in North Vietnam, as advocated by some generals and admirals and their congressional supporters, cannot be expected to bring a quick end to the struggle in the south. Further, the Secretary made clear that, while the bombing can make infiltration and supply from the north more costly and more difficult, it cannot reduce such infiltration and supply below the meager levels needed to continue the active Communist operations in the south. This conclusion is consistent with the fact that since the United States started its bombing of the north, the numbers of North Vietnamese units fighting in the south have greatly increased, and the enemy forces in the south have been able greatly to increase the quality and quantity of their weaponry.

To be sure, Secretary McNamara does not advocate stopping the bombing in the north. Indeed, he concludes:

> The present objectives of our bombing in the north were soundly conceived and are being effectively pursued.

But he is addressing himself to the military aspect of the matter, and he does not even attempt to discuss the great political and psychological advantages that would flow from a cessation of the bombing.

It is my deeply held conviction that the short-range military advantages of the bombing in the north are more than offset by the long-run political and psychological advantages—enhancing the chances of a peaceful settlement—that would accrue from stopping the bombing.

On the military side, Secretary McNamara's analysis makes clear that the advantages of the bombings are not overwhelming; the implication of his statement is that the number of men and the amount and types of equipment that are sent to the south from the north are determined by Hanoi's decision, and not by the intensity or by the extent of our bombing. This again is consistent with the record of the last 2 years.

It has been argued that if we had not been bombing, Hanoi would have dispatched many more men and munitions to the south; and that the United States would consequently have had to send 800,000 more troops to South Vietnam, but this is just a guess. One can equally well argue the contrary, that without the psychological stimulus and unity in North Vietnam created by our bombing, the flow of supplies and men might have been less than it was—that it might have continued at the pre-February 1965 level. The same arguments can be made—without certainty on either side—as to whether, if we were to stop the bombing, the future flow of men and supplies would increase or lessen. On this score, it does seem clear that a bombing "pause," announced as such, would be more damaging to us from a military point of view than an announced cessation of the bombing. During a pause, the other side will naturally tend to make use of the lull to speed the flow of men and supplies. If a cessation were announced, on the contrary, Hanoi would not have the same incentive to do this; instead, they would then have to reconsider their policies in the light of the new total situation.

While the military considerations in favor of the bombing are thus marginal, if not dubious, the psychological and political factors militate strongly against continued bombing of the north.

Psychologically, our direct attacks on the north seem to have solidified the people of North Vietnam in opposition to the attacker and to increase their motivation to undertake sacrifices in support of the conflict throughout Vietnam. The latest to report this from Hanoi was the experienced radio commentator, David Schonbrunn. And we should have expected this result, based on our own experience following Pearl Harbor and, more particularly, on the British reaction to the blitz of 1940. By bombing the north, we have made the total struggle in Vietnam one in which the North Vietnamese people were fully identified, because they and their homeland were under direct attack. If we had not been bombing in the north, many of these same people might have regarded the fighting in the south as remote from their immediate interests. In this connection, the question is pertinent: If Hanoi had been able to bomb the San Francisco docks, what effect would that attack have had on American attitudes toward the war in Vietnam? Would such an attack not have tended to unify Americans in support of the war?

It is when one considers how possibly to get peace negotiations underway, that the advantages of stopping our bombing of the north seem overwhelming. If we were to accept the risks involved in such a step and to announce and put in effect a cessation of the bombing, the whole political picture would change. The pressures from the rest of the world, instead of being focused largely on us, would be focused on Hanoi and the National Liberation Front to enter into meaningful negotiations.

If the administration is right, as I believe it is, about Hanoi being reluctant to negotiate, we must use every means available to us to bring political pressure on Hanoi to negotiate and, if we make full use of a decision to stop the bombing in the north, we should be able to mobilize not only the nonalined world, but also, the Soviet Union and Eastern European Communist states, to bring such pressure to bear on Hanoi. The coming session of the U.N. General Assembly, which starts September 19, presents the President with an opportune occasion for announcing an all-out drive to achieve an honorable peace in Vietnam, with the help of the member states of the U.N., based on our willingness to stop the bombing of North Vietnam without trying to exact a prior commitment from Hanoi that it will enter into negotiations.

One way of doing this would be to invite a group of nonalined nations—possibly the 17 who urged negotiations in 1965—to set up a press conference at a time and place of their own choosing and to invite to that conference such governments and parties as they see fit. In making public such an invitation, we would announce our intention to attend such a conference and to stop the bombing of North Vietnam 3 weeks or a month before the conference was set to open. Under these circumstances, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for Hanoi to refuse to attend the conference. The pressures on it to do so would be tremendous, and should offset the counterpressures to be expected from Peking. At the very least, if Hanoi remained obdurate and stayed away from the conference, the attitude of the rest of the world toward the conflict would inevitably shift. The same result would occur if Hanoi and the National Liberation Front were to come to the conference, but were to filibuster instead of negotiating in good faith.

If either of these contingencies did occur, the United States would obviously have to reconsider its strategy. All options would be open to us at that time, and we would be in a position to move in a far more favorable worldwide political atmosphere.

Some thoughtful Members of Congress have suggested that instead of stopping the bombing, we should reduce or limit it in some way. In my view, such a half-measure would not serve the purpose of putting Hanoi under worldwide pressure to negotiate. Hanoi could, and presumably would, reiterate its often expressed insistence that no negotiations can take place until the bombing of the north is stopped. The result might be different if Hanoi were eager to find a way to negotiate but, as I have said before, I am in agreement with the administration that this is not the case.

Obviously, whatever the United States decides to do, either at the coming General Assembly or otherwise, must be done

in consultation with the Government of South Vietnam that emerges from next week's elections. But I believe the course of action that I have suggested would be the right course of action whether the Thieu-Ky ticket is successful, as anticipated, or whether a civilian President and Vice President are elected.

In conclusion, I want to say only that any course of action in Vietnam involves risks, and my proposal is no exception. But it is clear that present policies in Vietnam offer no prospect of an early end to the conflict and have been far less successful than their advocates within the administration earlier predicted. Is it not time that something new was tried?

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution summarizing the views set forth in these remarks.

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and insert the text of the resolution at this point in the RECORD.)

H. CON. RES. 501

Whereas the costs of the Vietnam war, in human and material terms, and in terms of unmet needs at home and abroad, are mounting daily; and

Whereas since a quick military victory is not possible and withdrawal is out of the question, the only way to achieve a speedy end to the conflict is through negotiation; and

Whereas the Government of North Vietnam has repeatedly stated that they will neither negotiate, nor agree to negotiate, so long as the United States bombing of North Vietnam is not stopped; and

Whereas the military value of the bombing is limited and its continuation is not essential to the protection of American forces in South Vietnam, and an end to the war would save thousands of American lives; and

Whereas so long as the United States bombing continues, there is no chance of action favorable to the United States being taken by the coming United Nations General Assembly; and

Whereas the chances of helpful action by the United Nations General Assembly or by nonaligned members of the United Nations depends upon United States willingness to stop the bombing in advance of negotiations and in advance of any commitment by the Government of North Vietnam to participate in negotiations; and

Whereas halfway measures, such as a bombing pause, announced as such, or a limitation of the bombing, would not have the same compelling political impact and would give the Government of North Vietnam an excuse to continue to avoid negotiations; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that:

1. The United States should be prepared, at a favorable moment which would make maximum use of the political potential of such a step, to stop bombing of North Vietnam as a necessary first step in an all-out effort to get negotiations started.

2. The United Nations General Assembly opening on September 19 offers an opportune occasion for an announcement of such a decision, so as to mobilize member nations in support of the effort to move the struggle from the battlefield to the negotiating table.

ROGERS PROPOSES NATIONAL "TEENAGE ALERT" PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation has been alarmed over the increasing involvement of young people with drugs, alcohol, and illicit sex.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, passed the Drug Abuse Act in 1965, to help curb the illicit traffic of drugs.

Yet we have statistics now that show the use of drugs being used by young people across the Nation is increasing and examples range from small groups to more than 30 percent of a student body in a high school in Oakland, Calif. There are studies which point out that in one school it was estimated that 75 percent of the student body had tried some form of drugs.

The Drug Abuse Center estimates that between 1 and 4 million young people have used LSD, which I consider a frightful figure considering the danger involved.

The Bureau of Narcotics tells us that there are nearly 5,000 known addicts under the age of 21. The total number of known addicts is nearly 60,000, and I stress the fact that these are only the known addicts.

What we need now is a national program of education that will curb this fantastic increase in drug and alcohol use. One that will be effective in telling the young people of the Nation the realities and consequences of these vices.

I think we have a base for such a program in "Teenage Alert," a program which was instigated in Broward County, Fla., by Dr. David J. Lehman. Each school will designate 1 week of the school year as "Teenage Alert Week."

The doctors of the Broward County Medical Association offered their time to speak, explain, and provide materials which are distributed to the schools and parents. The material deals with the effects and use of drugs, including stimulants, narcotics, marihuana, and LSD, and also delves into the consequences of clandestine sex behavior and the use of alcohol. The Bar Association of Broward County will have its members explain the law on drugs and its serious consequences.

Another phase of the program offers a chance for the parent to participate by attending separate lectures, also given by the physicians.

I spent an hour with Dr. Lehman and found it so informative that I became enthused and called Dr. Philip Lee, the Assistant Secretary of HEW for Health, to see if he thought the program could be adopted on a national level.

Dr. Lee was impressed as a result of his conversation with Dr. Lehman, and is investigating this program with a view to encouraging its use on a nationwide basis.

I am also encouraged at the thought of being able to attack the mounting problem of teenage crime. I believe that if we can reach people in the junior and senior high school level, we may prevent some of our young people from taking the first frightful step to becoming involved with the law or wrecking their lives as a result of the use of drugs and alcohol.

While I speak of supporting this program on a national level, I would point out that while it is national in scope, the work which will be done will be done by the people on the local level with only the supplementary help and encouragement of the Government.

It will be the local groups and the parents who will, in the end, make this a success. And that is one of the beauties of this program.

I hope my colleagues will join with me in encouraging the development of the "teenage alert" program in their districts—calling on medical associations and bar associations to actively work on such programs—and by calling on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to support this program and to furnish educational material necessary for the initiation of a national "teenage alert" to prevent the growth of drug abuse among the young people of the Nation.

FIFTY YEARS OF FOREIGN LOANS AND FOREIGN AID BY THE UNITED STATES, 1917–67

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II we have been privileged to find in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many clearly itemized tables and articles dealing with our American aid commitments overseas. These tables have been extremely helpful to Congressmen and staffs in serving as background information on forthcoming foreign aid legislation; as briefing materials for our speeches on the floor of the Congress, and as data to be furnished to informational media as well as to our constituents. Year by year these exhaustive statistics have been used to keep us up to date as to what the United States is actually doing in giving grants or furnishing loans to other countries.

As most of us who have used and inserted these tables from time to time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD know, they have often originated in our own famous research organization, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This organization is devoted exclusively to the basic purpose of furnishing authentic data and studies for the use of the Congress.

I want to say that Congress can consider itself very lucky in that our Legislative Reference Service has on its staff in the Economics Division the man who has compiled most of these foreign aid statistics from divergent governmental sources. His tabling and meticulous accounting of our foreign aid expenditures through the years have enabled us to have the latest data at our fingertips. Naturally he has had to get them from the operating agencies, but his putting them in clearly understandable and useable forms has made his published work invaluable to us.

As a staff member assigned to the origi-

nal Herter committee to assist in making the first survey for the Marshall plan in 1947, Mr. Hermann Ficker has since that time become one of the most knowledgeable experts in our Government concerning all aspects of our multifaceted foreign aid programs. His ready reference to original source materials, authoritative analyses and studies, and making data available to Congressmen with explanations, both timely and definitive, have been much appreciated.

Not only does his competency extend to the programs and projects under our worldwide economic assistance effort, our military assistance overseas, our surplus food shipments under Public Law 480, our foreign loans and currencies, the operations of international lending agencies and technical service programs, but also to the comparative aid efforts of other major industrial nations. An economist in international finance and trade, Mr. Ficker is as well known overseas as here at home. He has been invited to participate in aid and trade symposiums by the Governments of Great Britain, West Germany, Ghana, and South Africa.

Mr. Ficker is also a very fluent speaker and often lectures on foreign aid, African affairs, or other items of international economics content to business groups, student seminars, and church fellowships.

I feel that I express the sentiments of many of my colleagues when I say that we are particularly fortunate in having a man as devoted to our legislative service as he is. Publicly I wish to say to him: Thank you for your loyal and expert service on our behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand Mr. Ficker's latest compilation entitled: "Fifty Years of Foreign Loans and Foreign Aid by the United States, 1917 to 1967." It is a 40-page tabulation of the sum of $204 billions disbursed by the United States in the form of loans and grants during the last 50 years. We have just recently debated foreign aid in the House. We shall debate it again. Here we can ascertain for ourselves how this mammoth sum has been distributed—how, when, and where—as gifts or loans, and for economic or military aid.

How often does the question not come up concerning the exact totals various countries owe us as a result of the old World War I Liberty Bond loans? This tabulation with sources shows us what is owed. Both principal and interest are there.

What other assistance did our executive agencies extend in the period between the two World Wars? The list gives all.

What did our Allies and the then free world countries get from us during World War II in the form of lend-lease? The totals in grants and small loans are there.

How have we distributed our aid, as loans and grants, as economic and military, since the end of World War II? The tables give the totals for the last fiscal year disbursements, as well as the cumulative totals for the period 1945–1966.

What do foreign countries owe us today on loans granted since 1945? Repayments are noted and outstanding balances for individual countries are given.

Which countries have since the end of World War II received the largest amounts of United States aid and how much? The lists giving the totals in descending order are explicit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this tabulation will prove to be of great use to all Members of Congress.

I include this tabulation in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

FIFTY YEARS OF FOREIGN LOANS AND FOREIGN AID BY THE UNITED STATES, 1917–67

(By Hermann Ficker, economist in international finance and trade, economics division, May 16, 1967)

MAGNITUDE OF AID

The magnitude and complexity of U.S. official loan and foreign assistance programs since 1917 are such that the summary total of $204 billion of loans and grants disbursed should be considered as an approximation only. Currently there are fourteen major departments and agencies of the U.S. Government that act as principals or agents for the several programs that extend assistance to foreign countries, and twenty account headings and programs under which the yearly Foreign Assistance Act is divided by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

Two agencies of the U.S. Government publish periodic reports of our aid totals:

1. Agency for International Development (AID)—U.S. Department of State;

2. Office of Business Economics—U.S. Department of Commerce.

Sometimes discrepancies arise because AID uses obligational totals only, while the Office of Business Economics uses only actual delivery or utilized totals. Both agencies supply figures to the Appropriation Committees of Congress.

The present tabulation utilizes these and other sources and presents a summary of foreign aid data in such a manner as is believed to be most useful for the Congress.

In the following tabulations major emphasis is given to the postwar period. However, for the sake of those who need the totals, a breakdown by military aid, economic grants and utilized credits is appended also for the period July 1, 1917 through June 30, 1945. Aid totals are gross figures; in other words, reverse economic grants and repayments of loans and credits are not subtracted from the totals of aid extended.

A recapitulation of U.S. foreign loan and aid figures since July 1, 1917 and availabilities for fiscal year 1967 is as follows:

	Billions
World War I Allied debts, original principal only	$12.193
World War I German debts, original principal only	1.157
U.S. aid, other, 1917–40	1.533
World War II aid, lend-lease and other, 1940–45	49.205
Postwar aid—1945–66	122.365
Availability of aid—July 1, 1966	6.684
New funds appropriated for fiscal year 1967	2.935
Total	196.072

It should be noted that, in the case of World War I debts, only the original principals are used; otherwise interest due on June 30, 1966 should be included as follows:

	Billions
Allied debts	$11.595
German debts	0.432

Although the interest on funds borrowed by the U.S. Treasury for purposes allocable to foreign aid cannot be accurately determined, it is safe to say that since 1940 such interest could reasonably amount to over $2 billion. Although this total is not added to U.S. aid expenditures, the costs assessable as interest still come from the pockets of the U.S. taxpayers.

SUBSCRIPTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

In addition to the expenditures, availabilities and interest mentioned above, the United States has indirectly extended foreign aid in the form of capital investments in the six international financial institutions, as follows:

	Billions
International Monetary Fund	$5.516
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	.635
Inter-American Development Bank	.800
International Development Association	.424
International Finance Corporation	.035
Asian Development Bank	.020
Total	7.430

Payments to these six institutions constitute an additional measure taken by the United States Government to promote foreign economic development, and have been excluded from the aforementioned foreign aid totals because they do not result in immediate equivalent aid to foreign countries. Use of their available dollar funds is largely determined by the management of these institutions, in some cases subject to certain controls which can be exercised by the United States.

AVAILABILITY OF U.S. FOREIGN AID FUNDS ON JULY 1, 1966

As noted in the foregoing statement unexpended appropriated foreign aid funds and new funds appropriated for fiscal year 1967 amount to under $10 billion.

Although these unexpended funds comprise nearly 70 percent of aid funds available for future disbursement, the figures are sometimes misinterpreted as to the actual amount of money available for new programs of foreign assistance. Unexpended funds are already substantially committed in (1) continuing programs or nearing completion, (2) tentative agreements for grants and loans not yet fully completed and (3) contracts and assistance programs in process of discussion. This is essentially true of all military assistance and defense support programs, the various economic aid programs and to a large extent of the loan authorizations given to foreign countries, but not yet fully utilized or drawn from the U.S. Treasury. Thus essentially the only funds for new foreign aid programs beginning July 1, 1966 are those appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 1967 and, even of this total, a large percentage is for continuing programs.

WORLD WAR I DEBTS

As an introduction to the series of tables comprising United States grants, loans and credits extended during the last fifty years, we begin with the cash advances made under the various Liberty Bond Acts of World War I and subsequent sales on credit in the immediate postwar years. Table I gives in detail the original totals and the principal under the funded agreements between 1923 and 1930. The interest of $11.595 billion has not been included in the summary table at the beginning of our tabulation.

As noted in the footnotes under Table II, the German debts to the United States arose from the charges for the upkeep of occupation troops in the Rhine districts after World War I. Interest of over $432 million has also not been included in the summary tabulation.

TABLE I.—WORLD WAR I DEBTS

STATUS OF INDEBTEDNESS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES ARISING FROM WORLD WAR I, AS OF JUNE 30, 1966

[In millions of dollars]

	Agreed principal indebtedness [1]	Interest through June 30, 1966 [2]	Total	Cumulative payments	
				Principal	Interest
Total	12,193.267	11,594.902	23,788.169	760.852	1,998.713
Armenia	11.960	27.989	39.949	----------	----------
Austria [3]	26.843	.044	26.887	.863	----------
Belgium	419.838	310.569	730.406	19.158	33.034
Cuba	10.000	2.287	12.287	10.000	2.287
Czechoslovakia	185.071	106.473	291.544	19.830	.304
Estonia	16.466	21.297	37.763	----------	1.248
Finland	9.000	11.309	20.309	[4] 4.108	[4] 11.309
France	4,089.690	3,112.149	7,201.838	226.040	260.036
Great Britain	4,802.182	6,828.232	11,630.414	434.182	1,590.673
Greece [5]	32.500	17.653	50.153	0.984	3.143
Hungary [6]	1.983	2.709	4.692	.074	.483
Italy	2,042.364	324.894	2,367.259	37.464	63.366
Latvia	6.889	9.011	15.900	.009	.752
Liberia	.026	.010	.036	.026	.010
Lithuania	6.432	8.397	14.829	.235	1.003
Nicaragua [7]	.142	.027	.169	.142	.027
Poland	207.344	272.278	479.622	[8] 1.287	21.359
Rumania	68.359	49.447	117.806	[9] 4.499	[9] .292
Russia	192.601	466.460	659.061	----------	[10] 8.750
Yugoslavia	63.578	23.668	87.246	1.953	.636

[1] Includes indebtedness arising from pre-Armistice and post-Armistice cash advances under the Liberty Bond Acts of World War I (including the advance of $12,167,000 to Greece under the act of Feb. 14, 1929), sales on credit under the acts of July 9, 1918, and Mar. 30, 1920, and obligations acquired for transportation services by the U.S. Shipping Board during World War I. Includes original advances and credits, plus accrued uncollected interest and future interest funded in debt funding agreements concluded between May 1, 1923, and June 23, 1930.

[2] Includes interest accrued and payable on original advances and funding agreements, excluding interest incorporated into funded principal.

[3] The Federal Republic of Germany has recognized liability for securities falling due between Mar. 12, 1938, and May 8, 1945.

[4] $6,360,250 has been made available for educational exchange programs with Finland pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 222–224.

[5] The agreement of May 28, 1964, ratified by Congress in Public Law 89–766, approved Nov. 5, 1966, refunds $11,366,000 of the principal indebtedness and establishes a settlement for the interest due and unpaid on that principal.

[6] Interest payments from Dec. 15, 1932, to June 15, 1937, were paid in pengo equivalent.

[7] The indebtedness of Nicaragua was canceled pursuant to the agreement of Apr. 14, 1938.

[8] Excludes claim allowance of $1,813,429 dated Dec. 15, 1929.

[9] Excludes payment of $100,000 on June 14, 1940, as a token of good faith.

[10] Principally proceeds from liquidation of Russian assets in the United States.

Source: Foreign Credits by the U.S. Government, Office of Business Economics. U.S. Department of Commerce, March 1967.

TABLE II. GERMAN WORLD WAR I DEBT TO THE UNITED STATES

STATUS OF GERMAN WORLD WAR I INDEBTEDNESS, AS OF JUNE 30, 1966

[In millions of dollars or dollar equivalents]

	Funded indebtedness [1]	Interest through June 30, 1966 [2]	Total	Cumulative payments	
				Principal	Interest
Total	1,156.608	432.057	[3] 1,588.664	81.040	2.048
Repayable in U.S. dollars: Mixed claims [4]	97.500	----------	97.500	49.500	----------
Repayable in U.S. dollars, but stated in reichsmarks without maintenance of value: U.S. dollar equivalent [3]	1,059.108	432.057	1,491.164	31.540	2.048
Total, reichsmarks	2,680.100	1,072.691	3,752.791	132.200	6,466
Mixed claims [4]	1,632.000	533.460	2,165.460	81.600	5.610
Army costs	1,048.100	539.231	1,587.331	50.600	.856

[1] Includes indebtedness arising from awards of the Mixed Claims Commission under the agreement of Aug. 10, 1922, as funded (after collections of $32,183,061) in the agreement of June 23 1930, and indebtedness arising from charges under the Armistice Convention for upkeep of troop of occupation in the Rhine districts (agreements of May 25, 1923, and Jan. 14, 1925), as funded (after repayments and principal allowances of $98,726,671) in the agreement of June 23, 1930.

[2] Includes interest accrued and payable on principal matured and unpaid and interest under the moratorium agreement of May 26, 1932.

[3] Includes conversions to U.S. dollar equivalent of amounts stated in reichsmarks (but payable in U.S. dollars). Amounts collected have been stated at the collection rate; that is, at rate specified in the agreements: the average of the middle rates prevailing in Berlin during the half-monthly period preceding the date of payment. Thus, some collections took place at rates approximating 24 cents per reichsmark, others at rates approximating 40 cents per reichsmark. The rate prevailing at the time of funding agreement (1930) was about 24 cents per reichsmark. Amounts uncollected are included as stated in current Treasury Department reports (at 40.33 cents per reichsmark, the rate prevailing after the U.S. dollar devaluation in 1934). Total indebtedness is sum of collected and uncollected.

These reports do not reflect the replacement of the reichsmark by the deutschemark in the post-World-War-II period, nor the subsequent revaluations of the deutschemark to approximately 25 cents. The substitution of dollar bonds for reischsmark bonds (see footnote 4) was made at about 20 cents per reichsmark in 1953. If the reichsmark were to be equated to the deutschemark, as was common in many of the debt settlements negotiated in 1953, then the total amount due as of June 30, 1966, at the currently prevailing rate of exchange (25 cents per deutschemark) would approximate $935,000,000 and the funded indebtedness would approximate $767,000,000 (before the devaluation of the U.S. dollar the funded indebtedness was stated at $755,000,000).

[4] Under the agreement of Feb. 27, 1953, the indebtedness under the June 23, 1930, agreement was decreased by 489,600,000 reichsmarks (from 2,121,600,000 reichsmarks) and the indebtedness of $97,500,000 created.

Sources of data on World War I debts: "Memorandum Covering the World War Indebtedness of Foreign Governments to the United States (1917–21) and Showing the Total Amounts Paid by Germany Under the Daws and Young Plans" (revised July 1, 1944); annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury; and memorandum reports of the Treasury Department (1940(?) and 1944) to the Department of Commerce for inclusion in publications of the Department of Commerce.

U.S. AID FOR PERIOD 1918–40

In addition to the cash advances to the seventeen European nations toward the end of World War I, the United States also extended large amounts of relief to the war-ravaged areas. These grants were substantially from surplus war materials although the U.S. Treasury also advanced over $84 million for food and clothing to the American Relief Administration for distribution. Substantial grain shipments helped to forestall famine in various areas of Europe.

During the interwar period from 1918 through 1940 the United States extended aid totaling over $1.5 billion in grants and credits as shown with breakdown in Table III:

TABLE III.—*Interwar period assistance, 1918 to June 30, 1940*

[In millons of dollars]

1. Surplus War Materials, relief	575.844
2. U.S. Treasury, relief	84.094
3. U.S. Grain Corporation	56.859
4. Federal Reserve System	422,350
5. Export-Import Bank	248.578
6. Grain Stabilization Corporation	11.250
7. Reconstruction Finance Corporation	54.000
8. Second Export-Import Bank	28.900
9. U.S. Treasury, shipping	15.904
Total	1,532.778

1. Surplus war materials, for relief (War and Navy, Act of July 9, 1918):

Belgium	29.873
Czechoslovakia	20.622
Estonia	12.213
France	407.341
Latvia	2.522
Lithuania	4.159
Nicaragua	.171
Poland	59.636
Rumania	12.923
Russia	.406
Serbia	24.978
Total	575.844

Source: Complete breakdown in: U.S. Treasury; Annual Reports, 1921, p. 33; 1922, p. 281.

2. Relief: U.S. Treasury, American Relief Administration (Act of Feb. 25, 1919):

Armenia	8.028
Czechoslovakia	6.428
Estonia	1.786
Finland	8.282
Latvia	2.610
Lithuania	.822
Poland	51.672
Russia	4.465
Total	84.094

Source: Complete breakdown in U.S. Treasury, Annual Report, 1921, p. 36.

3. United States Grain Corporation (act of March 30, 1920):

Armenia	3.932
Austria	24.056
Czechoslovakia	2.873
Hungary	1.686
Poland	24.313
Total	56.859

Source: Complete breakdown in U.S. Treasury, Annual Report, 1921, p. 35.

4. Federal Reserve System (credits for foreign central banks):

	Authorization
England (1925)	200.000
(1931)	125.000
Poland (1927)	5.250
Belgium (1926)	10.000
Italy (1927)	15.000
(1934)	25.000
Roumania (1929)	4.500
Austria (1931)	1.083
Hungary (1931)	5.000
Germany (1931)	25.000
Nicaragua (1935)	.550
Foreign Banks (1939)	5.020
Miscellaneous (1940)	.947
Total	422.350

Source: Annual Reports of Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System, 1914–41.

5. Export-Import Banks of Washington (authorizations):

Argentina	2.670
Brazil	83.030
Chile	14.425
China	63.208
Colombia	10.005
Costa Rica	1.000
Denmark	10.000
Dominican Republic	3.000
Ecuador	1.150
Finland	30.000
Haiti	5.500
Hungary	1.000
Iceland	1.000
Mexico	.500
Nicaragua	2.500
Norway	10.000
Panama	4.500
Paraguay	3.500
Poland	6.050
Portugal	5.500
Spain	14.023
Venezuela	.200
Miscellaneous	11.818
Total	248.578

Source: Export-Import Bank of Washington, Statement of Loans and Commitments, Dec. 31, 1940.

6. Grain Stabilization Corporation (became part of the Federal Farm Board, created in 1929; its work was discontinued in 1933):

China, Sept. 26, 1931	7.500
Germany, Sept. 11, 1931	3.750
Total	11.250

(NOTE.—China received 15 million bushels of wheat and Germany 7½ million bushels. Current market price was 49½ cents per bushel.)

Source: New York Times, Sept. 12, 1931, p. 2, Sept. 27, 1931, p. 23.

7. Reconstruction finance corporation (authorization):

Russia (1933)	4.000
China (1933)	50.000
Total	54.000

(NOTE.—Only $17,105,385.80 of the Chinese authorization was actually disbursed.)

Source: "Foreign Loan Policy of the United States Since 1933," by B. H. Williams, New York, 1939, pp. 39–41.

8. Second Export-Import Bank, Washington:

Cuba (silver bullion transaction)	28,000,000

(NOTE.—Credits authorized in five transactions for the purpose of financing the sale of silver bullion to Cuba. This bullion was minted into pesos in the U.S.A. and then shipped to Cuba. Repayment was made on receipt on the pesos. On June 30, 1966, all of the commitments of this bank were assumed by the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D.C.)

Source: "Foreign Loan Policy of the United States," by B. H. Williams, New York, 1939, pp. 49–50.

9. U.S. Treasury, 1922–40:

Poland (shipping 1924)	3.737
Greece (shipping 1929)	12.167
Total	15.904

LEND-LEASE AND OTHER AID DURING WORLD WAR II

During World War II the United States granted nearly $47 billion in lend-lease to her allies and free-world powers. Small reverse lend-lease totals have not been shown. On the other hand, lend-lease supplies in the pipeline at the cessation of hostilities and which could be applied to civilian end-use purposes, as well as unexpended civilian-type goods, were given to our allies under long-term credits. These surplus property credits are included under postwar loans during the period 1945–1966.

Other major grants by the United States included support for UNRRA, post-UNRRA aid, Philippine aid, Chinese aid and some inter-American aid. Major loans consisted of credits extended by the Export-Import Bank and for some surplus property.

TABLE IV.—U.S. FOREIGN AID DURING WAR PERIOD—GRANTS BY TYPE AND CREDITS UTILIZED, JULY 1, 1940–JUNE 30, 1945

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Gross grants			Credits and loans utilized
	Lend-lease	Other	Total	
Tota	46,728.287	1,400.010	48,128.297	1,076.843
American Republics	364.948	58.085	423.032	246.397
Argentina		1.239	1.239	.390
Bolivia	5.026	1.926	6.952	4.510
Brazil	347.945	12.694	360.639	33.462
Chile	22.038	2.864	24.902	1.766
Colombia	8.278	2.231	10.509	8.187
Costa Rica	.156	1.723	1.879	5.951
Cuba	6.154	.504	6.658	28.941
Dominican Republic	1.458	.400	1.858	3.000
Ecuador	7.208	4.132	11.340	5.567
El Salvador	.877	1.026	1.903	.900
Guatemala	1.736	1.484	3.220	
Haiti	1.362	1.131	2.493	10.320
Honduras	.368	2.720	3.088	
Mexico	38.621	8.130	46.751	1.266
Nicaragua	.885	1.257	2.142	4.000
Panama	(1)	.989	.989	2.488
Paraguay	1.952	2.406	4.358	5.205
Peru	18.001	3.485	21.486	
Uruguay	6.942	.814	7.756	.079
Venezuela	4.480	2.557	7.038	2.446
Unclassified	[2] (−108.539)	4.373	(−104.166)	127.919
Austria		1.022	1.022	
Bahrein				17.048
Belgium-Luxembourg	68.774		68.774	
British Commonwealth	30,450.412	17.016	30,467.428	607.461
United Kingdom	28,600.797	16.158	28,616.955	434.281
Australia	896.641	.108	896.749	8.372
Bermuda		.001	.001	
British East Africa		.301	.301	
British Honduras				.468
Canada				32.785
Hong Kong		.368	.368	
India	610.172	.077	610.249	131.555
New Zealand	249.432		249.432	
Trinidad and Tobago		.003	.003	
Union of South Africa	93.370		93.370	
China	845.743	385.116	1,230.859	118.501
Czechoslovakia	2.760	5.717	8.477	
Egypt		1.700	1.700	
Ethiopia	1.238		1.238	3.858
inland		1.489	1.489	26.211
rance and possessions	2,613.543	23.580	2,637.123	
France	2,613.543	7.449	2,620.992	
Algeria		15.945	15.945	
French Equitorial Africa		.118	.118	
French Morocco		.068	.068	
Greece	75.365	3.627	78.992	
Iceland		.099	.099	
Iran	7.791	.353	8.144	.222
Ireland		.308	.308	
Italy and former possessions		310.181	310.181	
Italy		310.166	310.166	
Eritrea		.015	.015	
Japan and possessions		4.122	4.122	
Ryukyu Islands		4.048	4.048	
Miscellaneous islands		.074	.074	
Liberia	.236		.236	3.334
Netherlands-Indonesia	114.690	3.625	118.314	36.137
Netherlands	114.690		114.690	36.137
Indonesia		3.625	3.625	
Norway	37.039	.070	37.109	
Philippines		52.515	52.515	
Poland	12.119	10.084	22.203	3.511
Portugal and possessions		.001	.001	1.271
Portugal				1.271
Angola				
Cape Verde Islands		.001	.001	
Saudi Arabia	5.489		5.489	12.714
Spain		1.759	1.759	.112
Sweden		.766	.766	
Turkey	90.041		90.041	
U.S.S.R.	10,760.971	15.205	10,776.176	
Yugoslavia	32.050	1.028	33.078	
Trust Territory of the Pacific		1.926	1.926	
International organizations		53.238	53.238	
Unclassified areas	1,245.077	447.379	1,692.456	

[1] Less than $500.
[2] Excess of deductions.

Note: Due to rounding detail may not add to total. Grants and credits are gross figures. Repayments and reverse grants are not included.

U.S AID TOTALS BY YEAR FOR PERIOD 1940–66

As noted in the succeeding table, aid during the period 1940–66 amounted to $171.6 billion. During the postwar period our $122.4 billion in aid were distributed largely to Europe for rehabilitation and subsequent rearmament against Communist aggression. Only since 1960 have the technical assistance and development programs in the developing nations increased and has military aid begun to taper off.

TABLE V.—TOTAL U.S. ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES, BY TYPES: ECONOMIC (GRANTS AND LOANS) AND MILITARY—PERIOD, JULY 1, 1940 TO JUNE 30, 1966 (BY FISCAL YEARS)

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal years	Economic grants	Economic loans	Military assistance	Total
1940–45 [1]	48,128	1,077	War	49,205
1946–48 [2]	6,586	8,058	481	15,125
1949–52 [3]	16,082	3,459	2,842	22,383
1953–57 [4]	10,390	3,426	15,307	29,123
1958	1,727	1,181	2,404	5,313
1959	1,749	1,657	2,160	5,567
1960	1,960	1,318	1,845	5,123
1961	2,164	2,012	1,466	5,642
1962 [5]	2,261	2,588	1,527	6,376
1963	2,205	2,653	1,881	6,738
1964	2,041	2,569	1,523	6,134
1965	2,028	2,800	1,313	6,140
1966	2,489	3,127	1,135	6,751
Total [6]	99,811	35,924	35,835	171,570

[1] War period, economic grants comprised mostly lend-lease shipments.
[2] Postwar relief period, comprising UNRRA, interim aid, and Greek-Turkish aid.
[3] Marshall plan period, mostly rehabilitation of Europe.
[4] Mutual security, period began with Korean war and subsequent rearming of Europe and countries on periphery of Soviet bloc.
[5] Foreign assistance period begins with increasing percentage of U.S. aid devoted to loans.
[6] Availabilities of carryover funds and new appropriations for fiscal year 1967 amounted to $9,619,000,000.

BREAKDOWN OF U.S. AID BY COUNTRY AND TYPE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966 AND PERIOD 1945–66

In the period following World War II the United States has disbursed $86.530 billion in economic aid and $35.835 in military assistance, totalling $122.365 billion.

In Table VI it is seen that during the twenty-one year period the largest share of gross foreign aid has gone to Europe, with the smallest percentage to the underdeveloped continent of Africa.

Table VII shows the military and economic aid for the last fiscal year as well as for the cumulative period, fiscal years 1945–1966. In this table it is also noted which countries received military or economic aid during fiscal year 1966; others show when our aid programs ended or began. Military aid to Austria, Laos, India, Nepal and Pakistan is classified; hence is not shown in individual country totals.

TABLE VI.—PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL U.S. FOREIGN AID BY REGION: POSTWAR PERIOD, JULY 1, 1945, TO JUNE 30, 1966

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	Amount	Percent
Total, all countries	$122.365	100.000
Europe	47.095	38.487
East Asia	27.600	22.556
Near East and south Asia	25.416	20.771
Latin America	11.695	9.557
Africa	3.631	2.967
Nonregional and other	6.928	5.662

TABLE VII.—U.S. FOREIGN AID, MILITARY AND ECONOMIC—POSTWAR PERIOD, JULY 1, 1945 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1966

[In millions of dollars]

Countries	Fiscal year 1966			Fiscal years 1946–66		
	Military	Economic	Total	Military	Economic	Total
Total	1,135.0	5,616.0	6,751.0	35,835.0	86,530.0	122,365.0
Europe	122.2	468.0	590.2	16,273.2	30,822.1	47,095.3
Albania (ended 1947)	--------	--------	--------	--------	20.4	20.4
Austria	(1)	--------	(1)	(1)	1,198.0	(1)
Belgium-Luxembourg	1.7	17.5	19.2	1,255.3	749.6	2,004.9
Czechoslovakia (ended 1955)	--------	--------	--------	--------	193.0	193.0
Denmark	20.1	--------	20.1	618.7	301.8	920.5
East Germany (ended 1955)	--------	--------	--------	--------	.8	.8
Finland	--------	.6	.6	--------	134.4	134.4
France	.8	11.0	11.8	4,258.7	5,150.9	9,409.6
Germany (Federal Republic)	-.1	2.5	2.4	951.5	4,045.9	4,997.4
Berlin (ended 1962)	--------	--------	--------	--------	131.9	131.9
Hungary (ended 1957)	--------	--------	--------	--------	31.5	31.5
Iceland	--------	7.7	7.7	--------	84.0	84.0
Ireland (ended 1955)	--------	--------	--------	--------	146.5	146.5
Italy	3.3	64.7	68.0	2,312.4	3,780.5	6,092.9
Malta	--------	1.2	1.2	--------	6.1	6.1
Netherlands	.1	--------	.1	1,240.6	1,229.8	2,470.4
Norway	42.8	--------	42.8	884.2	351.8	1,236.0
Poland	--------	6.3	6.3	--------	554.5	554.5
Portugal	-.5	5.9	5.4	330.2	188.9	519.1
Spain	37.8	122.4	160.2	608.6	1,395.7	2,004.3
Sweden (ended 1955)	--------	--------	--------	--------	109.0	109.0
United Kingdom	-.1	86.1	86.0	1,034.5	8,010.4	9,044.9
U.S.S.R. (ended 1947)	--------	--------	--------	--------	186.4	186.4
Yugoslavia	.3	141.9	142.2	695.6	2,168.3	2,863.9
Regional	16.0	--------	16.0	2,082.7	652.3	2,735.0
East Asia	534.5	1,264.8	1,799.3	10,241.4	17,358.8	27,600.2
Burma	--------	.4	.4	--------	100.6	100.6
Cambodia (1955+)	--------	-2.0	-2.0	87.1	254.0	341.1
China (Taiwan)	76.5	68.9	145.4	2,606.0	2,293.5	4,899.5
Hong Kong	--------	1.3	1.3	--------	41.9	41.9
Indochina (undistributed, ended 1961)	--------	--------	--------	709.6	825.6	1,535.2
Indonesia	-4.8	20.4	15.6	63.2	771.4	834.6
Japan	1.2	52.4	53.6	1,073.1	2,899.8	3,972.9
Korea	153.1	248.5	401.6	2,614.6	4,260.1	6,676.7
Laos (1955+)	(1)	54.8	(1)	(1)	473.4	(1)
Malaysia	.2	6.2	6.4	3.8	43.7	47.5
Philippines	25.1	13.1	39.2	489.5	1,435.5	1,925.0
Ryukyu Islands	--------	15.8	15.8	--------	340.6	340.6
Thailand	40.7	60.4	101.1	612.2	477.0	1,089.2
Vietnam (South)	213.4	707.9	921.3	1,517.8	3,072.3	4,590.1
Western Samoa (1962+)	--------	--------	--------	--------	(2)	(2)
Regional	28.3	16.8	45.1	662.6	69.2	731.8
Near East and south Asia	250.9	1,474.4	1,725.3	6,681.8	18,733.7	25,415.5
Afghanistan	.2	39.1	39.3	3.2	343.2	346.4
Ceylon	--------	12.7	12.7	--------	101.5	101.5
Cyprus	--------	.3	.3	--------	19.3	19.3
Greece	78.7	6.8	85.5	1,854.3	1,895.1	3,749.4
India	(1)	913.1	(1)	(1)	6,769.2	(1)
Iran	44.7	21.1	65.8	895.2	856.8	1,752.0
Iraq	.2	5.1	5.3	46.6	56.1	102.7
Israel	2.4	36.9	39.3	27.6	1,076.9	1,104.5
Jordan	8.8	44.3	53.1	55.6	517.2	572.8
Near East, etc.—Continued						
Lebanon	0.1	-0.5	-0.4	8.7	79.2	87.9
Nepal	(1)	11.7	(1)	(1)	97.8	(1)
Pakistan	(1)	141.6	(1)	(1)	3,072.0	(1)
Saudi Arabia	3.2	--------	3.2	161.7	47.4	209.1
Syria	(2)	.3	.3	.1	73.2	73.3
Turkey	100.4	157.1	257.5	2,762.1	2,277.7	5,039.8
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	--------	58.9	58.9	--------	1,133.3	1,133.3
Yemen	(2)	2.7	2.7	(2)	41.8	41.8
Regional	12.1	22.5	34.6	858.9	223.4	1,082.3
Central Treaty Organization	--------	.4	.4	--------	52.8	52.8
Africa	21.9	388.3	410.2	212.1	3,418.7	3,630.8
Algeria (1956+)	--------	21.4	21.4	--------	179.4	179.4
Botswana (1965+)	--------	4.7	4.7	--------	7.4	7.4
Burundi (1961+)	--------	(2)	(2)	--------	6.7	6.7
Cameroon (1960+)	--------	2.1	2.1	.2	27.0	27.2
Central African Republic (1961+)	--------	.6	.6	--------	3.5	3.5
Chad (1961+)	--------	1.2	1.2	--------	5.5	5.5
Congo (Brazzaville) (1961+)	--------	-.2	-.2	--------	2.2	2.2
Congo (Kinshasa) (1954+)	3.6	36.9	40.5	17.8	333.2	351.0
Dahomey (1959+)	--------	1.3	1.3	.1	9.6	9.7
Ethiopia	10.7	57.5	68.2	109.3	208.2	317.5
Gabon (1960+)	--------	1.0	1.0	--------	5.8	5.8
Gambia (1956+)	--------	.3	.3	--------	.6	.6
Ghana	--------	9.4	9.4	(2)	174.8	174.8
Guinea (1959+)	.7	6.2	6.9	1.0	74.7	75.7
Ivory Coast (1961+)	--------	2.8	2.8	.1	28.7	28.7
Kenya (1954+)	--------	21.8	21.8	--------	57.2	57.2
Lesotho (1961+)	--------	.8	.8	--------	1.1	1.1
Liberia	.6	11.0	11.6	6.2	235.4	241.6
Libya	1.7	1.1	2.8	12.5	207.5	220.0
Malagasy Republic (1959+)	--------	1.6	1.6	--------	9.6	9.6
Malawi (1956+)	--------	3.6	3.6	--------	11.8	11.8
Mali, Republic of (1961+)	.5	2.2	2.7	2.9	15.8	18.7
Mauritania (1954+)	--------	.2	.2	--------	3.0	3.0
Morocco	3.1	62.3	65.4	37.3	546.8	584.1
Niger (1961+)	--------	1.9	1.9	.1	10.5	10.6
Nigeria	.3	29.3	29.6	1.3	189.0	190.3
Rwanda (1962+)	--------	3.8	3.8	--------	5.5	5.5
Senegal (1961+)	.1	2.9	3.0	3.0	18.5	21.5
Sierra Leone	--------	5.4	5.4	--------	32.5	32.5
Somali Republic (1954+)	--------	5.0	5.0	--------	52.2	52.2
South Africa (ended 1960)	--------	--------	--------	--------	150.6	150.6
Southern Rhodesia (1954+)	--------	(2)	(2)	--------	7.0	7.0
Sudan (1956+)	.3	18.9	19.2	.6	107.8	108.4
Tanzania (1958+)	--------	6.3	6.3	--------	50.0	50.0
Togo (1959+)	--------	3.2	3.2	--------	12.0	21.0
Tunisia	0.2	20.3	20.5	19.8	468.1	487.9
Uganda (1954+)	--------	3.8	3.8	--------	21.0	21.0
Upper Volta (1961+)	(2)	1.3	1.3	.1	6.7	6.8
Zambia (1953+)	--------	5.9	5.9	--------	36.1	36.1

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE VII.—U.S. FOREIGN AID, MILITARY AND ECONOMIC—POSTWAR PERIOD, JULY 1, 1945 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1966—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Countries	Fiscal year 1966			Fiscal years 1946–66		
	Military	Economic	Total	Military	Economic	Total
Africa—Continued						
Regional (East Africa) (1961+)	--------	7.3	7.3	--------	18.4	18.4
Regional (USAID) (1964+)	--------	.3	.3	--------	1.3	1.3
Regional (Africa)	--------	22.9	22.9	--------	76.0	76.0
Latin America	83.5	1,387.7	1,471.2	1,040.3	10,654.4	11,694.7
Argentina	6.4	27.8	34.2	92.2	666.4	758.6
Bolivia	2.4	36.3	38.7	15.0	445.6	460.6
Brazil	22.6	383.6	406.2	298.6	2,887.1	3,185.7
British Honduras	--------	.5	.5	--------	4.4	4.4
Chile	8.5	107.7	116.2	120.9	1,121.3	1,242.2
Colombia	8.3	104.5	112.8	89.4	745.4	834.8
Costa Rica	.1	13.8	13.9	1.9	147.1	149.0
Cuba (ended 1961)	--------	--------	--------	10.6	41.5	52.1
Dominican Republic	1.7	113.0	114.7	17.1	303.0	320.1
Ecuador	3.9	28.8	32.7	44.9	234.7	279.6
El Salvador	.7	9.3	10.0	4.8	103.3	108.1
Guatemala	1.2	3.8	5.0	11.1	198.1	209.2
Guyana	--------	7.4	7.4	--------	24.4	24.4
Haiti	--------	6.1	6.1	4.3	104.5	108.8
Honduras	.7	13.9	14.6	5.3	83.2	88.5
Jamaica	(2)	6.6	6.6	1.1	43.2	44.3
Mexico	.2	128.2	128.4	11.4	1,056.8	1,068.2
Latin America—Continued						
Nicaragua	1.0	20.3	21.3	8.8	124.3	133.1
Panama	.4	13.3	13.7	2.3	170.7	173.0
Paraguay	1.0	15.0	16.0	7.4	98.8	106.2
Peru	9.8	43.4	53.2	135.5	543.4	678.9
Surinam	--------	5.1	5.1	--------	10.1	10.1
Trinidad and Tobago	--------	9.0	9.0	--------	52.2	52.2
Uruguay	2.5	6.7	9.2	37.4	82.0	119.4
Venezuela	8.8	8.9	17.7	103.9	288.3	392.2
Other West Indies (1955+)	--------	.5	.5	--------	3.7	3.7
Regional—Central America (1961+)	--------	−1.0	−1.0	--------	83.1	83.1
Regional—Latin America	3.3	275.4	278.7	16.5	981.1	997.6
Oceania	17.4	159.3	176.7	130.6	298.5	429.1
Australia	17.4	134.0	151.4	125.9	149.4	275.3
New Zealand	--------	6.5	6.5	4.7	23.0	27.7
Trust territories in Pacific	--------	18.4	18.4	--------	125.4	125.4
Regional	--------	.4	.4	--------	.7	.7
Canada (ended 1961)	--------	--------	--------	13.1	23.2	36.3
Supraregional	105.1	472.9	578.0	1,242.2	5,220.6	6,462.8

[1] Classified.
[2] Less than $50,000.

Note: Dates show when aid began or ended.

Source: "U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants, July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1966." Special report prepared for the House Foreign Affairs Committee, by the Agency for International Development (AID), Mar. 17, 1967.

TOTAL U.S. AID BY COUNTRY IN DESCENDING TOTALS FOR PERIOD 1945–66

Table VIII shows the amounts distributed to individual countries in descending totals. Nearly half of the countries that received over $1 billion each, is in Europe. The underdeveloped areas are to be found in the lowest ranks; however, it should be noted that large amounts of aid were distributed on a regional basis, where two or more countries benefited. Countries, whose military aid is classified, would certainly have ranked higher, had that type of aid been included in their totals.

TABLE VIII.—*124 countries and entities received aid from the United States in descending totals, postwar period, July 1, 1945—June 30, 1966*

[Gross aid in millions of dollars]

Twenty-seven countries received more than $1 billion each:	
France	9,409.6
United Kingdom	9,044.9
India*	6,769.2
Korea	6,676.7
Italy	6,092.9
Turkey	5,039.8
Germany (Federal Republic)	4,997.4
China (Taiwan)	4,899.5
Vietnam (South)	4,590.1
Japan	3,972.9
Greece	3,749.4
Brazil	3,185.7
Pakistan*	3,072.0
Yugoslavia	2,863.9
Netherlands	2,470.4
Belgium-Luxembourg	2,004.9
Spain	2,004.3
Philippines	1,925.0
Iran	1,752.0
Indochina (undistributed)	1,535.2
Chile	1,242.2
Norway	1,236.0
Austria*	1,198.0
Egypt (United Arab Republic)	1,133.3
Israel	1,104.5
Thailand	1,089.2
Mexico	1,068.2
Forty-seven countries received between $100 million and $1 billion:	
Denmark	920.5
Colombia	834.8
Indonesia	834.6
Argentina	758.6
Peru	678.9
Forty-seven countries received between $100 million and $1 billion:	
Morocco	584.1
Jordan	572.8
Poland	554.5
Portugal	519.1
Tunisia	487.9
Laos*	473.4
Bolivia	460.6
Venezuela	392.2
Congo (Kinshasa)	351.0
Afghanistan	346.4
Cambodia	341.1
Ryukyu Islands	340.6
Dominican Republic	320.1
Ethiopia	317.5
Ecuador	279.6
Australia	275.3
Liberia	241.6
Libya	220.0
Guatemala	209.2
Saudi Arabia	209.1
Czechoslovakia	193.0
Nigeria	190.3
U.S.S.R.	186.4
Algeria	179.4
Ghana	174.8
Panama	173.0
South Africa	150.6
Costa Rica	149.0
Iceland	146.5
Finland	134.4
Nicaragua	133.1
Berlin	131.9
Trust Territories of the Pacific	125.4
Uruguay	119.4
Sweden	109.0
Haiti	108.8
Sudan	108.4
El Salvador	108.1
Paraguay	106.2
Iraq	102.7
Ceylon	101.5
Burma	100.6
Thirty-two countries received between $10 million and $100 million:	
Nepal*	97.8
Honduras	88.5
Lebanon	87.9
Iceland	84.0
Guinea	75.7
Syria	73.3
Kenya	57.2
Trinidad and Tobago	52.2
Somali Republic	52.2
Cuba	52.1
Tanzania	50.0
Malaysia	47.5
Jamaica	44.3
Hong Kong	41.9
Yemen	41.8
Canada	36.3
Zambia	36.1
Sierra Leone	32.5
Hungary	31.5
Ivory Coast	28.8
New Zealand	27.7
Cameroon	27.2
Guayana	24.4
Senegal	21.5
Uganda	21.0
Albania	20.4
Cyprus	19.3
Mali	18.7
Togo	12.0
Malawi	11.8
Niger	10.6
Surinam	10.1
Eighteen countries received less than $10 million:	
Dahomey	9.7
Malagsy Republic	9.6
Botswana	7.4
Southern Rhodesia	7.0
Upper Volta	6.8
Burundi	6.7
Malta	6.1
Gabon	5.8
Eighteen countries received less than $10 million:	
Chad	5.5
Rwanda	5.5
British Honduras	4.4
Central African Republic	3.5
Mauritania	3.0
Congo (Brazzaville)	2.2
Lesotho	1.1
East Germany	0.8
Gambia	0.6
Western Samoa (less than $50,000).	
Regional, by area:	
Regional, Europe	2,735.0
Regional, Near East	1,135.1
Regional, Latin America	1,084.4
Regional, East Asia	731.8
Regional, Africa	95.7
Regional, global	6,463.5
Total	122,365.0

*Five countries received economic aid as noted but their military asistance totals are classified.

INDEBTEDNESS OF OTHER COUNTRIES TO THE UNITED STATES ON LOANS MADE SINCE 1945

The question is often asked: how much do foreign countries owe the United States on loans made since 1945? World War I debts will be found in Tables I and II while all debts subsequent to World War II are to be found for individual countries in Table X. Table IX gives the grand total of loans and credits extended according to program as $31.966 billion of which total $26.368 billion had been utilized by June 30, 1966. Against this latter total repayments of $5.345 billion have been received, showing the balance outstanding as $19.365 billion. The breakdown by country is shown in Table X.

Seeming discrepancies between utilization, repayment and outstanding balances in the total and summary entries are a consequence of the fluctuation in exchange rates applied to transactions for loans in the category "without maintenance of value."

TABLE IX.—TOTALS OWED TO THE UNITED STATES, BY PROGRAMS—STATUS OF FOREIGN LOANS AND OTHER CREDITS FROM U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES SINCE JULY 1, 1945 AS OF JUNE 30, 1966

[In millions of dollars or dollar equivalents]

Credit program	Amount authorized	Status of credit		
		Utilized	Principal collected	Principal outstanding
Total U.S. Government foreign credits to all countries and to international organizations	31,966.118	25,368.138	5,345.112	19,365.251
Under foreign assistance (and related) acts	11,567.167	7,959.433	743.207	7,214.078
Country program loans	10,658.367	7,530.674	612.367	6,918.579
Social progress trust fund	501.234	258.465	12.136	246.329
Deficiency and basic material development	26.348	26.348	10.697	13.239
Financing of military sales	381.218	143.945	108.007	35.938
Under agricultural trade:				
Development and Assistance Act	5,140.294	4,097.777	113.295	3,332.908
Currency loans to foreign governments	4,111.369	3,379.977	20.201	2,747.051
Currency loans to private enterprises	285.254	223.575	48.285	136.441
Long-term sales	743.671	494.225	44.808	449.417
Under Export-Import Bank Act	7,305.506	5,414.252	1,817.088	3,597.164
Administrative area development	18.000	9.612		9.612
Under Lend-Lease Act	127.966	127.966	102.668	25.298
Surplus property sales	1,148.039	1,148.039	721.698	422.538
Sales of overseas surpluses	1,146.130	1,146.130	721.273	421.054
Sales of domestic surpluses	.151	.151	.047	.103
Merchant ship sales	1.759	1.759	.377	1.381
British loan	3,750.000	3,750.000	600.941	3,149.059
Loans to the United Nations	165.000	141.263	39.190	102.074
Under Euratom Cooperation Act	56.188	31.769		31.769
Prior grants converted into credits	2,688.027	2,688.027	1,207.025	1,480.752

Note: Totals rounded.

TABLE X.—TOTALS OWED TO THE UNITED STATES, BY COUNTRY—STATUS OF FOREIGN LOANS AND OTHER CREDITS FROM U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES SINCE JULY 1, 1945, AS OF JUNE 30, 1966

[In millions of dollars or dollar equivalents]

Area and country	Amount authorized	Status of credit		
		Utilized	Principal collected	Principal outstanding
Total U.S. Government foreign credits to all countries and to international organizations	31,966.118	25,368.138	5,345.112	19,365.251
Western Europe (excluding Greece and Turkey)	10,370.403	9,555.689	2,859.142	6,665.315
Austria	92.370	79.235	33.446	45.789
Belgium	172.538	154.478	84.731	69.747
Denmark	35.616	35.616	5.265	30.351
Finland	138.477	137.794	68.362	69.421
France	727.821	716.816	310.817	402.662
Germany	1,235.970	1,235.284	1,018.362	217.022
Iceland	47.437	39.844	7.731	32.028
Ireland	128.200	128.200	17.955	110.245
Italy	504.538	322.148	168.249	153.889
Liechtenstein	.575	.575	.246	.328
Luxembourg	3.000	3.000	.694	2.306
Netherlands	129.500	129.500	63.979	65.521
Norway	87.400	87.400	62.314	25.086
Portugal	137.281	136.367	21.976	114.392
Spain	674.998	508.795	76.315	432.424
United Kingdom	5,100.088	4,850.088	787.669	4,062.408
Yugoslavia	943.731	820.573	90.692	702.158
European Atomic Energy Community	100.868	60.545		60.545
European Coal and Steel Community	100.000	100.000	31.100	68.900
NATO	9.976	9.331	9.238	.093
Eastern Europe	384.731	384.731	103.884	280.847
Czechoslovakia	7.599	7.599	2.729	4.870
Hungary	15.917	15.917	10.112	5.805
Poland	138.720	138.720	58.558	80.163
Soviet Union	222.495	222.495	32.486	190.009
Near East (including Greece, Turkey, and United Arab Republic)	3,391.802	2,552.928	286.064	2,151.079
Cyprus	1.308	.373		.373
Greece	286.654	257.600	72.842	184.798
Iran	485.870	349.218	94.085	255.391
Iraq	24.433	19.363	1.484	17.879
Israel	616.537	526.884	58.748	465.768
Jordan	27.954	17.801	1.400	16.401
Lebanon	7.334	7.334	1.782	5.552
Saudi Arabia	82.499	9.113	6.984	2.129
Syria	38.047	12.296	.855	10.655
Turkey	1,113.708	768.367	35.378	732.210
United Arab Republic	707.458	584.577	17.506	468.922
South Asia	6,108.736	4,657.760	218.865	4,134.225
Afghanistan	67.466	55.326	9.686	45.640
Cylon	23.973	15.910	1.222	14.688
India	4,512.490	3,447.170	171.247	2,972.606
Nepal	5.268	2.383	.048	2.334
Pakistan	1,499.538	1,136.973	36.661	1,098.956
Africa (excluding United Arab Republic)	1,297.053	799.518	66.794	730.323
Algeria	12.594	11.572		11.572
Cameroon	13.000	4.851		4.851
Congo (Brazzaville)	.250	.250	.025	.225
Congo (Kinshasa)	63.309	24.235		24.235
Ethiopia	97.303	48.071	8.796	39.275
Ghana	147.367	68.043	.266	67.777
Guinea	25.997	2.532		2.532
Ivory Coast	19.043	8.415	.517	7.898
Kenya	16.901	13.419		13.419
Liberia	177.137	125.140	15.817	109.323
Libya	7.014	7.014	1.082	5.932
Malagasy Republic	2.700			
Malawi	.200			
Mali	3.200	.160		.160
Morocco	332.143	267.789	3.435	264.356
Niger	2.300	.339		.339
Nigeria	67.521	14.454	.568	13.886
Senegal	3.268	.300	.090	.210
Sierra Leone	12.672	11.285		11.285
Somali Republic	6.200	2.388	.035	2.353
South Africa	34.152	34.152	25.634	8.517
Sudan	35.720	17.696		17.699
Tanzania	12.588	7.641	.225	7.415
Tunisia	170.182	111.596	5.802	103.376
Uganda	5.450	2.532		2.532
Zambia	4.900	4.554		4.554
East African Common Services Organization	3.574			
Unspecified areas in Africa	20.368	11.089	4.502	6.568
Eastern Asia and Pacific	3,055.904	2,255.227	483.361	1,754.965
Australia	225.456	68.440	39.055	29.385
Burma	71.844	45.968	5.264	40.704
China—Taiwan	521.502	396.984	35.098	361.761
Indonesia	326.750	306.454	119.143	171.815
Japan	1,149.844	979.650	215.453	764.197
Korea	255.594	91.268	6.742	83.620
Malaysia	23.520	20.000	5.838	14.162
New Zealand	12.478	5.822	4.983	.839
Philippines	214.678	146.151	34.584	111.234
Ryukyu Islands	29.224	17.382	.223	17.159
Thailand	133.164	91.280	13.773	77.507
Vietnam	91.850	85.828	3.205	82.583
Western Hemisphere	7,050.584	4,992.304	1,285.920	3,519.599
Argentina	632.984	486.718	131.891	341.491
Bolivia	184.043	94.107	9.533	84.608
Brazil	2,290.364	1,724.805	453.306	1,140.348
Chile	905.775	705.021	87.653	609.406
Colombia	572.807	423.214	116.102	285.703
Costa Rica	91.161	52.834	11.974	40.859
Cuba	37.598	37.598	1.332	36.267
Dominican Republic	134.571	62.090	.941	61.149

TABLE X.—TOTALS OWED TO THE UNITED STATES, BY COUNTRY—STATUS OF FOREIGN LOANS AND OTHER CREDITS FROM U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES SINCE JULY 1, 1945, AS OF JUNE 30, 1966—Continued

[In millions of dollars or dollar equivalents]

Credit program	Amount authorized	Status of credit		
		Utilized	Principal collected	Principal outstanding
Western Hemisphere—Continued				
Ecuador	174.068	101.109	28.743	72.742
El Salvador	65.370	41.077	6.597	34.481
Guatemala	52.882	26.048	4.357	21.691
Guyana	9.500	.096	----------	.096
Haiti	37.942	37.942	3.594	34.348
Honduras	40.238	23.318	2.564	20.754
Jamaica	19.600	1.973	.093	1.880
Mexico	636.092	398.463	122.658	275.805
Nicaragua	72.352	32.972	8.913	24.059
Panama	87.767	61.080	6.454	54.627
Paraguay	55.223	32.701	3.359	29.343
Peru	394.457	298.533	135.527	162.998
Western Hemisphere—Continued				
Surinam	5.950	1.000	----------	.000
Trinidad and Tobago	17.000	12.773	1.929	10.844
Uruguay	57.547	34.507	2.935	18.264
Venezuela	304.249	182.881	43.643	139.238
Central American Bank for Economic Integration	62.500	10.895	.030	10.865
Unspecified areas in Western Hemisphere	108.543	108.543	101.793	6.750
Nonregional international institutions:				
United Nations	165.000	141.263	39.190	102.074
Unspecified areas	141.905	28.716	1.891	26.825

Note.—Totals rounded.

Sources: Foreign credits by the U.S. Government since 1945, status as of June 30, 1966. Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, March 1967.

1. U.S. Foreign Assistance, AID, Mar. 17, 1967.
2. Operations Report, AID, Dec. 20, 1962.
3. Foreign Grants and Credits, U.S. Commerce Department, No. 79, August 1966.
4. Proposed Program for Fiscal Year 1966, AID, March 1966.
5. Foreign Aid, 1940-51, U.S. Commerce Department, 1952.
6. U.S. Foreign Aid, H. Doc. 116, Legislative Reference Service, June 11, 1959.
7. Twenty-two Years of U.S. Foreign Aid, Legislative Reference Service, April 1963.
8. International Financial Statistics, International Monetary Fund, April 1967.
9. Foreign Credits by the U.S. Government as of June 30, 1966, U.S. Department of Commerce, March 1967.
10. The World War Indebtedness of Foreign Governments to the United States (1917-21), as of June 30, 1966, U.S. Department of the Treasury, January 1967.

PROMISES AND EXPECTATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned by the remarks made yesterday at the Midwest Governors' conference by Governor Romney, of Michigan. It seems to me that the Governor is not going to help his own cause or the interests of the Nation by the reckless charge—which he has made before, and repeated as of yesterday—that President Johnson is personally responsible for Negro unrest by stirring up "excess expectations."

It is interesting that such a comment should come from a Governor who recently attended a Negro rally at Flint, Mich., and announced that he was there to support open occupancy in the State of Michigan, and then went halfway back across the State to say he did not mean to say anything about open housing, that it was a slip of the tongue.

What is most disturbing is that the Governor should take it upon himself to determine not only for Negro Americans but for all Americans what is an "excess expectation."

The vast majority of Americans know that the record of the administration of Lyndon B. Johnson is unparalleled in the field of civil rights, and the vast majority of Americans also know that it has not only been the President's leadership but also the will of the country, expressed in acts of Congress, that has made this record.

Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was not an empty promise, nor was the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The appointment of Robert Weaver as the first Negro Cabinet officer in history, and the nomination, and now its confirmation by the Senate, of Thurgood Marshall as the first Negro Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States are not empty promises.

The poverty program is not an empty promise.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is not an empty promise.

The model cities and rent supplement programs are not empty promises.

A recent editorial from a highly respected Negro daily in Chicago, the Chicago Daily Defender, summed up the attitude of the vast majority of American Negroes, I am sure, better than Governor Romney, when it reported:

> Negroes have not had in the White House a greater crusader for the rights of the American black man than Lyndon B. Johnson. In point of objective reality and in the context of racial justice, he is the greatest President ever occupied the White House.

I believe that not only will the statement of the Defender be recorded by history as correct, but also it will be recorded that the actions of President Johnson in advancing the opportunities of Negro Americans were and are in the interest of the whole Nation.

THE LATE HENRY J. KAISER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a foremost builder and industrialist, Henry J. Kaiser, is dead. During his long and achievement-filled lifetime he was known throughout the Nation as a remarkable innovator in business methods and techniques. He was a man who demonstrated unparalleled determination and boundless confidence in every venture he undertook.

His passing is mourned especially by the people in the Pacific Northwest, where he left his indelible mark as the builder of Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, where he established a World War II shipbuilding operation that could produce a vessel in less than a week, and where he established a vast aluminum industry.

Henry J. Kaiser, who headed a multibillion-dollar industrial complex, had a humble beginning. Born of immigrant parents in New York State, he left school at 13 to work in a drygoods store in Utica for $1.50 a week.

After operating a photographic business in Lake Placid, N.Y., and Daytona and Miami, Fla., Mr. Kaiser decided to seek greater opportunity in the West. He moved to Spokane, Wash., in 1906 and became a salesman for McGowan Brothers Hardware Store at $7 a week. Mr. Kaiser soon became sales manager of the business. In 1912, he joined a construction company and 2 years later he established his own contracting firm. His company handled millions of dollars worth of construction in the Pacific Northwest and British Columbia and in 1921 he moved his headquarters to Oakland, Calif.

Mr. Kaiser's abilities as a contractor were again utilized in the Pacific Northwest in the 1930's, when he was affiliated with Columbia Construction Co., which built Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River and with Consolidated Builders, Inc., which built Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia. During World War II, his genius for getting things done resulted in the establishment of shipyards in the Pacific Northwest which mass-produced Liberty ships and small aircraft carriers.

Mr. Kaiser established his aluminum industry in Spokane by reactivating two World War II plants. The aluminum reduction plant at Mead and the rolling mill at Trentwood still constitute the largest payroll in the Spokane area and these plants make a significant contribution to the region's economy.

Mr. Kaiser also was a builder of nuclear production facilities. His Kaiser engineers built two of the major plutonium producing reactors for the Atomic Energy Commission at Hanford Works near Richland, Wash., in the 1950's.

Mr. Kaiser always was the tireless innovator. Of the 32 corporations and more than 50 active affiliated companies and subsidiaries in the Kaiser industrial complex, he was quoted as saying "I started

each one of them because I needed it, or the country needed it."

Thus, when he needed cement to build Shasta Dam in California, he established his own cement producing operation, Permanente Cement Co. Today it is one of the largest in the West. When he needed steel to build ships, he started his own steel company, Kaiser Steel.

While Mr. Kaiser established new patterns in almost every industry he entered, he also pioneered in labor-management relations. His companies often set the pace in peaceful settlements with labor organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a story in the August 25 edition of the Spokane Daily Chronicle, an editorial in the August 25 edition of the Chronicle, and an editorial in the August 26 edition of the Spokesman-Review.

[From the Spokesman-Review, August 26, 1967]

ZEALOUS KAISER WAS CONSTRUCTIVE

The death this week of Henry J. Kaiser has stimulated a respectful new appreciation of his contributions to society and those personal character qualifications which propelled him into worldwide industrial leadership.

A zealous, imaginative individual, Mr. Kaiser had no shame in his belief in the profit motive in American business.

As he developed his ability to "get things done" and as he widened his activities among construction projects and programs, Henry J. Kaiser also visualized a need for personal involvement in humanitarian enterprises. And for many of these he will be fondly remembered.

The Kaiser achievements as a builder were dependent, in part, upon an unusual intuition and perception of economic forces and governmental changes which provided the opportunities he capitalized upon.

He adapted himself and his organizations to the realities which existed. He combined business-world practicalities with visionary new ideas on how to satisfy human needs and desires.

His entry into the aluminum industry and his firm's remarkable success in this competitive field is only one example of his daring zeal. He was a modernizer and user of new technologies in many industrial works. But he did not ignore the human elements involved in his vast industrial complex.

Henry J. Kaiser exercised a constructive influence upon the worlds into which he moved, and upon many thousands of associates whose own accomplishments have been greater because of their mutual trust in this man of achievement.

In the Spokane and Inland Empire community where the Kaiser influence has been felt in an effective and popular manner over a period of many years, the termination of his spectacular career is noted with sorrow and sincere appreciation of what one individual can accomplish through constructive endeavor.

[From the Spokane Daily Chronicle, Aug. 25, 1967]

KAISER EMPLOYES MOURN HIS DEATH

The flags at Henry J. Kaiser's aluminum plants in Spokane were flying at half staff today for "an old Spokane boy" who grew up to be one of the mightiest of industrial giants and this city's largest industrial employer.

Kaiser died yesterday in Honolulu.

Kaiser Chemical & Aluminum Corp.'s Trentwood and Mead works, which he took over in 1946, today employ well in excess of 4,000 and are part of a $2.7-billion industrial organization.

Kaiser came to Spokane as a young man to win a bride and went on to found a great industrial empire as a producer of aluminum, magnesium, cement and steel, a builder of ships, airplanes, automobiles, dams and cities, and a manufacturer of hundreds of products.

He was born May 9, 1882, at Canojaharie, N.Y., quit school at the age of 13 and walked the streets of New York as a boy, looking for a job.

STORE CHAIN BUILT

An interest in cameras led him to the photographic business and, at the age of 21, he owned a string of photographic stores at Lake Placid, N.Y., and Daytona Beach and Miami, Fla. But he fell in love with a young woman who walked into one of his shops and her guardian supplied the spark that set the boy's ambitions aflame.

Bess Fosburgh's guardian insisted that Kaiser show more affluence before the two could be wed. So Kaiser decided the great American West was the place in which to accomplish this feat, and he landed at Spokane in 1906 looking for a start.

His first job was as a salesman for McGowan Brothers Hardware Store here at a salary of $7 a week. His enterprise soon made him sales manager and the right to marry Miss Fosburgh.

He next became a salesman for the Hawkeye Fuel Co. here and then salesman and manager of paving contracts for the A. J. Hill Co. He formed his own company, also a paving operation, in 1914 in British Columbia, the Henry J. Kaiser Co., Ltd., which soon was engaged in $1-million road-building contracts throughout the Pacific Northwest.

HOOVER DAM BUILT

The firm branched out into other construction and, in the 1930s, joined with other companies to build the $55-million Hoover Dam. He later had a hand in the building of Grand Coulee Dam, Shasta Dam and Bonneville Dam.

World War II spurred Kaiser to even greater efforts and he became a major factor in war production. During the war years, he built $4 billion worth of ships and his company once built a Liberty Ship in less than five days.

After the war, Kaiser entered the automobile industry with Kaiser-Frazer Corp. But, of more importance to Spokane, he had the foresight at a time when the aluminum industry looked dead to revive the big Mead reduction works and Trentwood rolling mill, which now constitute one of the most important factors in the Spokane economy.

OPERATIONS EXPANDED

Again building on his start in Spokane, Kaiser tied in other plants throughout the country to become one of the nation's largest and most successful light-metals producers.

In recent years, his own efforts had been devoted much to city building in Hawaii.

On his last visit to Spokane, in 1954, he referred to himself as "an old Spokane boy," who was pleased with the growth and the energy of the city and the Inland Empire.

The woman who inspired his early career had preceded him in death in 1951. His second wife, Alyce, and his son, Edgar Kaiser, were at his bedside in Honolulu when he died.

[From the Spokane Daily Chronicle, Aug. 25, 1967]

KAISER VIEWED A WORLD

The name of Kaiser would stand high in Spokane business history if Henry J. had never lived here. Employment at Trentwood and Mead by Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Co. has represented one of the biggest payrolls in the community for more than 20 years.

That he did live here for years added a certain local possessiveness to the world-renowned industrialist who died yesterday in Honolulu.

He died at 85—15 years short of the goal he had avowed. The fact that he set such a goal tells the fundamental story of his attitude toward life.

After he came west and began clerking for McGowan Brothers Hardware at Wall and Sprague in his early 20s, he lived for a time at S1115 Grand, near the top of the hill. The view was excellent.

But young Kaiser was seeing far beyond the city below him and the still sparsely settled Valley and the mountains north toward Canada.

From other selling jobs and work with a paving firm he progressed into road-building and a share through the years in construction of Hoover, Grand Coulee, Shasta, Bonneville and Hungry Horse dams.

Kaiser built ships, factories, vehicles, hotels. Kaiser produced steel, magnesium, cement, munitions. And of course his luster glows brightest here in terms of gleaming aluminum.

Henry J., looking always toward tomorrow, probably felt that he had guided his vast industrial interests only through their beginning. But what a beginning! From a Spokane hillside on a clear day he could see forever.

TAX EQUITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the Tax Equity Act of 1967—H.R. 12706—to make a number of major reforms in our tax laws. This is a complex and far-reaching proposal which would wipe out many of the truly unconscionable inequities which now riddle our tax structure. Because of the technical nature of the bill, which was printed in its entirety in yesterday's RECORD, I now insert an outline summarizing its provisions:

OUTLINE OF THE TAX EQUITY ACT OF 1967, INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, DEMOCRAT OF NEW YORK

I. Title of Bill is Tax Equity Act of 1967.

II. Capital Gains at Death—eliminates present provision that unrealized capital gains are not taxed as such at the time of a man's death (except as part of his estate).

III. Eliminates the provision whereby millionaires can deduct all charitable contributions (including to tax-exempt foundations) if, in 8 of the previous 10 years his contributions plus taxes (including State and local) reached 90% of his income. (Ordinary taxpayers can deduct contributions only up to 30% of income.)

IV. Stock Options are a device for corporations to allow high-paid executives to buy stock at less than market price and then pay only the lower capital gains taxes on the difference when they later sell. The bill eliminates this loophole.

V. Eliminates the special exemption for the first $100 of dividends from stock—deductions now enjoyed by 1 in 7 taxpayers (mainly the more affluent).

VI. Eliminates the multiple corporation tax dodge whereby a corporation divides itself into several entities for tax purposes. Its profits are divided among them and each pays taxes at a lower rate than if the parent company paid on the total income itself.

VII. Interest on Municipal Development bonds floated to provide free factories and facilities for profit-making companies is now deductible. The bill would end this deductibility.

VIII. Oil Depletion Allowances are now set at 27½% of gross income from oil wells up to 50% of income. A comparable deduction of 23% now exists for 41 minerals. The bill would reduce these to 15%.

IX. The present law permits a wealthy person to evade part of the estate taxes by giving away money during his lifetime to those who would be his heirs. The gift tax (which starts after $30,000 in taxable gifts) is set at ¾th of the rate set for estate taxes. The Tax Equity Act would make the gift tax rate equal to the estate tax rate.

X. Present law permits the executor of an estate to give the Federal government bonds in payment of estate taxes and the face amount of the bonds is credited towards the taxes even though the market value of the bonds may be much less. The Tax Equity Act would allow only the real value of bonds to be used for paying estate taxes.

XI. Arbitrage bonds are municipal tax-free bonds the proceeds of which are then used to buy Federal bonds which pay more interest to the municipality than it is paying on its bonds. This, in effect, allows a municipality to make a guaranteed profit on the fact that its income from its bonds are free from Federal taxes while the same is not true for Federal bonds. The Tax Equity Act eliminates this exemption.

XII. The Tax Equity Act establishes a minimum tax of 10% on income in excess of $10,000 a year and 20% on income in excess of $100,000 for individuals or corporations. This is to prevent pyramiding of loopholes.

XIII. Restoration of excise taxes on furs, jewelry (over $10), social club dues (over $25 a year), cosmetics (which sell for more than $2), handbags and luggage (which sell for more than $10), cameras, photo equipment, etc.

XIV. The Tax Equity Act eliminates special accelerated tax depreciation now permitted on speculative, investment real estate.

XV. The Tax Equity Act would eliminate the deductibility of the cost of lobbying before government agencies as a business expense.

TRUTH IN THE MARKETPLACE—II

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at an informal meeting of New York members of the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs in New York City, on August 28, we heard a number of excellent statements regarding H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, and related truth-in-lending bills. One of the most comprehensive and eloquent discussions of the need for this legislation was presented by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY of New York. His statement displays a compassionate understanding of the problems faced by low-income consumers, as well as a realistic assessment of how to deal with those problems. I insert Senator KENNEDY's statement herewith:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY ON H.R. 11601, TRUTH-IN-LENDING, CITY HALL, NEW YORK CITY, AUGUST 28, 1967

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: A casual look through the daily papers here in New York City—or in any other American city—on any given day is all one needs to appreciate the importance of the legislation before you today. Auto dealers and department stores, banks and finance companies, appliance stores and furniture stores—all advertise the ease of buying on credit. The consumer is barraged with a spate of variations on "buy now, pay later": A used car ad invites him to "buy on long, low, easy, bank terms." A TV retailer's ad entices him with "No down payment, 24 months to pay." And a bank offers "up to $2,000 just on your signature, a year to repay." But none of the ads tell him just how much this easy credit will cost him.

These advertisements—and the retailing practices they promote—have, of course, been remarkably successful in our affluent society. As more families with more income—3 out of 10 families now earn over $10,000 a year—see more products to choose, they buy, and buy, and buy—and they do it on the installment plan. The amount of credit buying has multiplied seventeen times since the end of World War II, four times in the last fifteen years. Short-term consumer debt is now nearly $100 billion, and when mortgages on one-family and other homes up to 5 units are thrown in, Americans owe well over $300 billion, almost as much as the national debt. Mortgage debts aside, about half the labor force is buying something on the installment plan. And the typical worker spends $1 of every $4 in his pay envelope to pay for the car or television set or refrigerator that he bought on time.

What is wrong with this picture is that the hard-pressed wage earner was never told—either in the advertisement or at the time of sale—the true cost of the credit involved. If more Americans are buying on credit, more are being deceived by misstated finance charges; more are victimized by disreputable lenders and sellers.

Reputable banks here in New York City advertise personal loans at "$5.25 per year, discount, for every $100 you borrow." They do not say that, even though the money is paid back a little each month, the interest charges are calculated as though all of the money is kept by the borrower for the whole year. This doubles the true interest rate from the quoted 5¼ percent, and the word "discount" means that there are added charges which bring it to over 12 percent.

Reputable department stores promote revolving credit plans at a cost of 1½ percent a month. This sounds inexpensive enough—but many do not stop to calculate that this is 18 percent a year, and most do not know that the store's accounting practices may increase the effective rate to a far higher level.

And if reputable institutions understate the cost of credit, or imply that it is less than it is, there are thousands of other stores and dealers who are far less scrupulous. This Committee's files are full of the worst reported cases—the man in Chicago who paid 283 percent interest for a car, the lady who bought a $123.88 TV set for 24 easy payments of $17.50—an interest rate of 229 percent. And the fact is that you and I can shop absolutely at random in any city in the United States and find interest rates—which we must calculate for ourselves, if we are able to—of anywhere from 20 to 50 percent and on up for everything from cars, to furniture, to appliances, to jewelry, to small loans.

We hear much about the fact that the poor pay more—and they do. The most shocking cases of overreaching are generally of poor people, who cannot afford a down payment, are attracted by low monthly payments, and are unsophisticated about the total cost they will end up paying. They fall victim more easily to aggressive salesmanship, to contracts disguised as receipts, to unconscionable collection procedures. And I have no doubt that resentment against exploitation is one of the grievances being expressed in the riots which have ripped our cities.

But the failure of banks and department stores and auto dealers to convey all the facts about their credit policies affects almost every American. The suburban housewife and her wage-earning husband must make dozens of decisions every year about how to finance family needs—a new car, a vacation, clothes for the children, a patio in the backyard. Will they take money out of the savings account or sell some stocks or obtain a small loan or obtain a loan on a life insurance policy or buy on credit? Time after time they buy on credit, not realizing that they are paying an annual interest rate of 18 percent, and that it would be much cheaper to take the money out of savings or even to borrow it at a bank. They simply do not know—are not told—enough to make an informed decision about what is, after all, a very complex matter. Indeed, the whole thing is obfuscated for them by a welter of gimmicks—"add-ons," "discounts," "service charges," "financing charges"—which make it virtually impossible to figure out the total cost of credit. And this is a situation in which literally tens of millions of Americans find themselves.

As a result, few purchasers know what they pay for credit. One survey of families who had borrowed money showed that only 18 percent knew what interest rate they had paid. And, of the ones who borrowed $500 or less, those who knew the rate of interest had paid an average of 12.1 percent; those who did not know the magnitude of the financing charge were paying 37 percent interest, on the average.

The legislation before you today, therefore, is important to every consumer. And consumers, by definition, include us all. Every consumer—hence, every American—needs the information necessary to choose for himself the best way of financing the goods he wants to buy. The right to choose and the right to be informed—those are the rights which H.R. 11601 seeks to protect.

This is particularly important today, when we read that the cost of living is rising sharply. For now, more than ever, people will be tempted to borrow or buy on credit to get the things they want. And, more than ever, if they do not have enough information to decide the best way to finance their purchases, they will fall under the domination of overreaching creditors.

We would not find it acceptable if one car dealer quoted us a price in zlotys, another in lira, and another in deutschmarks, or if, in order to buy a suit of clothes, we had to compare prices quoted in rubles, pounds sterling, and pesos. Yet that—and worse—is the situation regarding consumer credit. Not only must the buyer compare apples and oranges, but he must do so without knowing how many are in each basket. Not only is it as though prices were quoted in different currencies, but it is as though the seller were neglecting to say whether he uses the Mexican or the Spanish peso, the British or the Austrian shilling, the French or the Swiss franc.

What is needed is a simple yardstick, a measure so that comparisons can be conveniently made and competition among sellers of credit will be encouraged. The consumer needs the assurance that he will be quoted a rate of interest, the lowest rate of interest which the free play of competition will bring—and that in all instances the rate quoted will mean the same thing: an annual rate, computed on the amounts actually owed.

This is the principle which Senator Douglas fought for so tenaciously, so perseveringly

for so many years. This is the principle which motivated Senator Proxmire when he took up this fight this year. It is the principle which was central to the thinking of Congresswoman Sullivan and your thinking, Mr. Chairman, when H.R. 11601 was drafted. And it is the principle which we must enact into law—this year, while the extraordinary momentum which has developed for this legislation still carries us forward.

Mr. Chairman, I am especially pleased with H.R. 11601. I was pleased, of course, that the Senate passed S. 5, and I think S. 5 is a good bill, but I believe your bill improves upon it in a number of very important ways.

First, the requirement that interest rates on revolving credit plans be stated on an annual basis is, I think, quite important. Revolving credit is now the fastest growing type of consumer credit. More and more department stores are using it, and revolving bank credit card plans are sweeping the country. These plans are so attractive, I think, precisely because they are expressed in terms of a 1½ percent a month charge, and people do not stop to think of that as an annual rate of 18 percent.

If revolving credit is the only exception to the requirement that interest be stated as an annual rate. I think its growth will invariably be enhanced. And as it is, some have estimated that it will grow to 50 percent of consumer debt within 5 years.

Your record is replete with examples of the confusion people experience about revolving credit. Some stores compute the interest before deducting payments made during the month. Others do not even credit returned merchandise before computing the interest. Some have a 30-day grace period before interest is charged; others do not. Some have a grace period but then charge retroactively to the time of purchase. And from this thicket have emerged retailers as witnesses, who say their quotations of a 1½% monthly interest rate communicates sufficiently to the customer. I find that testimony unsatisfactory, to say the least.

To leave this maze of practices unregulated would be a mistake, in my judgment. The annual rate of interest should be stated, so that the buyer can compare. He may discover, to his surprise, that he would be better off getting a bank loan, or that he would be better off buying in a different store. And the buyer should understand when a store will start changing the interest and how the principal amount owed is determined. H.R. 11601 would accomplish these ends. That is a wise aspect of your bill.

Second, your bill extends the requirement of full disclosure to the advertising of credit. This is right, in my judgment. Too many consumers have already made up their mind to buy when they walk into the store in response to an especially captivating advertisement. The ads should state the full truth about financing if they are going to go into it at all.

Third, the bill includes credit charges of under $10. To people who earn $10,000 and $15,000 a year, this point seems less significant, both to a person of modest income the loss of even five dollars to an overcharging seller of credit may mean the loss of a pair of shoes for one of his children. The person who pays a dollar a month for six months while he pays for a $50 chair is paying 48 percent interest, and he deserves to know that.

Fourth, H.R. 11601 extends the disclosure requirement to mortgages. This is important because of the number of ways in which additional finance charges are added through such devices as discounts and points. The potential mortgagee should know what the effective interest rate is. Your bill would insure that he does.

Fifth, the bill prohibits cognovit notes—that is, agreement by the borrower at the beginning that judgment can be entered against him without full legal process if he defaults on the debt. The provision will end a practice which is an open invitation to overreaching and abuse.

Sixth, H.R. 11601 creates a ceiling of 18 percent on interest charges. This is the one provision about which I have reservations. I believe that an 18 percent ceiling would be constructive if we could be certain that it would only be a ceiling. What worries me is that it will become a floor as well—that lenders will automatically begin charging 18 percent unless state law keeps them from doing so. I urge the committee to weigh carefully whether the need for a ceiling when the bill already requires full disclosure, outweighs the danger that the ceiling will also be the floor.

Finally, the most important, in my judgment, the bill takes a significant new step that will protect thousands of families from harassment and even loss of employment. I refer to the prohibition against the garnishment of wages. Garnishment is really the modern equivalent of imprisonment for debt. Particularly for the low-wage worker, it can spell disaster. He may get to work one day and find most of his pay being taken to satisfy a debt or, worse yet, he may find an employer who doesn't care for the clerical burden involved and therefore simply fires him.

This is not an isolated problem. At one steel plant in Chicago, 2,000 deductions are made every payday to satisfy debts. The company says it pays out $500,000 a year to its employees' creditors.

And garnishment leads to bankruptcy. As our American postwar credit buying spree has snowballed, so have personal bankruptcies—from 8500 to 176,000 in 20 years. It seems more than coincidence that the three States (Florida, Pennsylvania, Texas) with prohibitions of garnishment number in the lowest six States in rate of bankruptcy; or that bankruptcies declined by 9% in Illinois after the garnishment exemption was liberalized; or that Iowa experienced a 360% rise in bankruptcies after going from a 100% wage exemption to a $35 a week exemption. In a recent study in Michigan, 75% of bankrupts indicated garnishment was a factor in filing bankruptcy. And you have heard the personal testimony of bankruptcy referees and other experts that the incidence of personal bankruptcy is very much affected by the type of garnishment law which a State has.

Bankruptcies ruin people's lives. They cause permanent psychological damage to family relationships. They cause those creditors who did not hound the debtor to lose everything. They are not very satisfactory for anyone. Ending garnishments would not only protect thousands of individuals, but would protect most creditors as well. The fact is that garnishment is a legal tool often used by the same sellers who sell at unconscionable interest rates in the first place. One study in Milwaukee showed that a third of the over 6700 garnishments in one year were by three establishments. Two stores in Akron, Ohio accounted for twenty percent of the garnishments there.

Ending garnishment might cause overreaching sellers to think twice. And comparisons of States having differing garnishment laws shows that the prohibition would neither discourage legitimate sellers from extending credit nor cause greater losses for sellers.

On the other hand, I do urge you to consider carefully the suggestions that have been made to improve the anti-garnishment provision in the bill:

To protect workers more completely, the prohibition should apply to all personal earnings, instead of just wages, and should include also a prohibition on wage assignments.

To protect legitimate creditors, a ceiling on the exempt income of perhaps $15,000 should be established. High-income people, such as entertainers and executives, do not warrant a total exemption.

It may be, too, that total abolition of garnishment will prove impossible at this time. I strongly urge you, however, to report at least a provision protecting workers from being fired because of a garnishment and establishing a reasonable national wage exemption for garnishment. These provisions would at least do away with the worst abuses.

If we pass H.R. 11601, we will have protected the right of all Americans to buy on adequate information. We will have enhanced the competitiveness of the credit market—and such informed competition will harm only the disreputable loan-shark. And if we succeed in reducing interest rates by even one point on the average, we will save $1 billion a year—cash that can be spent to reduce existing financial burdens or to buy products. In the end we would have stimulated economic growth and improved the allocation of resources in the economy. If we do not pass this law, we turn our backs once again on the consumer; we show once again our indifference to his predicament.

We have this choice. We can abandon the consumer to the finance companies and the merchandisers who prey on his desire for a better life, or we can insure that he has the information he needs to choose intelligently. If the initiative shown by the Subcommittee is matched by the full Congress, we will choose correctly.

TER HORST ON GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the past couple of years we have heard a great deal of discussion of legislation to regulate, in one way or another, the sale of firearms. Much that has been said and written on both sides of the controversy has been emotional and inflammatory.

It was refreshing, as a result, to read a thoughtful article of the gun problem which appeared recently in the Detroit News. The article, which was written by the News' fine Washington bureau chief, Jerry Ter Horst, presents carefully and unemotionally the case for one side of the controversy.

I should hope, Mr. Speaker, that all of our colleagues, whether or not they favor enactment of legislation dealing with the sale of firearms, would read this article, which I am inserting at this point in the RECORD:

GUN-HAPPY UNITED STATES IGNORES FBI'S WARNING

(By J. F. Ter Horst)

WASHINGTON.—"The easy accessibility of firearms is a significant factor in murders committed in the U.S. today," said FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

"It is a problem which the American public needs to examine closely . . ."

Hoover's observation applied to the latest episode in this year's shooting spree—yesterday's sniper slaying of American Nazi leader George Lincoln Rockwell.

But Hoover actually uttered his words four years ago, in June, 1963, to be exact, five months before the fatal shooting of President Kennedy.

The assassination of Mr. Kennedy stirred

and troubled this country, as it did the rest of the world. What is it about the American dream that requires the punctuation of so much gunshot?

Mr. Kennedy's death prompted thoughtful and responsible persons, in and out of government, to pay attention to Hoover's warnings about the "easy accessibility of firearms and its influence on willful killings."

Gun control bills have been introduced each of the last five years in Congress. But even the mildest was defeated.

Even as Rockwell's slayer must have been preparing for his deadly pull on the trigger, Senator Robert F. Kennedy was trying to persuade New York's city council to approve an ordinance to regulate the sale of rifles and shotguns, "the tools of the urban rioter, the machinery of senseless killing."

"If we do not pass these laws," said the slain president's brother, "we sign the death warrant of more policemen and more children who will be caught in tomorrow's crossfire.

"If we act now, we can save hundreds of lives in this country and spare thousands of families all across this land the grief and heartbreak that may come from the loss of a husband, a son, a brother, or a friend."

What is it about America, defender of world peace, that breeds an atmosphere of violence at home?

H. Rap Brown, stormy leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), was arrested last week and accused of carrying a carbine in his airplane luggage.

Congress is told that Michigan national guardsmen had to be ordered to unload their weapons during the Detroit riots because they were "trigger-happy . . . firing wildly."

A sizable cache of military weapons was unearthed recently in New York headquarters of RAM (Revolutionary Action Movement).

Gun dealers in jittery cities everywhere, according to the Justice Department, report a run on small handguns that can be concealed in a pocket or a lady's purse.

In Miami, a 23-year-old motorist from Keego Harbor, Mich., is held today on charges of assault with intent to commit murder.

With two pistols and a grin he raced through the streets firing at random. Four persons were wounded. One of them said the gunman "looked as if he was getting a kick out of it."

"A strange and peculiarly American plague has long swept our land, a plague of guns," Carl Bakal wrote in his 1966 book, "The Right to Bear Arms."

Since 1900 more than 750,000 Americans have been killed by gunfire, according to a compilation of police and federal records. That's a higher toll than all of the Americans killed in battle since the Revolution and through Vietnam.

There are 50 fatal shootings a day, one every 30 minutes, 17,000 a year.

No "civilized" country in the world can match that record. No other country makes rifles, handguns and shotguns so accessible to anyone who wants to buy—in person or by mail. Only seven states, (Michigan is one) require a permit or a license before you buy a pistol or revolver.

And almost everywhere you can buy a rifle easier than you can get a dog or cat license, or even a hunting permit.

With hardly any effort—in some places—you can buy a mortar, a bazooka or an anti-tank gun.

The last time this reporter purchased a rifle, he had to produce more identification to get his check cashed than to get his hands on the weapon.

Nearly two million guns are made in the United States and sold each year, and another million are imported. Estimates are that there are more than 50 million privately owned firearms in the country.

"COMMUNITY, RELIGION, POLITICS, AND THE URBAN CRISIS: THE VIEW OF A PRACTICING POLITICIAN," AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS TO CHRISTIAN FAMILY MOVEMENT CONFERENCE, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, AUGUST 26, 1967

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on August 26, 1967, I had the privilege of addressing the annual conference of the Christian Family Movement, an international organization for married couples concerned with applying Christian principles to families and life. The meeting was held at the University of Notre Dame, in the congressional district I represent.

I insert my address at this point in the RECORD:

"COMMUNITY, RELIGION, POLITICS, AND THE URBAN CRISIS: THE VIEW OF A PRACTICING POLITICIAN", AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS TO CHRISTIAN FAMILY MOVEMENT CONFERENCE, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, AUGUST 26, 1967

First, I am pleased to welcome you to Indiana, to the University of Notre Dame and to the district I have the honor to represent in Congress.

Second, I am glad to see the ecumenical complexion of your conference.

You may be interested to know that I have just returned from a visit to Greece, where I attended sessions of the Archdiocesan Council of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America in Athens, and that I also went to Istanbul, where I had the high privilege of visiting for several hours with His Holiness, Patriarch Athenagoras I, Ecumenical Patriarch of Eastern Orthodoxy.

The Patriarch invited me to sit at his left and then, with a smile on his face, told me, "That is where Pope Paul sat when he visited me a few weeks ago in this room. You are sitting in the Pope's chair."

The Patriarch told me about his talks with Pope Paul and described them as "a dialogue of love."

He also said that he thought all theologians ought to be taken to an island and left there because they are the ones responsible for dividing the churches. Of course, the Patriarch was speaking facetiously, and I, for one, am glad to see today's theologians moving in other directions, moving, in the words of the theme of this conference, toward building community rather than division.

I want this afternoon to discuss with you the relationship between religion and politics and, in accordance with your conference theme, to suggest how these concepts relate to the idea of building community. In doing so, I want to pay special regard to the urban crisis in America.

RELIGION AND POLITICS

As a preliminary matter, I think we should explore the relationship between religion and politics. I believe we should begin with the critical question: Why should we as Christians be concerned at all about politics and about government? Is there a religious responsibility incumbent upon us as Christians—as distinguished from our responsibility as citizens—for action in the political order?

Some say no, that the Christian as an individual and the church as an institution, must stand aside from the turmoil and tumult that is politics. Separation of church and state, they argue, means the separation of politics from religion.

I strongly disagree with this contention. The crux of the problem, in my view, is that many Christians do not understand how they can relate the law of love to the world of politics.

On the one hand, they see Christian love—*agape*—represented by Christ on the Cross—utterly self-sacrificing, self-giving, other-regarding love. On the other hand, they perceive the world of politics where "accommodation", "negotiation", and "compromise" correctly characterize the political process. Thus, selfless Christian love seems to stand in stark and irreconcilable contrast with calculating, bargaining politics. Never, some persons therefore argue, can the twain of politics and religion meet.

Yet I believe that the law of selfless love does speak to the hurly-burly political world inhabited by Presidents, Congressmen, cabinet officials and assemblymen.

I believe that there is a concept that bridges the two seemingly disparate worlds, a link that connects the law of love to the practice of politics.

That concept is justice.

IDEA OF JUSTICE

The idea of justice has varied through history, but I suggest that at the very least justice means guaranteeing to every man his due, assuring him that he gets what he is entitled to as a man.

Now it should be clear that justice is not the same as love. Love does not count or reckon—but justice does. Justice must be calculating in order to allocate responsibilities and rewards among competing interests. It is not love, therefore, but justice that should be the immediate objective of political action. Martin Luther King is therefore speaking the language of justice through political action when he says, "I'm not asking for a law to make the white man love me, just a love to restrain him from lynching me."

The relationship between love and justice—and, I suggest, between religion and politics—is summed up by theologian Reinhold Neibuhr when he says: "Justice is the instrument of love."

Love, then, is most assuredly not irrelevant to political action. On the contrary, it is our love for our fellow man that generates in us a concern that he be treated justly. Love is the force that motivates our commitment to justice.

I believe, therefore, that we have in the concept of justice a link which binds together the worlds of Christian faith and political action—and does so in an intellectually honest, theologically consistent and politically realistic way.

And I believe that it is the principal purpose of political action to seek, in the given circumstances, to promote, for all men, the widest degree of justice possible. Indeed, when we legislate in Congress, we constantly use the rhetoric of justice—parity for farmers, equitable tax laws, fair labor standards, equal opportunity—and we do so even when we fail in our acting to match our rhetoric.

BUILDING COMMUNITY

Having demonstrated, I hope, that the spheres of religion and politics can and, moreover, should be closely linked, I want to proceed to the central theme of this conference and of the Christian Family Movement program for the year ahead: building community through religious life and politics.

Community is not a concept easy to define. Indeed, one scholar listed some ninety-four definitions of the term community.

For the sake of simplicity, I shall use the definition in the CFM materials prepared for

your use: Community is the spirit that draws men together before the community, in the physical sense, is constructed; it is the spirit which continues to nourish the existing physical community.

Considered in this sense, and given the directions in which our society appears to be headed, there are, I believe, few concepts more crucial to the destiny of America than the concept of community.

I cannot prove, in these few minutes, that a sense of community is a prerequisite to a just society. But this assumption seems reasonable enough. Surely a psychological frame of mind grounded in an awareness of shared experience and common purpose must exist before mere geographic locality can be transformed into a harmonious and satisfying environment—into an environment, that is in which each human being recognizes and appreciates the aspirations of his neighbors and in which men strive together in the words of Aristotle, "to give to every man his own."

GENUINE COMMUNITY

Now I don't know about your hometown, but I can say that neither South Bend, Indiana, nor Washington, D.C., nor I daresay any city in America, operates exclusively upon the principles of love and justice and has developed what can be described as a genuine community. I fear, moreover, that no such community is likely to be seen upon this planet in the next several years—under either a Democratic or a Republican Administration. But there is no reason to believe that we cannot now begin to move ahead toward community.

Move ahead from what? What is the state of community in the nation today? In leaving aside consideration of the condition of community within other nations and among all nations, I do not overlook the world-wide dimensions of the problem.

This morning's New York Times, for example, quotes leaders of the World Council of Churches, meeting in Crete, as well as Franz Cardinal König, of Vienna, all warning of the dangers to the world of increased racial strife not only in the United States but elsewhere.

I shall nonetheless focus my comments upon community in the United States, the arena in which you will be acting, and more precisely, I mean to concentrate on community in urban America.

Our vast, complex, and increasingly technologically oriented society is changing in scale beyond our capacity fully to comprehend. And community has fallen victim to these massive social forces.

Community is barely visible within the decaying cores of the great cities of the nation and some of the smaller ones as well.

It is, indeed, my thesis that this breakdown of a sense of community is a thread running through nearly all the enormous problems besetting our cities today. Slum housing, poor education, widespread unemployment and underemployment among the Negroes, explosive race relations, paternalistic welfare systems, decaying family structures, poverty amid affluence—all these are harsh signs of grave divisions within the American society.

SEARCH FOR MEANING

Consider the inner cities of America. They are erupting with erratic but volcanic outbursts of hostility, anger, fury, hatred. None of us can condone lawlessness and violence. But none of us should fail to search conscientiously for the meaning that underlies this sad commentary on the American society.

Although it is difficult to assign exact weight to each factor contributing to the riots, there is no inscrutable mystery as to why, on balance, the seething frustrations occasionally explode in violence. In a word, we have not done enough and what we have done, we have done too slowly.

Here is the assessment of Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, in his statement which was read at all masses in Washington four weeks ago:

As Christians, he said, our efforts to eliminate segregated slum housing have been feeble. Our support of desperately needed programs of job training and job opportunities for unemployed Negroes in our ghettos has been far less than adequate. Our education system throughout the nation moves at a snail's pace in its faltering efforts to readjust to the rapidly changing situation in our crowded urban centers and to provide the kind of education needed in the inner city. Our programs of urban renewal have not been designed primarily to meet the needs of disadvantaged low income families. Too often, to the contrary, these families have been the victims rather than the beneficiaries of urban renewal. Our welfare programs have too often been paternalistic, demeaning, and inadequate and have weakened family life.

We have tolerated the commercial exploitation of ghetto residents by excessively high prices, inflated credit rates, and inferior products. . . .

Under such conditions as Cardinal O'Boyle describes, it would seem that the only community that can emerge is one based upon a commonly felt animosity.

Or hear the words of New Haven's Mayor Richard C. Lee, speaking earlier this week in the aftermath of serious civil disruptions in his city. Both Mayor Lee and New Haven, as you know, have been for a decade held up as an exemplary urban administrator and community. New Haven had its own broad antipoverty program two years before the idea became fashionable in Washington. Its urban renewal program is one of the most extensive in the nation.

PROGRESSIVE PROGRAMS

Yet, said Mayor Lee, who rose to national prominence on the strength of those progressive New Haven programs: "New Haven is not a model city, and it never has been. We've done a lot, but for every one thing that we've done, there are five that we haven't."

Only this week leaders of the new Urban Coalition—big city mayors and businessmen, labor, church and civil rights spokesmen—including Mayor John Lindsay, Walter Reuther, David Rockefeller, Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young—declared that so far our nation has moved too slowly and too modestly in attacking the ills of urban America.

A similar note of urgency was voiced in Washington this week by John A. McCone, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and head of the Commission to investigate the 1965 Watts riot. Unless an answer is found to the racial problem, "it is going to split our society irretrievably and destroy our country".

Yet in spite of the eloquence with which the Cardinal and the mayors and the civil rights leaders speak and in spite of the harsher language of the riots and disorders, I fear that too many middle class Americans still do not realize that many of their fellow Americans—especially Negroes—feel locked out of the mainstream of American life.

Michael Harrington's classic book on poverty was perceptively titled, "The Other America," for most Americans have little contact with poverty or with poor people.

The same point is made in a column in this morning's Washington Post headed, "White Assessment of Riots Ignores Thinking of Blacks".

Says White: "What we most need to understand is that the Negro is alienated from the white community."

Replies Black: "Alienated? We've never been let into the white community. Come down and see."

The beleaguered Mayor of Newark, Hugh Addonizio, was really making the same point about the lack of contact and community when he told the Senate Judiciary Committee this week that "it was the cruelest of myths" that middle class Americans have an interest in saving the nation's cities.

"Affluent American," he said, "are gripped more by the need to buy a vacation home, a sport car for their college bound son and a second color television set than they are with sharing their affluence with the poor."

LACK OF COMMUNICATION

Let me give you another illustration of what I am trying to say about this lack of communication between whites and blacks in America.

A high official of the Federal Government was walking through a Negro street in Washington, D.C., to see what he could see. It was a hot night. A family was out on the sidewalk. A police car came up: "Get the hell back in the house." The smallest of incidents, it meant so much that it was told to the President himself and he has repeated it, struggling to grasp what he was up against.

What we are up against is, in large measure, I suggest, that we do not yet realize how deeply run the fissures dividing the haves from the have-nots in this land of spectacular plenty, or how many white Americans are unaware of the plight of many black Americans.

If we begin to understand this lack of communication and this lack of community, both words, I note, with the same Latin root, we can begin to appreciate why some Negro leaders reject the possibility of constructive change through the existing political and social system.

They feel helpless to affect their own destinies and environments and this helplessness underlies much of the hostility and frustration and cynicism and ultimately the result to violence.

For they certainly do not feel members of a community—with shared experience and a sense of common purpose. And, of course, this lack of community is most dramatically visible in the inner cities of America.

What, then, is to be done? . . . to restore community where it has been riven—to build community where it has not existed?

First, it seems clear to me, that Christians, motivated by love to seek justice for all men, have a religious as well as civic responsibility to work, both through politics and outside politics, for concrete measures to build community—at every level in our society.

Second, I believe that business and industry, labor and education, as well as the churches and government—all the institutions of our society—must undertake a particular commitment to make our cities genuine communities in which all citizens participate and have a stake. And this will not be easy. But easy or not, it is imperative.

CAUSES OF RIOTS

We are busy right now, with commissions, governmental and non-governmental, diagnosing the causes of the riots and of the malaise affecting urban America.

I suggest that there is no simple explanation and no single cause of the disorder.

And, I suggest further that no single program, governmental or non-governmental, will cure the ills of urban America.

But there is much that can be done that we are not now doing: And so, as President Kennedy said in another context, let us begin.

I here offer only a few observations in terms of action—action to build community.

First, we must work at every level, neighborhood, town and city, state and region and national.

We in Washington clearly are not going to

solve all these problems from the Nation's Capital.

Having said that, I hasten to add that we in Washington—the President and Congress—Democrats and Republicans—must do far more than we have done.

The conservative coalition that has crippled model cities, killed rent supplements, hobbled the Teacher Corps, restricted aid to education and laughed at a rat control bill will not be easy to persuade to embark upon a still more ambitious Marshall Plan for urban America.

But if we in Congress are to be able to act, we need the support of people like you—and this means political action, about which I shall say a further word in a moment.

But let me here state that governmental action alone is not enough.

NEED BUSINESS SKILLS

We need to harness the technological capacity and inventiveness, the skills and genius of American private business and industry, to an assault on the problems of the urban ghetto—and people like me in Congress are more and more anxious to see greater reliance on the private sector of the American economy to help build communities.

Labor union leadership needs to begin to look outward again and recover some of the idealism that historically has caused the American labor movement to be a champion of the downtrodden and disadvantaged—and not be content to relax in self-satisfaction at the higher standard of living which union activity has helped make possible for its members.

The churches—four years ago in the forefront of zeal for the cause of the American Negro—have also, I fear, been caught up in some of the understandable backlash of recent events and are no longer heard with the tenacious eloquence that marked the March on Washington of 1963.

What I am saying is that we must work, both inside and outside politics, if we are effectively to help build community in this troubled land of ours.

Let me conclude with some more specific suggestions to you as members of the Christian family movement.

I applaud your forthcoming program of year long study of and commitment to the task of building community. For first, you need to learn about the problems; you require knowledge before you can undertake action.

Second, I hope you will give particular attention to supporting one vital aspect of the war on poverty—the Community Action Program.

COMMUNITY ACTION

As you know, under the Economic Opportunity Act, public or private groups known as community action agencies may apply for funds for projects in poverty target areas. One of the main ideas underlying the concept of community action is that the traditional and often paternalistic approach of welfare agencies can never be adequate. The philosophy embodied in CAP holds that citizens can and should actively participate in identifying their own needs and in helping shape programs to alleviate those needs. Community Action aims, in a word, at participation, and, through this involvement, to build communities out of the non-communities which are so characteristic of our inner cities. Indeed, the law calls for the "maximum feasible participation" of the neighborhood residents in these target areas. As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, the House committee having jurisdiction over the poverty program, I can say that the evidence of pride in self-help achievement has been, in many instances, wondrous to behold.

CAP, as you are aware, is a bold and often controversial program. There has been nothing like it in the history of this nation—or any other nation so far as I am aware. If it were not controversial—if established agencies and interests did not feel at all threatened by the impact of this program—then I dare say CAP's potential probably would be very limited indeed.

I urge you then, upon your return to your own cities and towns, to familiarize yourselves with your local community action agency. It is a unique and significant undertaking which will play a very important role in determining whether millions of Americans can yet be incorporated into the mainstream of American life—through the creation of viable communities willing and able to look more effectively after their own needs.

POLITICAL ACTION

I would not feel that I had preached my complete sermon unless I said a final word admonishing all of you not to turn your backs on political action but rather to welcome politics as an instrument—and a legitimate one in a free society—in the search for justice and community.

I would, moreover, encourage at least some of you to consider taking the plunge into electoral politics and consider becoming politicians yourselves.

Let me here make bold to offer these few guidelines to Christians thinking of going into politics.

First, it is not enough to be a good Christian to be effective in politics. You must also be a good politician, that is, understand the process of political decision making and be willing to work hard at politics.

Second, you must either have or develop a thick skin. I need not here elaborate.

Third, you must understand that all policies, societies, governments, and all politicians are under God's judgment. None must be absolutized or deified as incarnating God's will. For none is righteous, no, not one. The Christian in politics will, therefore, always live under tension, always aware that he measures political achievements by standards that require ever greater effort. He can never be satisfied.

Fourth, the Christian in politics must be outgoing and must actively seek justice and combat injustice. I should add, however, that there is no mandate for him to ride at full armor into every battle that comes along. If he does, he will soon deplete his forces and diminish his effectiveness. He must make realistic judgments on when and where to move.

ARMED WITH UNDERSTANDING

Finally, the Christian in politics is armed with a unique understanding of human nature. He realizes that man is made in the image of God, yet prideful; he is aware of the role of self-interest in politics, of his own as well as that of others. He knows that, as an active participant in politics, he often will find himself in morally ambiguous situations. But as Dean John C. Bennett of Union Theological Seminary has said, "Instead of being unnerved by guilt or despair in their midst, Christians do know the experience of receiving grace and forgiveness while they take responsibility."

I told you at the outset of my remarks that two weeks ago in a small room in Istanbul, I—an American Methodist—talking to a Greek Orthodox Patriarch—sat in the same chair in which the Roman Catholic Pope had sat a few weeks before.

As I listened to the Patriarch tell of his warm meeting with the Pope, I could sense the community that had developed between these two great men.

And I sense the community here that marks members of the Christian Family Movement.

It is your task, and mine, to help build that community—many communities—throughout the country that we love.

"FACE THE ISSUES," AN INTERVIEW WITH DON STACY, PAST PRESIDENT OF THE OLE MISS DEMOCRATIC CLUB, STATION WLBT, JACKSON, MISS., JULY 22, 1967

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who had the opportunity to study for a year at the University of Mississippi in 1945–46 while serving in the U.S. Navy, I have naturally taken a continuing interest in the young people of that State and especially in the work of the young Democrats of Mississippi.

Although I cannot in good conscience profess enthusiasm for the results of this week's primary election in Mississippi, there is one development there which I feel is very noteworthy. I refer to the continued growth of the Young Democratic Clubs of Mississippi, the official youth organization of the National Democratic Party.

This organization, Mr. Speaker, is fully committed to the principles of the National Democratic Party, the principles of democracy and equality of opportunity for all the citizens of our country. Mr. Speaker, the Young Democratic Clubs of Mississippi represent a great deal that is praiseworthy in American youth today.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of an interview which explains much of the work of the Young Democratic Clubs of Mississippi. The interview which was conducted on Station WLBT, Jackson, Miss., on July 22, 1967, was with Don Stacy, past president of the Ole Miss Democratic Club. The transcript of the interview follows:

"FACE THE ISSUES", WLBT, JACKSON, MISS., JULY 22, 1967

MODERATOR. Welcome to Face the Issues. Today's topic will be the Young Democrats Club of Mississippi. Our guest is Mr. Don Stacy who is immediate past president of the Ole Miss Democratic Club and present member of the state's executive committee. To start our program off today, I would like to ask Mr. Stacy if he would give us some of the background of the Young Democratic Party's activities and philosophy, particularly in Mississippi.

Mr. STACY. Thank you. The Young Democrats of Mississippi are a highly-motivated, modestly financed group that is interested in taking Mississippi back to the Democratic Party—back to what we like to call the house of our fathers. We received our present charter in 1965 in New York City at the 17th Annual Convention of the Young Democrats of America. We are recognized by the Democratic Party as the official youth group in the state of Mississippi. We are a racially inclusive organization of about 3,000 members from twenty-two counties and on seven university campuses. What we are trying to do is beckon our fellow Mississippians back to the ideals of people like Eleanor Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson, and John Fitzgerald Kennedy. To this end we have brought a number of outstanding speakers into the state of Mississippi. Among the speakers have been

Senator Robert Kennedy, Democrat of New York; George Grider, Congressman from Memphis; the Honorable Richmond Flowers, the Attorney General of Alabama; Ole Miss Alumnus and former Rhodes Scholar John Brademas, who is now serving in the House of Representatives from Indiana; former Solicitor General of the United States the Honorable Archibald Cox; Charles Weltner, Congressman from Atlanta; Senator Hart, Democrat of Michigan; Senator Mondale, Democrat of Minnesota; and this September we are looking forward with great enthusiasm to the visit of Vice President of the United States, Hubert Humphrey. I believe this has been the main import of our activities. Following these appearances we have sought to search out a nucleus of nationally loyal Democrats in the various counties to build on this nucleus and to prepare the people to participate in precinct and county and state conventions.

QUESTION. Mr. Stacy, you mentioned in your opening remarks that yours was the party recognized by the national organization. Are there other Young Democratic parties organized in the state of Mississippi?

Mr. STACY. No. All Young Democratic organizations adhere to our group. There are some Democratic groups that want to attach certain prefixes or suffixes, and call themselves Freedom Democrats or Mississippi Democrats. But, we are the Democratic party that you have always known on the national scene.

QUESTION. You just mentioned the Freedom Democratic Party, so let me go ahead and ask you now. What is your affiliation with the so-called Freedom Democratic Party of Mississippi?

Mr. STACY. There is no affiliation whatever. We are totally separate groups. They are essentially a civil rights organization. We are a political organization. To the extent that they participate in politics, they do so as a third party. Our only interest is in the national Democratic Party. And we are a racially inclusive group. More and more, the Freedom Democrats are tending to a racially exclusive group. This, I would say, is the main distinction.

QUESTION. Mr. Stacy, what percentage of your group is colored? Could you give us some generalization?

Mr. STACY. I have not had the pleasure of meeting all the 3,000 members of the Young Democrats of Mississippi, but I say it conforms roughly to the population of the state. I would say at least 40% of our organization are Mississippi Negroes.

QUESTION. Could you give us a few leaders of the Mississippi Young Democrats?

Mr. STACY. Yes. Our co-chairman is Hodding Carter III of Greenville, Mississippi, the editor of the Delta Democrat Times. Serving with him is Cleve Donald, who is a graduate of Ole Miss—in fact, the second Negro graduate of Ole Miss. He is presently pursuing a doctorate in History at Emory University in Atlanta. Some of the other officers are Jesse Epps from Clarksdale, Mississippi, Irvin Walker from Jackson, Mississippi, William Watkins from McComb, Mississippi, Bill Silver, from Oxford and now Jackson. These are Young Democrats who come immediately to mind as members of the Executive Board.

QUESTION. Mr. Stacy, your group is integrated. Is your group an integrationist group? Do you openly espouse integration as one of your tenets?

Mr. STACY. We openly espouse the idea of Americans getting together and meeting one another. We openly espouse the ideas of all Mississippians getting into the political process. If the political process is going to govern all Mississippians, we think it should embrace all Mississippians.

QUESTION. In your opening statement you said you would like to bring Democrats to the fold of the regular Democratic line and mentioned Eleanor Roosevelt and some others. Do you think that as you are presently constituted you could even achieve this goal? Don't you think that it is a rather formidable task in Mississippi to bring the regular rank and file Democrats into a philosophy such as yours?

Mr. STACY. It is a formidable task, but I think that Mississippians by and large are tired of being gulled and bamboozled by the party leaders. Mississippians have not ended up in the winning camp in a Presidential election since World War II. In fact, the majority of Mississippians cannot of their own memory recall when Mississippi did vote for the winning candidate. I think the height of this folly was reached in 1960 when we cast our electoral votes for a man who was not even in the race. And I think that Mississippians are tired of this sort of bamboozling, and they are willing to treat with their own problems, and think the party that treats best with those problems is the Democratic Party.

QUESTION. How many types of Democrats are there in the state now? There seems to be a profusion of Democrats.

Mr. STACY. I really could not keep up with all the prefixes and suffixes. I am interested in making the local Democratic Party look like and taste like the high-priced spread that is available nationwide.

QUESTION. Mr. Stacy, you were just talking about Mississippi going with the winner. Does your party, your organization, advocate going with the winner rather than the people of Mississippi voting their true convictions?

Mr. STACY. We feel the people of Mississippi should vote their true interest. We feel that a state which has suffered the economic privation of Mississippi, a state which has been handicapped with the educational system of Mississippi, should look and see if they should not desire a program such as STAR which teaches adults basic literacy, whether they should not desire a program which would teach the pre-school children what the names of colors are, and how to use a knife and fork. We think Headstart, we think STAR, we think the various other programs and projects of the Great Society meet Mississippi's needs. This is what we would call to the attention of our fellow Mississippians.

QUESTION. Mr. Stacy, do you plan to bring Mississippi back to the National Party by taking control of the state Democratic party, or do you plan to go outside of the state party and gain recognition for your group?

Mr. STACY. We plan to go to the local precincts. We plan to go to the county conventions. We plan to go to the district conventions. We plan to go to the state conventions. We plan to be in the delegation which sits on the floor of the National Convention to re-nominate Lyndon Johnson in 1968.

QUESTION. Well, if you do not win in the precinct, county and state conventions, will you propose a convention contest on this issue—that is, form your own delegation and send it to the National Convention?

Mr. STACY. We believe that a group of Mississippians should represent Mississippi on the convention floor. In 1964, the National Democratic Convention said that in 1968 it must be a nationally loyal, racially inclusive delegation that is seated from Mississippi. We want to give the people of Mississippi a chance to participate. We want to represent them. We, among others, will represent them. This is our opportunity. If we are frozen out and a racially exclusive delegation goes to the Convention, we will go along also because we think all Mississippians should be represented.

QUESTION. Is your organization, Mr. Stacy, backing a candidate in the governor's race in Mississippi?

Mr. STACY. No, sir. Our charter as Young Democrats prohibits us from endorsing any candidate in a Democratic primary. Even if this were not the case, I know of no candidate in the race who is loyal to the principles of the Democratic Party. So we could not, in good faith, endorse such a candidate.

QUESTION. Mr. Stacy, in that case let's go ahead and assume that one of the candidates that you did not especially off the record favor happened to be the candidate of the Democratic Party after these elections. Would your group still go ahead and endorse this man as Governor of Mississippi?

Mr. STACY. There are occasions, to use the words of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, when party loyalty asks too much. If the candidate were not a man who represented the whole people of Mississippi, if he were a man of a particular racial camp, if he were, as one has been described, a "fiery segregationist," we could not in good conscience endorse this man.

QUESTION. Well, on the national level, Mr. Stacy, if Robert Kennedy was the Democratic Party's candidate for President in 1968 or 1972, would your group endorse his candidacy?

Mr. STACY. We would endorse the candidacy of whomever the national party convention chose, because we would go to the convention as a loyalist group.

QUESTION. Mr. Stacy, is it not correct that most of the financing of your group comes from sources outside of the state?

Mr. STACY. No, sir, I do not believe that most of the financing comes from sources outside the state. Most of our financing comes from memberships which we sell in Mississippi, and from various older Mississippians outside the most literal description of "young" who are interested in seeing a national party re-instituted. Certainly, we do receive contributions from outside the state from people who are interested in restoring a political dialogue.

QUESTION. Well, Mr. Stacy, I have a newspaper clipping here, an AP release, from Boston, in regard to this fund raising dinner of which your organization was the beneficiary last month, and Mr. Silver, your Executive Secretary, in referring to this meeting, said that "we will need to meet a minimum operating budget of twenty thousand dollars. We hope to raise the additional funds at like receptions in New York and Los Angeles." Now, to me that indicates that you expect most of your money to come from outside.

Mr. STACY. Well, there is a difference between money anticipated and money received. The money we have received has been predominantly from within the state.

QUESTION. You have not used that money to back a candidate?

Mr. STACY. No sir, we have used that money to open an office in the Vincent Building, and to go into the remaining sixty counties in Mississippi and to find nationally loyal Democrats, and to let them know what they have to do to go to the county convention, and the district convention, and the state convention, and to make known the aspirations and ideals of the Young Democrats throughout the state.

QUESTION. Mr. Stacy, was your organization instrumental or connected with Senator Kennedy's appearance in Mississippi in the recent Poverty Commission hearings in our state?

Mr. STACY. No sir, we were not. We had the pleasure of entertaining Senator Kennedy when he came to the University of Mississippi, March 19, 1966, but we did not have the pleasure of meeting with him on his recent visit.

QUESTION. Mr. Stacy, would you say that the Young Democrats are closer to the Kennedy wing of the Democratic party than the Johnson wing of the party?

Mr. STACY. No sir, I would say we are mainstream Democrats. We have friends at the White House, we have good friends on the Hill. I would not say that we are in the Kennedy camp.

QUESTION. The Kennedys have been ex-

tremely kind to your organization though, haven't they, in giving of their time and talent to raise funds for your group?

Mr. STACY. Well, the fund-raising that has been most beneficial to our group was the one last month in Boston, Massachusetts at Tremont on the Common. There at a reception on June 15th, we raised $3,904.29 which we deposited on July 11th in the First National Bank of Jackson, Mississippi. Now as to whether or not this was Kennedy money: $100 of this came in a personal check from Edward Kennedy. Among the hundreds of others contributing was Edward McCormack, who ran against Edward Kennedy for the Senate in Massachusetts. And so I think really we have a sampling of all Massachusetts Democrats, for Senator Kennedy's was one-thirty-ninth of the money we received.

QUESTION. In practicing your politics on various state campuses, colleges and universities, are you able to work freely? Are you harassed in any way? How easy is it for a Young Democratic Club to get going and stay going?

Mr. STACY. I find it rather exciting. I do not find myself inhibited or impinged upon. I think the main thing you have to deal with is a distrust which young Mississippians have grown up with in the local political situation. You have to let them know that there is something candid, something new, something dynamic about what you are offering them. They have heard cliches and banalities so long that they are somewhat deadened to a political appeal.

QUESTION. The Young Democrats as an organization, do they believe in all the policies and practices of the Johnson administration including Viet Nam?

Mr. STACY. Yes, I think we showed our support for Viet Nam very graphically back in the fall of 1965, when the Young Democrats at Ole Miss had a "Pints for Patriotism" Drive at which some 700 pints of blood were donated for the troops in Viet Nam. Our slogan was, as I recall, "that if blood must be shed, that freedom be maintained, let that blood be ours, even as that freedom is ours." So, we have done more than mouthings. We have had support now, if you will pardon a pun, in vein.

QUESTION. In the Young Democrats are there members of other groups like the Freedom Democratic Party who have been both a member of the FDP and the Young Democrats?

Mr. STACY. I am sure there are. I am sure there are members of all backgrounds, of all persuasions, and that is exactly what we are striving for, to be representative of all of Mississippi. We are here to open doors, not to close doors.

QUESTION. Mr. Stacy, your organization in cooperation with others has recently filed suit against the Board of Trustees for the Institutions of Higher Learning to secure the removal of a ban on certain controversial speakers at the University of Mississippi. Do you care to comment on that?

Mr. STACY. Yes, we have a suit pending in the District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi. The institutions of higher learning, of which I believe there are eight or nine, are all under a very distasteful ban, and I think a very foolish ban. Any speaker who is invited to speak at the institutions of higher learning must first be approved by individually approaching all thirteen members of the Board of Trustees. And the Chancellor's hands are tied, whatever the merits of the speaker or of his speech, from inviting anyone who is "in disrepute in the community from which he comes," who is "likely to do violence to the academic atmosphere," who is charged with crime, or charged with a moral wrong. Now we feel that these standards are so vague and ambiguous that men must necessarily guess as to their meaning and differ as to their application. We feel that there is denial of anything like due process. Who would be prohibited under "disrepute in the area from which he comes?" Perhaps a resident from Harlem who had a good word for Mississippi. It is simply a shadow on the whole educational system.

We went before Judge Clayton on July 9th with regard to an institute which the University of Mississippi had funded with HEW funds, some fifty thousand dollars. In the prospectus which they sent to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, they listed Dr. Aaron Henry as a speaker. When they received the fifty thousand dollars they deleted his name as a speaker and cancelled the contract with him. Judge Clayton reinstituted the contract with Dr. Henry, saying that the Board's action was in violation of Article I, Section 10 of the United States Constitution, prohibiting a state from impairing the obligation of contract.

QUESTION. To be really effective, how many more members do you think you need or do you think you are effective now in doing what you had set out to do?

Mr. STACY. No, Sir we would like to get every Mississippian in the count. We want to go to every town, every community, every crossroad in the state of Mississippi and to all of our eighty-two counties and present our ideas to our fellow Mississippians and listen to theirs, that they may truly understand what our interests are, and to see that they do lie within the National Democratic Party.

QUESTION. What do you see your role in next year's presidential election? As you are presently constituted, can you be a factor?

Mr. STACY. We think we can be a factor because we think there is a real disgust in the heart of the average Mississippian about being gulled and bamboozled for so long, and we think we can speak honestly to him and with him as fellow native Mississippians. We can look to our interests economically, educationally, socially. And I think we can reason together, as the President likes to quote Isaiah, and see that the Democratic Party is indeed the party of Mississippians. The notion of Young Democrats—really, we are about as young in sentiment as L.Q.C. Lamar, who felt that Mississippi's future lay with the nation rather than against the nation.

QUESTION. Do you think the regular Democrats and the philosophy that most of them believe in really belong in another party, say the Republican Party?

Mr. STACY. It might well be that they belong to another party, for certainty they have a notion of reality that is somewhat fanciful. They keep telling us every four years that we are going to throw this election to the House of Representatives, something we have not done since 1876, and some of them may be off on another crusade behind the third party contender, George Wallace, and if so, we bid them God-speed.

QUESTION. Mr. Stacy, do you accept as accurate the recent reports of widespread starvation in Mississippi?

Mr. STACY. I find starvation a terribly imprecise word for this problem. I think there are considerable problems of malnutrition in the state. I think there is intolerable malnutrition. I think that part of it comes from the lack of education or comes from problems of hygiene, and part of it comes from the fact that what was originally designed as a dietary aid has become, indeed, the whole diet, and people are having to make do on starches, corn, beans, peanut butter, and just do not have the balanced diet that should be theirs.

QUESTION. In your opinion, is this problem of malnutrition more severe in Mississippi than other areas of the nation?

Mr. STACY. No, sir, I believe that there are problems of malnutrition in the large cities of the East. I believe that there are problems of malnutrition at the reservations in the West. I do not think that it is peculiarly a Mississippi problem. I would like to see something done about it because I do not think that you and I and our fellow Mississippians can tolerate malnutrition that debilitates and shortens the life span.

MODERATOR. Thank you Mr. Stacy.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND STUDIES PREVENTATIVES AGAINST STROKES

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress may well point with pride to its great interest in the health of our fellow Americans. Over the years, much legislation has been passed for such a purpose.

It has been shown that over 70 percent of all deaths occurring in the United States each year result from the three dread diseases of cancer, stroke, and heart disease. It was also pointed out that these three diseases' effects upon the economy of our country cause close to $30 billion each year in losses due to premature disability and death. During the last Congress we showed our concern and passed the Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendment of 1965—Public Law 89-239—which legislation was handled by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I have the honor of being its ranking member. Under the terms of that act funds have been authorized for grants to assist in the war against these three dread diseases.

I think that the Members of the Congress will be interested in the latest study regarding strokes and in the fact that a special stroke clinic has been established. This clinic is part of the University Hospital which is associated with the renowned Medical School of the University of Maryland in Baltimore. That city has long been known as a place from which great contributions to the healing sciences of medicine and dentistry have come.

The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness will provide $300,000 over a 3-year period to the University Hospital for this humanitarian purpose.

The Sun, of Baltimore, in its Sunday, August 27, 1967, issue, published an interesting article regarding the stroke clinic of the University Hospital. Inasmuch as this is a matter of broad general interest, I include it in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WAR ON MASSIVE KILLER: STUDY SEEKS PREVENTIVES TO WARD OFF STROKES

(By Paul Wilkes)

The smell of a fresh-smoked picnic ham was a familiar odor as he lifted a pole holding four hams from a metal tree that had just been pushed out of the smoke house. Not familiar was the weakness in his right hand.

He was left-handed. But that strong, veined right hand had never failed to lift its share of the poles of hams which weighed between 30 and 60 pounds.

"He was hard-headed," his wife said, "and

didn't want to see a doctor. He said it would go away."

It was two months ago that this rugged, packing house worker felt a numbness in his right hand. A month ago he was admitted to Carroll County General Hospital with a paralyzed right side. A week later he died, leaving a widow and six children.

Most third year medical students could link the numbness in the man's hands to his paralyzing stroke, and to his subsequent death. For some reason, the left half of the brain, which controls movement on the body's right side, was slowly starved of its normal blood supply.

Doctors at the stroke clinic of Maryland's University Hospital knew they were again woefully late when this 41-year-old man, with a medical history of no medical history, was sent to them from Carroll county. The specialists at the clinic knew he needed treatment when the right hand first started feeling numb at the controls of the smoke oven or while turning a door knob.

Like three-fourths of all stroke victims, this man had been warned of an impending attack.

CIRCULATION OF BRAIN CELLS

If the brain is deprived of blood or is flooded by internal bleeding, brain cells are not allowed to maintain normal circulation: taking in oxygenated blood and giving it up after withdrawing the life-sustaining oxygen. Like a man with his head held under water, they die. When brain cells fail, the part of the body they control becomes useless—this is a stroke.

Unlike a broken arm which will mend or a cut which will heal, the brain doesn't give any second chances.

In four rooms with flaking hospital-green paint on the walls, a dozen Maryland doctors at the two-year old stroke clinic are out to see if deaths like this can't be predicted and avoided.

"If he would have come to us when the numbness in his hand first set in, there's a good chance we could have saved his life," a neurologist working with the clinic said. An autopsy showed that a blood clot had formed in the carotid artery, a pencil-thin vessel in the neck which supplies much of the blood to the brain.

A simple operation could have removed that blood clot.

University Hospital's stroke clinic on the fourth floor of the outpatient clinic is a small but important first step in this area's war on stroke, the killer of about 200,000 Americans this year.

The clinic was formed by using technique best described by the word "scrounge." "Scrounging" space, equipment, personnel and doctors' time, a group of physicians led by Dr. Erland Nelson, head of the department of neurology, started the clinic.

AIM OF CLINIC

The aim was to give the most comprehensive attention to a select number of stroke victims while studying them to determine basically two things:

1. Using accepted treatment and therapy, which type of stroke patient responds best to which treatment? Hotly debated medical questions like those centering around the use of anti-coagulants, or blood-thinning agents, are being asked.

2. What accurate signals does the body give that it is headed for a stroke and what can be done to prevent the attack? In a pioneering effort, the clinic is developing a simple questionnaire which could be used to single out stroke-prone people for further examination and possibe preventive treatment.

This type of questionnaire could have saved the life of the 41-year-old packing house worker.

"Have you had a sudden feeling of numbness or pins and needles (tingling) . . ." reads one part of a question now contained in the experimental questionnaire. A "yes" answer could have brought this man to early medical attention and a finding that the blood clot in his neck was slowly squeezing off the supply of blood to his brain.

The numbness the worker felt falls into a category of pre-stroke symptoms known as transient ischemic attacks or TIAs. The clinic questionnaire tries to find out if a person ever had a true TIA, when, how often and how severe. TIAs, as the name implies, are not long in duration (usually from a few minutes to an hour) and are ischemic (caused by a deficiency in blood supply).

The task of developing a simple, accurate and easy-to-answer questionnaire went to Dr. Maureen Henderson, an epidemiologist studying disease patterns. A random sample of 3,000 Baltimoreans has already been taken. Dr. Henderson plans to have 2,000 more questioned.

INTERVIEWERS AT WORK

The survey is expected to be completed by the end of the year. More people in the heaviest stroke years, 45 and over, were included to make the survey as accurate cross-section of those most likely to suffer an attack. Professional interviewers are taking house numbers at random throughout the city and then seeking out a larger number of older people in those households.

In about two months the clinic doctors will start to see people who have listed what the physicians consider true TIAs (loss of speech, temporary blindness, paralysis of one side of the body) or a combination of lesser symptoms (fainting, numbness, nausea, or a weakness in one arm or leg). They will match person against questionnaire and keep a continuing history to see if the series of eleven questions does cull out the stroke-prone person.

"Obviously, no area of the country would have beds enough to admit every person who complained of any one of these symptons," Dr. Nelson said. "Any single symptom might be caused by a variety of conditions other than TIAs. But we must get to the person who has true TIAs before the stroke occurs."

A NEGLECTED DISEASE

If the clinic's questionnaire proved to be effective it would signal one of the most dramatic breakthroughs in stroke research history. It would be highly significant in itself, even though "stroke research history" is modest and could be chronicled on a fraction of the pages it would take to tell about advances in cancer, heart and polio research.

The President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke reported, "Stroke has been for many years a tragically neglected disease. The health professions have shown little interest in it; the public has accepted it with resignation." Strokes take their toll in lives and more often in tragic disabilities. Many of the 2,000,000 stroke victims alive today are seriously crippled.

Research dollars are not earmarked for stroke as they are for heart and cancer, which have powerful fund-raising and pressure groups stumping for their cause. Hundreds of millions of dollars will be spent on heart and cancer research alone this year.

Stroke hits the hardest in certain areas of the country and this provides a further impetus for the stroke clinic. The Southeast, which includes Maryland, has the highest stroke death rate. The hardest hit is the nonwhite female who far outdistances the second most likely to die from stroke, the nonwhite male.

Why strokes and the Southeast go too well together is a moot medical point. Doctors do agree that high blood pressure often leads to a stroke. And, seeing that the Southeast has a high percentage of Negroes and Negroes are more likely to have high blood pressure, this fact is given for the regional bulge in strokes. Still other physicians think that hereditary, dietary and environmental factors are most important.

Although Dr. Nelson cringes at using the word, the approach at the clinic is interdisciplinary. "It's an overused, trite word, but it accurately describes what we're doing," he said.

Two main disciplines share the bulk of clinic work: neurologists under Dr. Nelson, and cardiologists under Dr. Leonard Scherlis, head of the cardiology division.

"Amazingly enough, the heart man and the nerve specialist don't always have the best of communications while working on a stroke patient, although this interplay is crucial," a cardiologist at the clinic said. One-dimensional treatment of the stroke victims was made past history by the clinic.

INTRAMURAL WIT

Dr. Nelson, at 39, the youngest department head at University Hospital, injected some intramural wit to illustrate the problem: "That guy's (cardiologist's) heart isn't supplying my (neurologist's) brain with enough blood. I can't completely resolve the problem without the heart specialist's finding on heart strength, circulation and blood quality. The stroke occurs in the brain, but only because of faulty blood circulation.

"Now we have these two specialists side by side on each case with the ability to call in neuroradiologists (to interpret X-rays), vascular surgeons (to operate on blocked arteries), opthalmologists (faulty blood circulation in the eyes is often a signal of an impending stroke) and psychiatrists (for rehabilitation)."

Until last month, the clinic operated on money shuffled around on hospital ledgers, appropriated from the various departments who were interested enough in battling stroke.

In June the clinic was given a measure of fiscal legitimacy with a share of a $300,000 planning and development grant from the National Institute of Neurological Disease and Blindness. The grant provides $100,000 a year for three years to University Hospital's stroke center, of which the clinic is a part.

In addition to the clinic, the center is engaged in basic research on animals and on cell makeup, using an electron microscope. Dr. Nelson calls the $100,000 a year "seed money" planted to see if the center can be honed into a research unit worthy of still more institute dollars.

EXTRA SPACE

With this grant, Dr. Nelson and his band of volunteers will take over half a floor of a renovated building on the grounds. This will allow about four times as many patients to be seen each week. Now the clinic is only open on Wednesday afternoon with an average of ten persons treated or seen.

Its accomplishments over the past two years were summed up by Dr. Albert Heck, a clinic neurologist: "We've provided the best stroke care possible to about 100 patients while just scratching the surface in research in a field that needs more attention. We have no great discoveries to report. It will take a lot of time."

But, with a greater capacity and a larger group of stroke patients available for study, Dr. Nelson hopes to make contributions to the field of stroke prediction and prevention. He and his staff aren't satisfied with autopsies that showed a stroke killed a body which was doing its best to ask for help.

INTERNATIONAL DRUM CORPS WEEK

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it has been

stated that "next to love of God, the love of country is the best preventive of crime."

We all know that crime is rampant in our land and that crime challenges our free society. According to statistics compiled by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, one boy in six is referred to the juvenile court. Our streets are no longer safe, and our great cities have in the past few years been the targets for riots and fomentors of race hatred.

Dark as this picture is, there is still hope for a cure. Fortunately, there are people sufficiently aroused to accept the challege that crime and juvenile delinquency pose. Such dedicated persons merit full well our wholehearted support. That is why I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the splendid efforts of the Drum Corps Publicists Association in sponsoring International Drum Corps Week, September 2–9, 1967, and in emphasizing its motto "Pageantry and Patriotism: Youth on Parade." It is designed to honor the 1 million young people of the United States and Canada who actively participate in the colorful drum and bugle corps. Such wholesome activity tends to channel the energy and attention of our boys and girls to worthwhile things and it fosters patriotism and respect for law and order.

The drum is the most ancient of musical instruments. It has served in all ages as a means of expressing man's instinctive love of rhythm, and throughout history it has been a method of communication and has been used as the center for ceremonial music. The American Revolution opened when Drummer William Dinman beat the call "to arms" on Lexington Common.

Each year, during the past 4 years, International Drum Corps Week has served to bring attention to the patriotic and healthful aspects of such activity. The marches it participates in are always those of a civic and patriotic nature to underscore respect for law and order, pride in one's city, State, and Nation, and dedication to religion.

I salute the drum corps and wish it every success in the years ahead as an instrumentality to help make our young people better citizens of our glorious country.

RIGID, INFLEXIBLE REDTAPE DELAYING URGENT AID TO CITIES

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for our Cabinet officers to take swift, decisive action to clear away the bureaucratic redtape delaying vital aid to our cities.

We no longer have the luxury of time on our side, in solving the massive problems our communities face.

If the tragic weeks of turmoil this summer have taught us one thing—it is that the needs of the urban areas are urgent and time is running out.

I consider it a tragedy and a disgrace that it takes endless months, and even years, for a city's application for Federal assistance programs to move through the ponderous Federal machinery. And often, the aid given is too little, too late, or too long drawn out to be of consequence.

Because I feel so strongly on this point—and because I feel that positive action by the Cabinet officials directly involved could have gone far toward preventing the tragedy of this summer—I wrote the mayors of 52 cities stricken by varying degrees of racial turmoil, unrest, and violence, asking for their counsel and advice.

So far, more than one-third have replied—enough to give substance to my own belief that decisive action must be taken immediately to give cities the help needed to eradicate slums, to train the unemployed, to provide health and recreation facilities for those less fortunate than ourselves. And the key is implementation by the Cabinet officials of flexible guidelines giving the applicant cities greater latitude in application of such aid, in relaxing the rigid restrictions that often preclude cities from participation in such programs as urban renewal and slum clearance—but most of all, in expeditious action on all applications. Regional officials, who know the problem and have worked with local officials in developing a solution, should be given authority to approve and fund programs in the field.

It is ridiculous for an application for urgent assistance from a city facing disaster to move slowly through the pipeline to end up on some nameless official's desk in Washington, along with hundreds of others, and await its turn to be returned for revision and start the same process over again.

Here is where the executive branch can act, swiftly and surely, to clear the road of stumbling blocks. It has the power and authority to do so, and the need is evident.

My letter to the mayors covered two points. Primarily, I am interested in knowing if rigid and inflexible standards, and Federal redtape, have delayed needed assistance to communities.

Secondly, due to published reports, I wanted to know if federally paid antipoverty workers were directly involved in instigating, stimulating, or in any manner, abetting the disorders which struck the community involved. I also asked for any comments on how this program can be more effective, and reach the people who need help the most.

Of the mayors who replied, 18 said the OEO employees were not involved and many commented favorably on the tremendous work done by these employees in preventing violence. Two were noncomittal, and two—one in confidence—stated the actions of certain OEO employees and projects were questionable.

But it was evident from the comments in their letters, many view this program as ineffective, and failing entirely to reach the people needing help. And I think the evidence being developed across the country is ample to indicate the need for a redirection, a redefining of the goals, and abandonment of the sociological theories and more emphasis on the practical aspects of helping the poor to help themselves.

But my primary concern in writing the mayors was in finding out why the vast programs and funds authorized and appropriated by Congress are failing to reach the cities. I posed the following broad question to them: "Have you found that the criteria set by Federal agencies for programs such as slum clearance, urban renewal, model cities, and so forth, which could help your community alleviate existing conditions, too rigid and inflexible to meet the urgent action communities require? Can, and should, the Federal agencies move quickly and more decisively in granting assistance? Have you any suggestions for streamlining the present procedure for qualifying for and receiving such aid?"

Fifteen of the mayors said requirements are too rigid, restrictive, and inflexible. Four did not find them to be so, but qualified their answers. Three others were nonresponsive. Many offered positive suggestions for improvements, and because I believe their replies merit full consideration by my colleagues, I am asking that they be reprinted in full immediately following this statement.

Let me be perfectly clear, however, that in urging more flexible guidelines and expeditious processing of project applications, I am not suggesting that we abandon planning and efficiency. I am recommending that the machinery for consideration and approval be geared to meet the urgent and realistic needs of our cities, that artifically set standards that preclude many cities from participating be relaxed, that every effort be taken to remove the stumbling blocks from the road to progress facing our cities today.

It is apparent to me the need for specific and decisive action in the executive branch is great, and I would recommend:

First. The President establish within the White House a special Office of Community Assistance, headed by an able and knowledgeable special assistant, with power and authority to cut through the mass of redtape and delay and bring expeditious action on community assistance applications.

Second. The Cabinet officers and agency heads assign a special deputy whose sole duty is to expedite action on these applications, with full power and authority to act for the Secretary, or the director of the agency.

Third. Regional officers for the various departments be given full power to approve and fund programs in the field.

Fourth. The executive branch, and Congress, undertake studies on the need and desirability for "block grants" to communities, for such communities are often in better position to assign priorities and know first hand the varying needs of their areas.

Fifth. The legislative committees of Congress, in authorizing legislation for these assistance programs, write into the law safeguards against unreasonable, unworkable and often unnecessary regulations and restrictions imposed by the administering agencies that do little but delay action.

These are but a few recommendations which I believe could go far toward bringing the problem we now face under control.

We, in Congress, can do much to see the great benefit of the programs we have authorized and funded are moved expeditiously to the applicant communities. We can act ourselves to clear away potential areas of delay and indecision.

When the House considered the model cities bill, I attempted to amend the bill to insure that no stumbling block was placed in the way of any community wishing to participate in the program. I tried to amend the bill to prohibit the Housing and Urban Affairs Department from requiring municipal zoning as a qualification for participation. I was not successful.

Then the furor of the rat control bill, H.R. 11000, hit the House. One of the requirements for a city to participate in the $40 million rat control program was that it submit to HUD an approved workable program—which means zoning.

What does zoning have to do with rat control? Surely, rats bite just as often—destroy just as much—are just as big a health hazard in unzoned cities as in others.

I cite this as an example of the stumbling blocks being thrown in the path of our communities today. Submission and approval of a workable program—a lengthy and time-consuming process—is wholly and completely unnecessary to any program such as rat control. And the officials at HUD were derelict in not leading a fight to see such was stricken from the bill, and that the program was made available to every community in the country where rats are a problem that cannot be locally controlled.

My own city of Houston—one of the great and growing areas holding nearly 1½ million people—does not have zoning. We cannot participate in Federal programs such as urban renewal and slum clearance. I am hopeful the stumbling blocks will be removed and we can participate in the model cities program. But we could not have participated in the rat control bill as it was written.

Why? Our needs are as great and pressing as other urban centers. We have the same slums, the same unemployed, poverty-stricken people, the same pressing financial demands upon the city and county tax dollar to fund more and more vitally needed improvements as any other urban area. We cannot participate in the accelerated public works program of the Economic Development Administration because our overall employment figures are too high—yet we have pockets of poverty in Houston and Harris County where the need for help is pathetic, unemployment is rampant, and the city and county are powerless to help. Why?

We, in Congress, have been derelict in failing to see that aid is granted to all communities on the basis of need—not on artificial standards, and approved workable programs or other false criteria set by some unknown bureaucrat.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to take note of the need for action. We can no longer ignore the crying need of our communities for help—for time is no longer a luxury we can afford.

This has been a long and bitter summer of discontent. Unless we act now—in Congress and in the executive branch—unless we get these programs moving swiftly to reach the people—this was but a prelude of what we must endure next year.

I include my letter and replies received at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1967.

DEAR MAYOR: Since your city, like my home of Houston, has been one touched by civil disorder, I would like the benefit of your firsthand knowledge on two matters:

1. Have you found that the criteria set by federal agencies for programs such as slum clearance, urban renewal, model cities, etc., which could help your community alleviate existing conditions, too rigid and inflexible to meet the urgent action communities require? Can, and should, the federal agencies directly involved in community development programs, move quickly and more decisively in granting assistance? Have you any suggestions for streamlining the present procedure for qualifying for and receiving such aid?

2. Was any evidence developed that workers under the OEO poverty program were directly involved in instigating, stimulating or in any manner, abetting the disorder which struck your community? Can you suggest any guidelines to make this program more effective, to reach the people who need the help most?

I will appreciate your counsel and advice. Please feel free to comment frankly, for if you will so indicate, I shall certainly keep the source of the information you provide confidential.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

BOB CASEY.

HARTFORD, CONN.,
August 21, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT CASEY,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: My apologies for the delay in replying to your letter of July 26th, in which you ask several questions relating to the effectiveness of federal programs and our local anti-poverty organization.

The federal government has attempted to offer extensive financial and technical assistance to the cities regarding slum clearance, urban renewal, model cities, etc. On balance, we find that the programs are:

1. Under-funded. There is a vast gap between the federal rhetoric in Washington and what is delivered to us in terms of dollars and cents.

2. The programs are so decentralized that they encourage local fragmentation of effort.

3. The regulations are so cumbersome that we have a very difficult time keeping up with the red tape. In this connection, some of our so-called third party contracts for demolition of unsound structures run up to 85 pages, whereas if we were contracting our locally the contract would be 15 pages. In many instances contractors seeing that the federal government is involved, adds a certain percentage to the cost to cover the bureaucracy and often this percentage is equal to or exceeds the federal share of financial participation. The net effect is that it just takes longer for us to complete a project and the taxpayers are of course no better off.

4. Another problem is that in some cases the federal government deals through the state government, in some cases directly through the local government, and in other instances bypasses both and funds private agencies directly. In Hartford, we have been unable to determine the exact amount of federal money coming to the city and we are presently cataloging federal programs and their application and benefits to our citizens. Although the philosophy behind the federal programs recognizes our urgent needs, the administration of them leaves much to be desired. We would hope that some day we could receive "block grants" from the federal government with a minimum of red tape so that we could determine our own priorities, which we feel we are in an excellent position to do. In short, we need more money and we need much less red tape.

As a final thought, our problems cannot really be solved without metropolitan cooperation. Attitudes must be softened both by the urban and suburban community and unless our minority families can have equal opportunity in employment, housing, education, and mobility, I fear that the situation will not be mitigated.

The answer to your second question is no. There was no evidence that the workers under the OEO poverty program were directly involved with instigating stimulating or inciting the disorder which struck our community. In fact, it was partly through the effort of our anti-poverty agency field workers that the disturbances were kept to a minimum.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE B. KINSELLA,
Mayor.

WATERLOO, IOWA.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: Please excuse the delay in answering your letter concerning federal programs and the involvement of our community in civil disorder.

In answer to the first question asked by you concerning the criteria set by federal agencies for programs in cities, I do believe that the rules and regulations are too rigid and that there is way too much red tape in getting the programs off the ground when they are needed.

I might suggest the possibility of streamlining to a certain extent the procedures for funding so that if the program is good and has been carried out successfully in the past, or by past record another program has been carried out successfully in a community, that funding be made immediately and minor details worked out later. At the same time less local involvement by regional offices would be of great assistance. I do believe that we on the local level understand our problems better than these people and that by giving us some leadership and relying on the integrity of various people sitting on the Boards of Directors, we could simplify the procedures. I have said before and I will say again that it appears to me that too many times regional office people are interested in facts and figures only to be able to sell their program to higher-ups and only to prove that they are doing a good job, rather than assisting the local program in doing what it is supposed to do.

In answer to the second question, I have no evidence nor would I be able to show that workers under the O.E.O. program were involved in instigating or stimulating the disorder. I can add, however, that persons who have been working with the program were of assistance in helping us to get to the people involved and to end the disorders rapidly.

I have stated in a letter to Congressman Carl Perkins that it appears to me that maybe the people we are trying to help are too bewildered by the number of programs that are set up to eliminate poverty. I would

like to ask a very hypothetical question. If all of the poverty in the United States were eliminated tomorrow where would all the employees go to find another job? I say this because I feel strongly that sometimes they oversell to justify their positions causes disorder rather than harmony in a community.

There is no reason for you to keep this information confidential since it doesn't bother me a bit if it is made public.

Yours very truly,

LLOYD L. TURNER,
Mayor.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
August 9, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CASEY: In response to your letter of July 26, 1967, I am happy to offer my opinion on the two questions that you raised.

In connection with the criteria set by federal agencies for the administration of programs such as urban renewal, model cities, and public housing, I definitely believe that a great deal of improvement would be made in these programs by simplifying their requirements and administration. In the case of Model Cities in particular, the application process should definitely have been administered in such a way as to provide for quick and decisive assistance. My suggestions for how these urban assistance programs could be streamlined and greatly improved are indicated in a statement submitted to the Housing Subcommittees of the Senate and House a few weeks ago, a copy of which is enclosed.

With regard to the Anti-Poverty Program, let me assure you that I have no reason to believe that any workers in this program in Philadelphia were in any way involved in instigating, stimulating, or abetting the disorders which have occurred in the community. We have not, of course, had any major disturbances this summer and it is my belief that the efforts of the Anti-Poverty Program, together with programs conducted by other City agencies, have had much to do with the peace that has prevailed. With regard to strengthening the Anti-Poverty Programs, I would make the same general suggestions that I have offered in connection with the other urban assistance programs. Namely, that the greatest possible latitude be given to the local community to determine its own problems and to find its own solutions to those problems.

I hope that my opinions will be of interest and use to you. If I can offer any further assistance, I will be happy to do so.

With all good wishes and kindest personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. J. TATE,
Mayor.

LANSING MICH.,
August 14, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
Twenty-second District, Texas, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: In response to your letter of July 26, 1967 may I say that Lansing has experienced a considerable degree of frustration as the result of the often times rigid, inflexible, and sometimes unrealistic requirements of our various federal agencies. We have experienced a problem common to many communities; i.e., federal programs which appear attractive and relatively simple, become extremely complicated and time consuming, thus resulting in a given program's inability to provide the kind of relief for which it was initially designed. For example: HUD has developed a completely different set of specifications and requirements for the construction of public housing in contrast to standards long established and found to be very practical by FHA for construction regulations. The result often times is a lengthy, costly, and confusing discussion by the developer, local housing authority, and regional HUD officials, as to details which are relatively meaningless as compared to the very real and serious problem of providing housing for our low income population.

In reference to your second question; while the local O.E.O. program may leave much to be desired from the viewpoint of the City of Lansing, we must first accept the fact that it is not a city program, and, at best, we have one or two votes on a 30 to 40 member Advisory Committee. Our local O.E.O. program encompasses a district far beyond the city limits of Lansing, and we, therefore, have little control over the program although a vast majority of those who are served are residents of our city which represents well over 50% of the district population. There has been no evidence to the affect that workers connected with O.E.O. were directly involved in any of the disorders. In fact, I must state that as a result of activities in three O.E.O. sponsored community centers much is being done to alleviate the pressures in the low income, youthful, minority groups which could result in stemming future disorders. Of immediate concern to me is the fact that, as I understand it, funds for the operation of these centers will cease within the next few weeks.

I would have to conclude that if a program were developed which would allow the city to use the vast sums which O.E.O. expends in this community, a much better and responsible job could be done.

I hope these rambling comments will assist you in the very difficult decisions, which you, as a member of Congress, must make regarding the future directions of our various federal "Aid to Cities" programs.

If I may assist in any way further, please so notify me.

Most sincerely,

MAX E. MURNINGHAN,
Mayor.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
August 8, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CASEY: I am in receipt of your letter of July 29th concerning civil disorder in Providence, Rhode Island.

I have on occasion found the criteria established by the federal agencies a bit cumbersome and time consuming. Yet, I recognize the extreme difficulties which the administrators of these programs must have in establishing orderly procedures. As a mayor vitally interested in programs for urban development, I would certainly like to see less rigid program standards, but I think that the biggest difficulty with which we are faced is the lag time which takes place between program submission and program approval. I expect this stems largely from the limited funds with which the federal departments have to operate. If the Congress were to fully fund rent supplement, Model Cities and economic opportunity, I am sure that the administrators of these programs would be able to quicken review time. Thus, the federal agencies directly involved would be able to move more quickly and more decisively in granting assistance. My experience has revealed that those programs which are fully funded always seem to be more quickly approved.

I have no evidence available to me at this time which would indicate that local OEO officials were in any way responsible for or even involved in creating civil disorder. In fact, the local anti-poverty personnel have been credited in Providence by me, the police and fire departments and by community people with preventing a riot. Their close work with our police department made it possible to enforce the curfew which lasted four days. No one in this City can heap enough praise upon their efforts. In fact, I think all cities might learn a valuable lesson from Providence and our plan.

The Economic Opportunity Program could be more effective if we could be assured of total funding for our comprehensive program. The war on poverty can be won if the Congress continues to give us the money to build the model cities and to provide the companion social programs which are necessary.

In a city like Providence our greatest needs are in the area of housing, education and manpower. None of these problems are unsoluble. We have the capacity and the will to transform deprivation and ignorance into a good life but we need your continuing assistance. Our Neighborhood Advisory Committees have allowed us to reach the people who need the help the most. They have given us the kind of total community involvement which is necessary to make this program work. They have given us the opportunity to share and understand the way of life of thousands of inner-city residents who reside in the Other America. I have no doubt that Providence will continue growing with your help into the kind of urban center which can be a model for all America.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, JR.,
Mayor of Providence.

TOLEDO, OHIO,
August 9, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
Member, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

SIR: As Director of Community Development for the City of Toledo, Mayor Potter has asked me to reply to your letter of July 26 concerning civil disorders.

In answer to your first question, we often find the Federal agencies too rigid and inflexible in administering Federal programs such as Urban Renewal. One of the unfortunate things about much of the criticism, however, has been to cause even greater inflexibility (red tape) since Federal administrative personnel, particularly at the lower level, hesitates to make quick or unusual decisions which may open them for criticism. One of the desirable aspects presently contained in the Model Cities Program is the proposed freedom at the local level to use the supplemental funds to meet the needs as determined locally and without being circumscribed by detailed regulations. As far as moving more quickly and more decisively in granting assistance, I dont think the Federal agency should be operating on a crash program or crisis basis but rather on a well-scheduled, adequately funded program where proper evaluation and decisions can be made on a coordinated basis but without unnecessary delay. The present review-and-approval procedure for Urban Renewal, however, takes too long a time and more extensive technical review is given applications than I believe is necessary.

In the recent disturbances in Toledo, there was no evidence that workers under the OEO Poverty Program were involved in instigating or stimulating any disorder. On the contrary, they probably played a positive role in holding down the tensions by direct communication through their Neighborhood Opportunity Centers. When the disturbance started, discussions were overheard by some youth to the effect, "let's do in Toledo what they're doing in Detroit." Therefore, the main impetus for disorder in Toledo was apparently the observations of what was taking place in Detroit just sixty miles away. Fortunately, firm action was taken immediately by the Police with the National Guard Troops held in reserve and the disturbances were held to a minimum.

Last week Mayor Potter called a meeting of

the Commission for Community Development comprised of citizens representative of the community, including the neighborhood where disturbances occurred, to investigate the unrest in greater detail and make recommendations for alleviating problem areas.

These recommendations will include implementation of proposals included in the Model Cities Application since the disturbances were entirely within the area proposed under Toledo's Model Cities Program.

Yours very truly,

WINSTON E. FOLKERS,
Director of Community Development.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
August 17, 1967.

Congressman BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: In response to your letter of July 26, regarding Federal programs in cities, let me point out that Oakland has worked closely with a number of Federal agencies in long-range programs directed at unemployment, education, and urban renewal.

To date Oakland has not been the scene of civil disorder. Most Federal programs in Oakland have been helpful to this City. We feel that their effectiveness could be increased by allowing greater authority in establishing and directing these programs.

I have frequently urged more flexible policies by Federal agencies. Furthermore, the approving and funding of these programs should be speeded up possibly by granting larger authority to the regional officials. We often hear that a proposed program is "sitting on a desk in Washington waiting for approval."

There is no evidence in Oakland that poverty workers have been responsible for creating disharmony. In fact, with very few exceptions the local poverty program leadership has been outstanding and the City administration is strongly in favor of these programs.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. READING,
Mayor.

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CORP.,
St. Louis, Mo., August 14, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT CASEY,
Congressman, 22d District, Texas,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: As General Manager of the Human Development Corporation (the local community action agency for the War on Poverty), I have been asked by Mayor Cervantes to respond to your letter concerning matters of civil disorder.

You ask if federal guidelines have been too restrictive or too inflexible. This is a rather complex question. Our position is that for the large metropolitan areas, the fewer guidelines the better. The reason is that the problems of metropolitan areas are so complex that inevitably almost any guideline runs up against a situation where a worthwhile approach is blocked because of various technicalities.

In addition, I would like to specifically state two major areas of concern:

1. I believe that a basic flaw in the housing programs for low income persons is the rigidity of federal guidelines, coupled with the Department of Housing and Urban Development's practice of reviewing nearly every major step in the construction process. The statement made by one person that the city of Boise, Idaho is considered competent to put in its own street lights, run its own school system, but not competent to build its own public housing projects, has much merit. I do not know precisely how to reconcile this problem of local autonomy vs. detailed federal control, but it is a problem that needs much study and experimentation.

2. The second major area of concern I am qualified to discuss. This is the practice of "earmarking" funds in the War on Poverty legislation. Originally, the 1964 funds left a lot of discretion to the local community. Now, less than 20% is left to our discretion. I am somewhat amused by all the talk of "block grants" and "open-ended" money to local communities to solve their own problems. This is *precisely* what the War on Poverty originally *was*. As the Mayor of Tulsa said, it originally was a Republican program—meaning that the local community allocated the funds as it saw fit.

A major reason that this occurs is that Congress wishes to insure that successful programs such as Head Start are given money. But, quite frankly, part of the problem seems to be the desire of each Representative or Senator to have his "name" on a specific program. While it doesn't require much political knowledge to know why this happens, it should also be made clear that this practice has greatly reduced local control and autonomy and caused many problems on the local level.

Given the fact that the War on Poverty funds are at the same level (generally speaking) each year, every time a portion of the money is "earmarked", the open-ended fund necessarily becomes less. At the local level, this causes serious funding dislocations. Some existing programs must be terminated, and new ones created to conform to the new Congressional guidelines. And, lurking in the back of our minds, is the fear that the following year, Congress may come up with still new programs, necessitating cutbacks or even termination of those started this year. This is not to say that new programs are never useful. The question is, which programs among the many possibilities are the most useful. And each community must determine priorities based on its own need. What is best for Kansas City may not be best for St. Louis. Unfortunately, what happens as a result of "earmarking" is that Congress sets the same priorities for all cities across the country.

Despite the Congressional earmarking practices it should be stated that the "unearmarked" funds, the Office of Economic Opportunity is quite flexible in allowing local autonomy in planning anti-poverty programs. OEO review is generally aimed at preventing the "scandal" type situations, such as excessive administrative costs, programs clearly meant only to satisfy political factions, programs involving discrimination or poor administration. Within these reasonable guidelines, program determinations are those of the local community.

Your second question asks whether OEO workers were involved in the group instigating the trouble in our community. First of all, I think the trouble you refer to was a minor incident last October which received more national than local publicity. To my knowledge, no OEO personnel were involved, they would give you the same answer. For example, it is a revealing fact that the press does not report, "79 General Motors employees involved in Detroit rioting."

The fact that a youth worked for us, and then, in his off-hours, does something, is clearly a matter over which we have no *prior* control. If we knew in advance that he would use his position to start riots, he would simply not be hired. If we find out that he does, after being hired, start riots (or commit any other crime), he naturally would be subject to the normal dismissal practices concerning any employee who performs anti-social acts. I attach a copy of our guidelines on community action which spell out our position on the types of actions employees engage in. It draws a clear line between lawful activities of employees and unlawful actions.

You also ask for guidelines to make OEO programs more effective. To answer this in detail might involve repeating all the books that have been written on the poverty program and the general problem of poverty. But, generally, what we have done is at least to follow several principles in program planning: we have involved residents and all representative community groups in our planning process. We have taken a hard look at the assumptions underlying particular program ideas. We have created a "Management Analysis" division to constantly check program progress and accomplishments.

We have done something further: we have attempted to hire the most capable personnel possible in administrative positions. We have accomplished this despite the action of Congress in limiting OEO CAP agency salaries to $15,000. This limitation is one of the most shortsighted that Congress could devise. As a conservative friend of mine recently said: "I may not like the Poverty Program spending $10,000,000 a year man running it." In other words, if you want efficient programming and administration, you have to get good men to the operation and that cost money. Our salaries for the top eight staff over $15,000 cost two-tenths of one percent of our total budget last year (that is, the excess of funds over the $15,000).

The one thing that can make the programs more effective is experience and a continual inter-change of ideas among all the enterprises, without knowing that there are several such existing programs (on-the-job training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, contracts with business groups for job development) that do involve private enterprise. The complexity of community action programs across the country is one that should be recognized; an interchange of information between them would be very helpful.

Specifically, we are currently investigating whether the process of family breakdown is worthy of more attention than it has received in the past. Our previous emphasis on preparing persons for employment may somewhat change. But at this stage, we have not completed any detailed analysis.

I have gone into quite a bit of detail in this letter. But, it has always been my belief that local administrators of such programs as the War on Poverty should constantly keep in touch with the legislators responsible for setting over-all policy. From you, we can learn the feelings of one who must see the national picture; from us, I believe, legislators can learn the day-to-day problems of the local scene.

If you wish any further information, do not hesitate to ask for it.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL BERNSTEIN,
General Manager.

DETROIT, MICH.,
August 17, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: Thank you for your recent letter expressing concern for our city in the wake of the riot.

As you know, a year ago I told the Ribicoff Committee, "We must make sure that everyone in this nation begins to think about the larger questions—begins to realize that the warfare on our city streets is as important to our national destiny as some consider the warfare in Southeast Asia."

It is acknowledged by objective observers that Detroit has used federal programs with great effect, that it has progressive leadership in the school system and in City Hall and that its relations with the Negro community are among the best in the country.

Still we must conclude that we have not done enough.

And we must conclude that Detroit's tragedy is just a part of the national picture of deep discontent in American cities today.

So far this year alone there have been disturbances of major proportions—ranging from major incidents to riots—in 59 of this nation's cities. Last year, 37 cities had such disturbances.

In Detroit, we have made a maximum effort to use all possible resources over a long period of time to lessen tension between the races and to improve housing, education and jobs for the Negro community.

Since last August when I testified before the Senate operations subcommittee, Detroit has received $61 million in federal grants for a variety of programs from an urban areas job contract to expansion of health services for residents of poverty areas. It is clear to me, however, that despite our massive efforts there is an underclass in our urban society who have not been reached and for whom there are few programs which offer hope.

It now seems necessary to reorganize the federal establishment of departments and agencies to make them more responsive to urban needs and to assure a coordinated effort which emphasizes innovation. As I have suggested before, block grants to cities would provide the necessary flexibility for such programs and fix responsibility where it belongs, right in the community where the money will be spent.

While there is no reason to expect employees and clients of the anti-poverty program to be any more or less involved in the recent rioting in Detroit than other persons in their neighborhoods, it does appear, from preliminary studies, that War on Poverty workers were not involved in the riot to any significant degree. For example, among the 5000 Detroit youngsters enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, only three were taken into custody during the riot. Their degree of involvement has not yet been determined.

Throughout the riot, each of the anti-poverty program's community development centers remained open with some workers reporting on activity in the street while others dispensed emergency food and helped displaced persons and others in the area with other riot-related problems, such as locating missing family members.

Since its beginning, Detroit's anti-poverty program has had built in maximum feasible participation by target area residents at all levels of decision-making.

We plan to continue this involvement and, if possible, expand it through increased community organization efforts. This will be possible, however, only if sufficient funds are allowed for the employment of community organizers in various programs.

Your interest in our city is much appreciated. I think we have shown in Detroit just how much can be accomplished through vigorous implementation of federal programs.

Detroit's social programs obviously are very relevant and still very much needed.

But, it is obvious that what we did could not prevent a significantly large percentage of our population from feeling alienated enough to strike out and violate society's law.

Much has been written about Detroit's plans for the future. I have tried here to indicate some helpful changes the federal government could make in its methods of meeting the needs of the cities.

The future of our cities and of our nation depend on how will we meet the challenges we now face. Detroit already has begun its task. We hopefully await future actions of Congress in this area.

Thank you again for your interest in and concern for our city.

Sincerely,

JEROME P. CAVANAGH,
Mayor.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
August 17, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT RANDOLPH CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: I have your letter of July 26, 1967. In response to your two inquiries, I would respond as follows:

(1) We have found the criteria set by Federal agencies for programs such as you outline in your letter, to be reasonable and not too difficult to meet. However, in one recent occurrance, we found that the requirements on setting up a code enforcement project in one district of our city to be difficult to establish and have abandoned the project, insofar as Federal assistance is concerned.

(2) The only disorder of any consequence that we have had this past summer is a case involving a Negro bootlegger who was attempting to sell whiskey out of his car in a public park on Sunday afternoon. At the time he was arrested, several of his customers attempted to assist him and the young officer, in response to his instructions, called for assistance. The assistance was made with overwhelming force when twenty policemen were dispatched to control the crowd that had accumulated around the automobile and did so with a liberal application of tear gas. The man and his friends that had attempted to interfere with the arrest, were charged in Municipal Court and fined. There was no indication that any person involved as a worker in the local O.E.O. program was associated in any way with this disorder.

Our local O.E.O. program, conducted under the Human Resources Corporation, of which I am President, has had an excellent relationship with the regional office of the O.E.O. The regional office has been most cooperative and has assisted the corporation and the city government in every way possible. As an instance of this, our recreation program in the poverty areas of this city has been more than doubled this summer because of funds that were supplied the city by O.E.O. through a contract with the Human Resources Corporation. We feel that our Headstart program has been productive and that our community programs while limited, have been useful in bringing the local government and the Federal government to the people of the area and have assisted many of them in a variety of ways. I personally feel that the O.E.O. programs represent an expression of concern by government to a group of people that have been deprived of human dignity in many ways and while, undoubtedly, time will show the need for change in some of the programs, certainly the expression of concern is long overdue.

I feel that the Congress of the United States is going to have to make some basic adjustments in some of our welfare laws and in opening opportunity to all of the people of this country or be faced with the problems that result when individuals are stripped of human dignity by the most highly organized society that the world has ever known. As an example of this, I think that the A.D.C. program must and should be replaced by a program of family allowances. No other nation has ever used tax money to encourage the head of a family to desert his responsibilities as we do in this country. No other nation has ever attempted to use tax money to destroy a family unit.

I think that the problem of employment is a problem for all who are receiving the protection of the Federal government to consider. I see no reason why a great corporation, that enjoys the benefits of the protection of the law, or a great union, enjoying all of the privileges of the monopoly situation allowed by Federal law, should be able to consistently deprive a young Negro man or woman of an opportunity to make a living.

I do not see why the depreciation of schedules of the Revenue Department should be used to encourage investment in slum property and to discourage the production of new buildings. I think it is past time for the Congress to consider the plight of financing great cities which are relying in general on an archaic property tax, which is non-responsive to the inflation which has been adopted as a matter of specific policy in western civilization, and which is the specific source of income for the firemen, policemen and other employees of local government units.

I have just spent the past four years in hard, tedious work in an attempt to get enough money to furnish the firemen and policemen of our city with an annual raise of approximately five percent. The other day, I watched a plumber's union in our city open the bidding of a strike situation, with an offer which would provide a plumber with a larger increase per week than a fireman or policeman has received in this city per month in a five-year period. This kind of an economic situation cannot long continue in big cities of this country. With the crisis that we have in law enforcement at this time, it is difficult enough to hire any policemen, much less additional ones to meet the needs of the times. Continued inflation, sponsored by the Federal government, can leave local government "on the ropes" in the next few months unless the sources of income are shared with local government units.

Sincerely,

ILUS W. DAVIS,
Mayor.

DES MOINES, IOWA,
August 9, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
Representative in Congress,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: This letter is in reply to your July 26, 1967 communication requesting my ideas on existing federal programs affecting cities, and in particular on the OEO poverty program.

In response to your inquiry, I am enclosing copies of two letters previously written by me on these matters—one to President Johnson and one to Mr. Morris I. Liebman, Chairman of the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity. As is indicated by these letters, both were written upon request.

I believe these two letters make clear my position on intergovernmental relations. And, from what I observe via the mass media, I do not feel as though mine is any longer a voice in the wilderness.

I appreciate your requesting my views on this matter. If you desire further information, please feel free to contact me.

Respectfully,

GEO. C. WHITMER,
Mayor.

JULY 28, 1967.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: The Director of the Polk County Community Action Council (PCCAC), Mr. Donald McKenzie, has requested that I write a letter to you commenting on whether the activities of the PCCAC, which is the Economic Opportunity unit in the Des Moines area, have contributed to riots.

First, it should be clarified that the City of Des Moines has not had riots this summer. Our city has experienced two disturbances of a racial nature, resulting in seventeen (17) arrests and estimated total property damage of between $4,000 and $5,000. Although these occurrences are regrettable, they were not of sufficient magnitude or intensity to be termed riots. However, the fact that Des Moines has not experienced a riot certainly does not preclude the possibility. Therefore, my comments will be confined to evaluating the role of the PCCAC in regard to the racial climate in Des Moines.

Many organizations—state, local, public

and private—are involved in Des Moines in programs designed to improve race relations and eliminate the basic social and physical conditions contributing to riots. The PCCAC is one such organization. However, there is danger that parts of the total OEO Program may be elevating expectations above the level of ability for immediate fulfillment, causing new and additional frustrations to emerge which can offset long-range goals and thwart their attainment, thus perhaps providing additional inducement for rioting and compounding frustration and disillusionment.

We are currently undergoing a period of dynamic change and experimentation with regard to intergovernmental relations, both vertically and horizontally. I am hopeful that the Economic Opportunity program will become more integrated with existing agencies and serve as a step in this rapidly evolving relationship toward a more workable and better coordinated process of government at the local level.

Respectfully,

GEO. WHITMER,
Mayor.

JUNE 12, 1967.

Mr. MORRIS I. LEIBMAN,
Chairman, the National Advisory Council On Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEIBMAN: This letter is in response to your May 23 communication requesting that I comment on the effectiveness of the Economic Opportunity Program in Des Moines.

Let me preface my comments on this matter by saying that the need for programs to alleviate and eliminate poverty conditions in Des Moines is great, and I believe that people-oriented programs designed to cope with the basic causes of poverty are essential in meeting this need.

In all candor, I must admit that the City of Des Moines has no valid means for evaluating the effectiveness of the Economic Opportunity Program in our city. This is due in part to the basic difficulty of validly evaluating programs for individual improvement on a short-term basis. Such programs can probably be empirically tested only after several years of operation. In addition, no empirical method of measuring the Economic Opportunity Program is currently in operation by the city or available to the city. Therefore, my review of the Economic Opportunity Program will be general in nature, but I believe it is nevertheless pertinent.

Speaking generally, I would imagine that the considerable sum of money being spent to attain the commendable objectives of the Economic Opportunity Program is having some positive effect. However, the efficiency with which these funds are being utilized is in question. I realize, however, that any evaluation of efficiency with regard to the war on poverty can be measured only in relation to the abilities of the personnel employed. This, in turn, complicates the efficiency-effectiveness relationship.

There is one question, however, which I think might be valuable for your consideration. Is it the purpose of the Economic Opportunity Program to promote social crisis situations as the best way to awaken the social conscience of a community to work for the achievement of the goal of eliminating poverty; or is the basic purpose of the Economic Opportunity Program to eliminate poverty on an evolutionary basis through constructive programs for up-grading the circumstances of disadvantaged people in cooperation with the many other agencies that are equally and vitally concerned? There may be some confusion at the implementation level of the Economic Opportunity Program as to which of these two avenues is appropriate. A clarification of this matter in theory and action would probably do much to promote the achievement of the elimination of poverty.

From the questions asked in your letter, it appears that you are assuming the current administrative structure of the Economic Opportunity Program, and in fact, the Economic Opportunity Program itself, should be continued as it is presently constituted. If this is the case, then the remainder of my remarks will be for naught, because I believe the entire program for alleviating the plight of the disadvantaged should be restructured to promote both effectiveness and efficiency.

The coordination of programs at the local level in metropolitan areas such as Des Moines is difficult enough with overlapping jurisdictions and fragmented responsibilities, without setting another administrative system into motion so as to further complicate this situation. On the other hand, local governments admittedly have not adequately met the needs of the disadvantaged. However, this inadequacy is due primarily to lack of financial resources and not to lack of concern by local officials. The number and magnitude of urban needs and problems are colossal compared with two or three decades ago. Nevertheless, cities must continue to rely primarily on the antiquated property tax for revenues, a source which is virtually exhausted and which is not adequate to meet the increasing needs of urban areas. In short, the cities have the greatest domestic needs; the federal government has the most equitable means of financing programs to meet these needs in the form of the income tax. Rather than providing local governments with funds to meet the needs of the disadvantaged, the Economic Opportunity Program was formed. This action illustrated a fundamental lack of confidence by the federal government in the ability of local officials to govern so as to meet the total needs of the community; and by total needs I mean that meeting the needs of the disadvantaged should most certainly be an essential part of any comprehensive local government program.

I believe the vast majority of local governmental officials have the concern of the entire community at heart, and I believe they do their utmost to serve the people in their respective jurisdictions with the limited financial resources available. The thing that has hampered the effectiveness of local government in recent years has been the lack of sufficient financial resources with which to pursue programs to meet the needs of the people within its jurisdiction. Provided with sufficient funds, local government can meet the needs of its people.

However, if the federal government should be the source of these funds, it should *not* be mute in its expectations of local government. I would prefer to see funds rebated to local governments on a formula basis from the federal government with comprehensive, yet flexible workable program requirements which local governments must meet in order to continue to receive such funds. These requirements should include specifications for programs to up-grade the living conditions of the disadvantaged, and should also include requirements designed to bring about cooperation between governments in metropolitan areas so as to promote the attainment of metropolitan government within the next five to ten years.

In short, I believe the Economic Opportunity Program is a stop gap measure of questionable effectiveness and efficiency which has served to dramatically point up the need for strengthening existing programs and instituting new and meaningful programs to serve the needs of the disadvantaged.

Title I and Title II of the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 have taken a step in the direction which I am advocating. Title I of the Demonstration Cities Act is designed to achieve a total attack on the physical and social ills of poverty neighborhoods, and Title II of this act is designed to promote metropolitan programs to serve within the context of metropolitan social, economic, and physical realities. I am hopeful that this Demonstration Program for which Des Moines has applied will be successful in our city as well as in other cities so it can be expanded, revised and incorporated into an organized program for rebating federal tax money to local governments. I am likewise hopeful that my comments will not be interpreted as the wailings of an "ultra-conservative reactionary," because I am definitely not. My recommendations are designed to most effectively and efficiently serve the needs of the disadvantaged of our nation, as well as citizens irrespective of economic status.

It is apparent that I am not an advocate of the Economic Opportunity Program as it is presently constituted. However, we are currently in a period of dynamic change and experimentation with regard to inter-governmental relations, generally, and more specifically, inter-governmental fiscal relations. I am hopeful that the Economic Opportunity Program will serve as a step in this rapidly evolving relationship toward a more workable and better coordinated process of government at the local level.

Respectfully,

GEO. C. WHITMER,
Mayor.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
August 8, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: We have found that the single most important factor working *against* riots and disorders is the antipoverty program.

We have had two disturbances and in neither of them have we had a single arrest involving any person engaged in anti-poverty projects.

We have made excellent use of the urban renewal program. There are times when criteria and standards are inflexible, but this is the result largely of Congressional demands growing out of opposition on the part of many people to any effort to remove the conditions of blight and to the development of programs aimed at helping Negroes.

We need massive attention by Congress to our urban problems and I hope that your inquiry will move us in that direction.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR NAFTALIN, *Mayor.*

ATLANTA, GA.,
July 31, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: I will make my reply to your letter of July 26 as brief as possible.

In answer to your first question, part one, "no", part two "yes", and the third, "no". In reply to your second question, I know of no OEO people being involved in any disturbances, and I feel strongly that we need more programs of this type.

Sincerely,

IVAN ALLEN, Jr.,
Mayor.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
August 7, 1967.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: Thank you for your letter of July 27 inviting my views on the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 on which you are now holding hearings.

You ask for a candid appraisal of OEO efforts in our city.

At the outset, I must tell you that our local CAP Agency was a glorified debating society for over two years! The "ground rules" for the development of the local board of directors as established by OEO were unrealistic. Endless debate developed an image detrimental to the total effort, and a resulting lack of performance.

During the past year, the Board of Directors of our local agency revised their By-laws to reduce the number of board members from 50 to 25. Certainly more practical.

However, the Mayor has *one* representative on the Board. One vote out of 25! I simply do not believe this is reasonable, practical or in good conscience.

The OEO Act should be amended to give the Mayor and the City Council both a voice and responsibility for the Community Action Program in any city. The Mayor is the elected head of City Government. He fields all the complaints, he knows the proper priorities for resolving needs; he should be made responsible for progress.

Replying to your specific questions:

1. "Do we continue or dismantle the present OEO organizational plan?"

Answer. If there is to be no change in giving the Mayor and City Council a strong voice in the management of the Poverty effort, then I have to say we would prefer to deal with the several Cabinet officials in Government; for example, The Department of Labor on Jobs and Job Training efforts, etc.

2. Are we on the right track with such programs as CAP, Job Corps, NYC, legal services, etc.?

Answer. From the office of the Mayor, reviewing all these efforts, there is one inescapable conclusion. All the funds involved; if made available to the city with authority to develop *priorities*, I believe we could focus attention on basic needs and the funds would go farther and produce better total results.

3. Give an appraisal of the Poverty Efforts in your city.

Answer. For the first time, the Omaha Agency directing these efforts is in tune with the needs. A new Director, Mr. Kenneth Shearer, has brought direction and management out of what had been sheer chaos! However, I do not believe we are coming to grips with the real problem of poverty or tensions.

Greater emphasis should be placed on jobs, job training and developing proper attitudes toward jobs and job training and toward our Society. Private industry, given some tax incentives, should be more deeply involved.

Greater emphasis should be placed on the housing needs in two areas, rehabilitation of housing in target areas, and dispersal of the ghetto through increasing the supply of decent housing outside the ghetto.

As long as the population density is as great as it is now, there will be tensions. The alternative is to provide more and better housing for needy families.

I know this is basically a HUD responsibility, but you simply cannot separate the housing problem and the related poverty problem.

Again, Private Industry should be given greater encouragement to become involved.

In summary, I believe I have to say that—

1. Elected officials should have a greater voice and greater responsibility in the poverty program.

2. Splintered programs and efforts will produce splintered results. There seems to be no priorities established to achieve our goals. We have a multitude of programs with varying degrees of success and no overall yardstick of achievement.

3. Greater emphasis should be placed on providing jobs with private industry more deeply involved.

4. HUD and OEO ought to join forces to *quickly* produce tangible results in providing more decent housing units for low income families. It can be done if we could eliminate the red tape.

5. The OEO program is a definite deterrent to violence. My complaint is that we can do more with what we have if we focus on those unmet needs which are the basis for violence.

The record of the City Administration in Omaha, in realistically facing up to our problems, has been well documented by Vice-President Humphrey in the field of jobs, and Secretary Weaver's staff in the field of housing rehabilitation, etc.

Our efforts, as good as they may be, are only token efforts. I simply believe we can do more with what we have if we would concentrate authority and give Private Industry the encouragement necessary to become deeply involved.

However, make no mistake about it, until there is total commitment, with appropriate priorities for action and a real sense of urgency on the part of all levels of government, we will, in my opinion, continue to live in an atmosphere of fear and tension which in turn breeds violence.

Sincerely,

A. V. SORENSEN,
Mayor.

BUFFALO, N.Y.
August 7, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Reference is made to your letter dated July 26.

I am sure that every official, both in Washington and on the local scene, would hope that governmental procedures relating to urban renewal could be expedited. I am also sure that even in the administration of local government we encounter delays because of necessary procedure and routine. Federal officials must be faced with the same obstacles. From this vantage point I could not intelligently and responsibly evaluate the procedures followed by Federal officials.

With reference to our recent disorders, we are attempting to assess all of the elements involved therein in order to reconstruct more clearly exactly what did take place in terms of causes and influences related thereto. We have not as yet reached any firm conclusions especially with regard to the areas touched upon in your letter.

Very truly yours,

FRANK A. SEDITA,
Mayor.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
July 31, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: As much as I would like to answer the questions contained in your letter of July 26, 1967, it is not possible for me to do so at this time. We are having our racial problems here, as are numerous other communities, and they are so time-consuming that little else can be accomplished right now.

I will, therefore, appreciate it very much if you will contact me again in about two weeks when I am hopeful that the situation will have quieted down.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JOSEPH P. VACCARELLA,
Mayor.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
August 8, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: This is to acknowledge receipt of your recent letter in which you ask my opinion about federal assistance and whether I think anti-poverty workers were in any way involved in starting riots in other cities.

First, may I say that Baltimore has not been touched by civil disorder. The city has not had a major racial disturbance this summer and I certainly hope that our efforts will further reduce the possibility of civil strife occurring here.

I sincerely believe that among the reasons Baltimore has not had a racial disturbance are a crash employment program by the city, and another by the city in cooperation with the state and private industry, which have meant nearly 1000 unemployed persons getting jobs. Further, the City Administration, in cooperation with the police department, has identified the Negro leaders in the slum areas and has been successful in getting them to work with us rather than against us. Of course, it goes without saying no anti-poverty workers were involved in racial disturbances here.

I hope that these comments will be helpful to you and if I can be of any further assistance, please call on me.

Sincerely,

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,
Mayor.

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY,
Nashville, Tenn., August 21, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: Both my city of Nashville-Davidson County and your city of Houston have shared similar experiences this summer. The problems of civil disobedience is a matter of great concern to all the urban centers of America and to the officials at all levels of government.

One of the basic problems that we face in trying to resolve the problems of slums relates to this explosive rise in the level of expectation for services and facilities. The citizen who lives at the subsistence level does not operate on a philosophy of delayed gratification. He does not understand, in many instances, the necessity for months and sometimes years of planning and engineering before a substantial change can be made in land uses and facilities in the central area of our complex metropolitan centers. Together, we must find a way to reduce this lead time through a cooperative teamwork approach between the levels of government. I sincerely believe that the Model Cities Program will permit us to devise and demonstrate a teamwork approach which will provide services and facilities faster and provide opportunities for a greater participation and involvement of the citizens residing in these areas.

The Federal Government must show more faith and a greater willingness to encourage and reward local government reform if we are to achieve an effective system of local government in our urban areas. The present federal regulations and guidelines in many programs for slum clearance urban renewal do tend to delay the ability to show positive results in slum areas. The inability of our local officials to have something to show as a positive symbol of commitment to the needs of these residents often tends to discourage the enthusiasm which can be generated, but which will not sustain itself in the absence of concrete examples of either improvement in facilities or service. We at the local level are often blamed for matters over which we have no control. This tends to further alienate many citizens who are inconvenienced or moved without the degree of relocation assistance which many of them require. Federal agencies must move more directly and decisively in granting stabilization assistance during the planning and engineering phases of these projects.

In regard to your second question, the

overwhelming majority of the OEO program in Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County has been positive and beneficial; however, one project, in particular, which involved the funding of a summer program in North Nashville, to be administered by SNCC, has tended to increase tensions between the races in the area. The Metropolitan Action Commission failed to adequate police and supervise this project in its initial phases; however, the project has now been terminated. Many of the programs presently administered by OEO would have a broader base of support if they operated on a feathered edge approach, whereby certain children of families just above the poverty level could participate by paying a partial fee. This would permit a greater economic mix and would avoid the image that if you participate you are very poor. One improvement that could be made in the OEO program would be to require that the OEO projects and programs be planned and projected for a period of three or more years in close coordination with the operations and service plans of local government in order to eliminate duplication, confusion and suspicion between the formal structure of local government and many OEO project proposals. The program would also be better off if there was a closer relationship between the promises and the amount of funds actually provided for them. The OEO program should be evaluated to determine which areas should be consolidated or transferred into the more formal structure of government at the earliest feasible date.

If I can be of further assistance to you in your evaluation of these programs do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

C. BEVERLY BRILEY,
Mayor.

WICHITA, KANS.,
August 25, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATVE CASEY: Your recent letter to Mayor Clarence E. Vollmer regarding the civil disorders in Wichita has been referred to me for a reply.

A number of studies indicate that the community development programs approved by Congress have been delayed as a result of the time required to process the applications by the Federal agencies. The National League of Cities, the United States Conference of Mayors, and the International City Managers' Association as well as your Texas Municipal League have all provided information on this subject that should be reviewed for an appraisal.

Regarding the OEO poverty program, we have not found any evidence that the workers in the OEO activities were directly or indirectly participating in the disorders. I serve as a member of the Public Officials Advisory Council for the Office of Economic Opportunity and have been following the program.

It is my opinion that the resources that have been made available by Congress to meet the needs of cities have been far less than is necessary to accomplish the objectives that have been prescribed.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. MCCLURE,
City Manager.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.,
August 23, 1967.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: Your letter of July 26th, required some research to be certain that all questions could be answered adequately.

We are not in a position to answer your first question with regard to criteria set by federal agencies being too rigid and inflexible to adequately meet action when required since we have not been a participant in any programs of this type. One of the reasons participation has been avoided by the City Council in the past, however, has been the opinion of the Council that too much outside direction would be superimposed on local government.

In answer to Question No. Two, we have no direct evidence of workers under the OEO Proverty Program being directly involved in any local disorders; but I might suggest that, in my opinion, the OEO program would be far more effective if locally elected officials who are the community leaders most responsive to the wishes of the electorate should be involved to a much greater degree in local matters than they have been heretofore.

We have had a single gentleman with "a record" who has agitated for formation of a Refuse Collectors' Union and who has been partially successful in creating dissension among the workers. We have long thought and now know that he has been partially financed by federal funds—under which program I am uncertain. I do not, however, believe this person is financed by the OEO Proverty Program.

Sincerely,

R. V. KARLEN, M.D.
Mayor.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
August 18, 1967.

Re your letter of July 26, 1967.

Congressman BOB CASEY,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: Before I get to the specifics of your letter, I would like to clear up two misconceptions which unfortunately have been reported in the national press. First, Rochester has not experienced, since 1964, civil disorder of any magnitude. Although we did have some problems with large groups of youths several weeks back, the situation at no time got out of control. The second thing I wish to make clear is that there is no evidence that the poverty program in this community has been directly or indirectly involved in trying to create community disorder. What you have read about, and what has apparently been misinterpreted, is an irresponsible statement made by the Executive Director of the anti-poverty program subsequent to the incidents described above. This statement was criticized by the City Manager.

I am attaching for your information, letters which have recently been sent to Sargent Shriver and to Congressman Perkins on this subject.

On the subject of federal program criteria, I do not believe it would be fair to say that they are too rigid and inflexible, with the possible exception of the maximum unit cost requirement under the public housing program. I think that of greater importance than procedural changes, is that these very important federal programs be properly funded so that communities can move ahead to do the many things that have to be done.

I hope these brief comments will be of some assistance to you.

Sincerely,

FRANK T. LAMB,
Mayor.

JULY 31, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: Although there was an incident in Rochester on July 24, 1967 at which I believe several local anti-poverty officials behaved irresponsibly, even dangerously, it would be most unfortunante if anyone were to conclude that the anti-poverty program in Rochester is not essential to this community's life.

The behavior of some officials in a specific incident cannot be allowed to overshadow the contribution Rochester's antipoverty agency has been making in helping the poor help themselves.

Faced as it has been with the problem of finding competent staff and with a continuing uncertainty of funds, it is surprising that Rochester's program has had any success. But it has. Hundreds of young people have found jobs and training through the Neighborhood Youth Corps; comprehensive service centers in poor neighborhoods staffed in large part by people of the neighborhood, have provided one-stop guidance to families that need help; imaginative programs of education for all age levels have been developed for those in danger of school failure or those who had already failed.

In short, the events in Rochester and in cities across the country of the past few weeks should not be used as an excuse for dismantling any of the programs aimed at eliminating poverty and all the consequences of poverty.

These violent outbreaks were criminal acts and were dealt with as such. But poverty continues and if anything, the national and local resources devoted to its elimination must be expanded, not diminished.

Yours sincerely,

SEYMOUR SCHER.

AUGUST 8, 1967.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: I am very pleased that you have asked for my comments concerning amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act currently before your Committee. I know that recent events in Rochester might well be interpreted by opponents of the anti-poverty program as additional fuel to promote their case; I therefore welcome this opportunity to make it crystal clear that the anti-poverty program in Rochester is absolutely essential to this community's well-being.

Our local antipoverty agency, Action for a Better Community, Inc., has been responsible for the development and implementation of dynamic and imaginative programs to aid the poor. Hundreds of the City's less fortunate have found jobs and training; comprehensive services have been brought directly to the poor neighborhoods; special and unique educational programs have provided new hope to those who formerly had no hope.

Through direct involvement of the poor in the administration of programs, we have been able to achieve a sense of community interest and commitment which has heretofore been unknown.

Certainly there is room for tremendous improvement in both the program and administration of our local anti-poverty efforts. It has not been easy to find competent staff, and there has been continuous uncertainty as to funding. My very frank judgment, however, is that national and local resources devoted to the anti-poverty effort must be greatly expanded . . . certainly not diminished.

I also feel very strongly that it would be a grave mistake to dismantle the present OEO organization. Its continuation and strengthening are essential if we are to properly concentrate on the problems of poverty which confront us.

I hope these brief comments will be of some assistance to you and your Committee as you consider this very urgent and essential national legislation.

Sincerely,

FRANK T. LAMB,
Mayor.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON COMMENDED ON ELECTIVE SCHOOL BOARD PROPOSAL

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is to be commended for taking another step forward in providing the residents of the Nation's Capital with more effective and representative government.

Following the District government reorganization plan, recently approved by Congress, the President has proposed that the District School Board be elective rather than appointive.

This proposal deserves our overwhelming approval. It will give Washingtonians a voice in choosing the officials who shape the educational policy for their children—a voice that citizens in other cities have long had. It will make the Board more responsive to the wishes of the citizens—as boards throughout the Nation have long been. It will, hopefully, elevate Washington's educational system to a level enjoyed by the best of our Nation's school systems.

Let us delay no longer in giving a voice to the voiceless and a vote on educational policy to the disenfranchised. Let us continue to support President Johnson's efforts to make Washington a showplace of effective representative government.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the editorial, "Another Step Forward," from the August 17 Washington Daily News, which commends President Johnson for his efforts in this matter:

ANOTHER STEP FORWARD

When President Johnson, Sen. Wayne Morse and Rep. John McMillan agree wholeheartedly on anything it would seem time to examine the circumstances for evidence of covert collusion.

However, in the case of the proposal to give District citizens the right to elect the members of the School Board, everything seems aboveboard. We are heartily in favor of the plan.

A few days ago, Rep. McMillan, chairman of the House District Committee and long a proponent of the principle that residents of the District are political morons, produced a bill providing for an 11-man School Board to be elected by the citizenry. Yesterday, President Johnson, who last week saw his D.C. government re-organization plan come to fruition, heartily indorsed the McMillan plan by putting forward an exactly similar proposal—without mentioning Mr. McMillan. Finally, the often dissident Sen. Morse, long a supporter of self-government for the District, backed the School Board bill. So, lacking unforeseen snags, it seems that D.C. citizens will be given another somewhat meaty bone to chaw.

All of which is to the good. According to the plan, the new School Board would have no powers beyond those enjoyed by the present board, the members of which are appointed by Federal judges here. However, presumably the members of the new board would more specifically represent the varying areas within this community and would, of course, be more responsive to the wishes of the citizens as a whole. So, we hope the proposal rides thru on a wave of Congressional good will—and quickly.

MODERN-DAY NORSE EXPLORER RETIRES TO SUNNY ITALY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in the Deseret News on Friday, August 11, regarding the retirement of Thor Heyerdahl, the Norwegian explorer, to Collari Micheri, Italy, where he is presently writing a series of books on anthropology.

I am happy to note that this modern-day Norwegian explorer who sailed across the Pacific in his raft, Kon-Tiki, is taking full advantage of the Italian hospitality and the Italian climate for his retirement. The friendship and hospitality that has been extended to him by the Italians is certainly not the same kind of treatment that Christopher Columbus is receiving at the hands of the experts at Yale University who have produced a map which they claim shows that Leif Ericson, another Norwegian explorer, was the first man to land on the mainland of North America.

As an American of Italian descent, I want to remind my Norwegian friends that it is not my intent to take away recognition from deserving explorers, regardless of nationality. But I do feel, on the other hand, that we should not forget the documented and historically accepted voyage made by Christopher Columbus—which established the existence of the Western Hemisphere, opened up the New World to exploration and development, and resulted eventually in the formation of the United States of America, a bastion of freedom, a bulwark against communism, and one of the greatest countries in the world today.

At this point in the RECORD, I include the article about Thor Heyerdahl, as well as excerpts from two articles which appeared in the Washington Post and Newsweek magazine disputing the authenticity of the "Vinland map." The articles follow:

[From the Deseret News, Aug. 11, 1967]

KON-TIKI EXPLORER SETTLES ON ITALIAN HILLTOP

COLLARI MICHERI, ITALY.—Twenty years after sailing across the Pacific Ocean in his raft Kon-Tiki, explorer Thor Heyerdahl, now 52, has settled down on a quiet Mediterranean hilltop to write anthropological books.

But the lure of the sea has not disappeared for the Norwegian, who sails in between his studies and his scholarly letter exchanges.

"I would not have liked to live in a tropical place like the Pacific Islands I visited," he says. "Too hot and too far from civilization.

"I wanted to live among great trees and old houses in a village like this one. It is like having one foot in Tahiti and the other on the mountains of Norway."

And in reverse, the place liked him. Heyerdahl was chosen recently as mayor of the nearby town of Alassio during three days of mock festivities when foreigners ran the town.

"He saw to the correct working of all local services including traffic and supplies, and everything went so well that some claimed things had never been better before," says an inhabitant of the province.

In a serious vein, Heyerdahl has been assembling material for a new book to bring more evidence to his theory that Indians from South America could have emigrated on rafts to islands in the Pacific.

Heyerdahl figures his Kon-Tiki, which took three months to cover the 4,000 miles, was merely the first step in demonstrating the validity of his theory.

About 10,000 tons of crashing water, several sharks, whales and two decades later, Heyerdahl has nearly completed research for the book after corresponding with scientists and anthropologists all over the world.

Besides research, Heyerdahl has been turning into an Italian landowner. Collari Micheri could in fact be called Heyerdahl City since the cordial-voiced explorer built his villa and bought out 15 small houses and an 18th Century church over a pine-dotted area of substantial acreage.

Heyerdahl stays most of the time in his house, perched 2,000 feet above the sea, with his wife Yvonne and daughters Annette, 13, Marianne, 10, and Bettina, 8.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 11, 1966]

THE MAP FLAP

Forgery was the ugly word circulating in the normally sedate precincts of antiquarians and cartographers last week. It was being applied to none other than Yale University's Vinland Map, hailed as dating from around the year 1440 and showing part of North America.

Released in a great burst of publicity—and with perfect timing—by the Yale University Press on Columbus Day eve last year, "The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation" delighted scholars who believed that the Vikings were first to reach the New World—and also outraged Columbus's supporters. George Painter of the British Museum, one of the group who studied the map, called it "the most tremendous historical discovery of the twentieth century." Even by tradebook standards the Vinland Map has had a big success: 10,000 copies have been sold, most of them at $15.

The credentials of Painter and his associates are impeccable. But so are those of the skeptics who suspect that the Vinland Map may be a fake, a cartographic Piltdown man. Eighty-five-year-old Eva G.R. Taylor, the most prominent critic of the map, is professor emeritus of geography at the University of London. Professor Taylor's main arguments, published in part in the Journal of the Institute of Navigation, go as follows:

1—The outline of the northern coast of Greenland in the Vinland Map is far too accurate to have been drawn in the fifteenth century. Up until that time, she says, the Vikings had not sailed beyond 76 degrees north latitude.

2—The relative positions of Ireland, Iceland and the Shetland and Faroe islands on the map corresponds precisely to those shown (inaccurately) on Mercator's world map of 1569.

3—Whoever made the Vinland Map could have derived the formula for its elliptical boundaries from Plate V in Deetz and Adams's "Elements of Map Projection," a 1945 publication of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey. The outlines of the two maps, when compared in scale, Professor Taylor claims, match within nearly one-tenth of an inch. Her suggestion: someone who had seen the 1945 book could have drawn the "1440" Vinland Map.

G. R. Crone, librarian and map curator

of the Royal Geographical Society, questions the Vinland Map from another angle. "How such a document could have escaped notice for so long is difficult to understand," Crone says. Crone believes the Vinland Map was probably drawn after Columbus' voyage and therefore is "not of exceptional significance."

For their part, the Vinland Map scholars stand by the evidence of the map's validity, but, says R. A. Skelton, superintendent of the British Museum's map room, "no artifact whose history is unknown is immune from the hypothesis of perfect or near-perfect forgery." Skelton and the others admit the relatively accurate rendering of Greenland is puzzling. Perhaps, they speculate, Vikings did explore the northern part of the islands. Or the mapmaker may have guessed at the coastline.

The Big Gap: Skelton discounts the Taylor theory that the position of the Sheltlands and other islands bears a striking resemblance to the Mercator map. "In small-scale maps," he argues, "'measurements' may be extremely misleading if used to deduce affinity, influence or copying." Other scholars brush off the close fit of the maps' elliptical boundaries as coincidence. Finally, the 500-year gap in the Vinland Map's history does not disturb Alexander Vietor, curator of maps at Yale. The "Speculum Historiale," which the map accompanied, he explains, "did not usually have illustrations, so no one would look there. It would be like looking for a dollar bill in an encyclopedia."

Academic opinion seems convinced by the watermarks, binding, writing and other evidence of age. But no one makes a categorical statement. Perhaps the memory of Piltdown is too strong.

A MODERN FAKER?

The most sweeping attack on the map, however, is an unpublished paper by Prof. Eva Taylor, possibly the world's most distinguished authority on medieval cartography, which advances evidence indicating that the map is a clever modern fake.

Prof. Taylor was shown a reproduction of the map some four years ago when Skelton was working on it. She told the Yale team she did not believe it was a genuine 15th century product. They decided, however, that her criticisms did not affect the authenticity.

Prof. Taylor then prepared a long critique of the map which contends that the likeliest explanation of certain incongruities is that it was built up in the 20th century from a series of maps.

These, she says, could be "Elements of Map Projection," published by the U.S. Hydrographic Office; "Imago Mundi," a scholarly periodical devoted to old maps; a modern atlas, probably Dierche's Schul-Atlas; a facsimile of Maggiolo's World Map of 1511, and some other modern maps.

One of her major points is the map's representation of Greenland. "Placed side by side with a 20th century map on approximately the same scale—1/66½ millionths—the two are at a first glance almost indistinguishable," she says.

If the Vinland Map's version of Greenland is genuine, she says, it is the only map before the 19th century that shows the whole of Greenland. All other evidence is that the north of Greenland was unexplored until then.

The Vinland version would lead to the conclusion that the Norsemen circumnavigated Greenland (going within six degrees of the Pole in open boats). "The latest scholarly study of the Sagas," she says, "does not suggest that they penetrated farther than 76 degrees north."

BETRAYING IGNORANCE

The other chief point she makes on the Atlantic section of the map is shown in the drawings. But Prof. Taylor makes numerous points about other sections, particularly the Eastern Mediterranean.

"The gross misplacing of Crete, the faulty Aegean Sea and the absence of the Sea of Marmora are strange features on a map purporting to be of the mid-15th century when extremely accurate charts of the Mediterrean Sea were available," she writes.

"As might be expected, a forger often betrays himself by not knowing quite enough about the field in which he is working."

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPER CONDUCT OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials have recently appeared in newspapers around the country containing accurate portraits of the President's conduct of the "affairs of state." The President carries the burdens of us all upon his shoulders. He needs and deserves our support. Thus, I insert the following editorials into the RECORD with the hope that all of my fellow Members will read them with the greatest of care:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News, Aug. 27, 1967]

AT 59, L. B. J. MORE PATIENT—MARKS BIRTHDAY SUNDAY

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson Sunday observes the 59th anniversary of his birth, sticking close to his job in the White House, amid indications that he has learned a lot and perhaps mellowed somewhat in the nearly four years that he has occupied the nation's highest office.

Once regarded as a tautly sensitive man unable to tolerate much criticism, he has emerged in recent months as a much more patient figure—a man who perceives the unenduring nature of political storm and fury. He has become, to those who observe him closely, a President able to roll with the punches that the presidency continually receives.

"He has grown into his job," a White House aide remarked the other day. "He is now comfortable in it.

"And the decision-making processes don't bother him a bit. Once he has his facts in hand, he doesn't hesitate to go ahead and make a decision based on his own best judgment and that of others he trusts."

With old friends Johnson, even during the toughest crises, is able to sit and talk in an amiable mood. The old Johnsonian temper may still flare occasionally, but for the most part he endeavors to keep an even keel in the conduct of the affairs of his office.

As he begins the 60th year of life Johnson is a President who feels that his life in the White House has been a good one.

He is remarkably pleased with his family, on the private side of his life, and on the official side he believes that he has an excellent Cabinet and the best White House staff that has served him yet.

While the White House continues to have an atmosphere of urgency and great activity, the feeling has grown in recent months that the days of erratic performances, too much showmanship and bad credibility are mostly over. There is a more forthright approach to be noted, although Johnson as a nonpareil political practitioner still maneuvers skillfully to have his way on public issues.

The President, who has been accused in the past of indulging in considerable self-sympathy, today displays very little of such an attitude.

He tells friends privately that he doesn't believe that he has nearly as difficult a situation as the leaders of such countries as the Soviet Union, Britain, West Germany and, of course, Red China. And he details the problems of the political leaders of each of those countries. His own problems, vast as they may be, diminish in size by comparison, largely because Johnson has tremendous faith in the capacity of the United States and its government to weather the storms of today's troubled world.

He is not happy about the war in Vietnam. But nobody is happy about the war. He adheres to the line that the United States has done what is morally believed to be right, that it is persevering in this course and that it has the stamina to stick it out.

While both hawks and doves are criticizing his conduct of the war, particularly in the Senate, he is able to note with satisfaction that the Senate this week passed the defense appropriations bill with only three votes against it. In this he apparently discerns something approaching a vote of confidence in the need for large outlays for the military operations in Vietnam.

And he believes that Congress, by and large, is supporting him on vital legislation, although he has been displeased over several setbacks he has had—such as the House's rejection of a bill for a federal rat eradication program.

But these have been minor in the overall view.

His toughest decisions in the last few months have been made in the face of strong political opposition. When he decided that legislation ought to be enacted to head off a paralyzing railway strike, he and his White House team went to work with extraordinary energy to persuade a reluctant Congress to pass it. Labor unions, which have been mainstay supports of the Democratic party, were strongly opposed, and their lobbyists were striving desperately to defeat the measure. In the end, the President prevailed and accepted the fact that he came away with a few scars.

The late spring Middle East crisis was an even greater test of the President's toughness and judgment. There were strong demands from politically powerful Zionist elements in this country for United States intervention on the side of Israel. At the same time it was evident that rash action by the United States could produce a confrontation with the Soviet Union which might destroy the peace of the world.

Johnson elected to play the situation coolly and with official nonintervention. His intelligence on the outlook in the Middle East was excellent. Washington knew, for example, that a blitzkrieg by the tough little Israeli military establishment could shatter the Arab forces in a few days. This is what happened.

As it turned out, the two major nuclear powers did not reach the confrontation stage. The Soviet Union, at the same time, received a humiliating setback in its efforts to subvert the Middle East, and the United States was unscarred.

"This may have been one of his finest hours in the presidency," a White House official says. "There was a tremendous amount of emotion in the crisis. But the President stayed cool, made his decisions carefully and a major war was averted."

Despite the display of admirable courage in dealing with explosive situations, Johnson finds himself this Sunday with a great amount of criticism swirling around him. The voice of Bobby Kennedy and Barry Goldwater have both been heard in the last week, assailing him on different fronts. In the Senate there is a turmoil over Vietnam and over the regular Army's handling of the Detroit riots.

It would be foolish to contend that John-

son does not resent much of this talk. He perceives the political motivation of it—and as a politician he can understand that—but he undoubtedly also feels that there are transgressions in some areas that can only aggravate already delicate situations.

He has told Congress bluntly that if it does not like his conduct of the war in Vietnam it can repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution under which the administration considers that congressional sanction has been given to the defense of South Vietnam. Congress has not accepted the challenge, but its dissidents continue to talk.

Meanwhile, the polls show Johnson's standing at new lows, particularly in the Midwest, and the recurrent speculation on "Will he run again?" is being heard increasingly.

The polls are, of course, annoying, but the President realizes that they can vary greatly over a few months time. In the meantime, he continues to follow the course he has charted, hoping that time will decree its rightness. Presidential year politics will take care of themselves; there is no point in getting agitated about them at this time.

As he marks his 59th birthday, the President is in excellent health. Visitors to his office are sometimes suprised at how well he looks, and friends are likely to contrast his appearance now to that when he was vice-president. He looks a lot better today than then, they will say, despite his added years.

The answer is that Johnson thrives on action, urgency and decisions. In the presidency he has all of these. It is the very job his temperament and ambitions require, and because of that perhaps the road will grow a little smoother for him in the next year.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Aug. 29, 1967]

L. B. J. DEFENDED ON WAR POWERS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Much confusion has arisen lately in the discussions in Congress as to the power of the president to engage in military operations in foreign countries without what is known as a declaration of war. The constitutional provision has been repeatedly interpreted to mean that Congress alone can "declare war," but nothing in the Constitution prevents a president from carrying on a war before Congress takes any action equivalent to a formal declaration.

As a matter of fact, the Constitution gives the president this specific duty:

"The United States shall guarantee to every state in this union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion."

The use of the words "United States" in a legal sense refers always to the executive branch of the government, and the Constitution itself says that "the president shall be commander in chief" of the armed forces.

No president could continue to protect the states of the union against invasion unless he had the right instantaneously to respond to an attack by a foreign power. If, for example, some country possessing nuclear weapons should suddenly explode a number of bombs over American territory, there would not be time for Congress to be assembled and a formal declaration of war to be issued. It is the duty, therefore, of the president, as commander in chief, to order immediate retaliation for such an attack.

The authority of a president to deal at once with an attack against American interests has been repeatedly invoked. President Wilson in April 1914, ordered American naval forces to seize Veracruz and to intercept a German vessel laden with arms headed for that port. Its cargo was for the use of a regime in Mexico at odds with the United States, and for the ultimate purpose of provoking a conflict with this country. Wilson didn't wait for a resolution by Congress before acting.

President Truman never requested from Congress a declaration of war even after he sent American troops from Japan to South Korea to help repel an invasion of that country by Communist forces. The assumption at the time was that the United States was bound by treaty to send its armed forces to carry out those decisions of the U.N. Security Council which were designed to maintain "international peace and security."

No declaration of war was made when in recent years American military forces, acting under the auspices of the United Nations, went to the assistance of governments in The Congo.

Moreover, the existing agreement, known as the North Atlantic Treaty, pledges the United States to go to war instantly when any country which is a member of the treaty organization is attacked. The treaty contains no reservation requiring an act of Congress as a prerequisite to military operations.

There are advantages in having Congress declare war in some cases or in refraining from doing so in other instances when outbreaks occur, as in the Dominican Republic in 1965 when United States troops were landed to protect American interests. A declaration of war is omitted when the conflict appears likely to last only a short time. For there is a hesitancy to put the country on a wartime basis and thus cause certain laws to come into force, as happens when there is a formal declaration of war.

The use, however, of a declaration of war or of a state of war has not been abandoned. In certain circumstances it is desirable to have such a proclamation so that, under international law, vessels transporting goods or supplies to belligerent countries may legally be searched and seized. But, in a sense, what Undersecretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach said recently to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about a declaration of war being "outmoded" is true.

In a nuclear age, no country that is attacked is going to wait for its own legislative body to assemble and debate the question of war or peace. The obligation to protect instantly one's own territory against invasion and to repel attack is obvious. To delay military action would only be in the interest of the enemy.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Aug. 24, 1967]

TAKING A GOOD LOOK AT SAIGON'S ELECTIONS

In view of the fuss and feathers in Congress lately over the conduct of the Vietnam elections, it seems a good thing that President Johnson has decided to send a delegation of prominent Americans to Saigon to see exactly what is and will be going on. When members of Senate and House were criticizing the way the electoral campaign is being waged, Premier Ky invited observers from this country and others to drop around and take a look for themselves as to whether the elections are being run honestly—as he claims—or farcically, as his critics charge. Perhaps his invitation was issued as much in indignation as cordiality. But in any event, the Congressmen rather haughtily brushed it aside, and this was neither particularly fair nor particularly smart.

Now President Johnson is making up for a certain amount of Congressional poor manners. As Press Secretary Christian says, the delegation will go not to supervise but to observe. The members are going there, in effect, to share an experience with the Vietnamese people. They will be free to go wherever they wish, individually or together, in any secure part of Vietnam. And though no official report is required of them, it obviously can be expected most of them will have interesting and important things to say on their return.

For while they do not go to advise on this election occasion, many of them will doubtless be able to offer good advice to the Vietnamese people on future election occasions. These elections are a new process in Vietnam. Setting aside wilful corruption which may or may not occur, there will be the confusions that always crop up when new constitutional methods of government are being introduced. The United States, on the other hand, has had generations of experience in the processes of democracy that this country so earnestly and urgently hopes will become part of Vietnamese life. American observations on what happens in Vietnam this time could be of immeasurable help to both that country and us the next electoral time around.

One may surmise that President Johnson incidentally hopes the presence of American and other foreign observers in Saigon will ipso facto improve the course of the present elections by putting candidates and parties on their good behavior. This might not be a bad idea as long as the American delegation stringently refuses to interfere in the campaign and polling for any reason whatsoever. But the main thing is to look toward future elections in Vietnam. There are bound to be things that go wrong in this one, as a starter. But we can help the next ones to be better, and we should, with the President's committee contributing first-hand advice.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express/News, Aug. 27, 1967]

BOBBY'S QUESTIONS NEED HIS ANSWERS

Bobby Kennedy's presidential campaign is producing more questions than answers, as such ventures usually do.

He complains that the proposed surtax is unfair. "We must build a system which is fair to all, and will thereby provide us the resources we need for the tasks ahead," he said. Well, he is in position to become a national hero if he will build such a system—if ours isn't, or even tell somebody else how.

Again, he laments that "we do not seem to know how we came to a war of this breadth (in Vietnam) or the way to bring it to an honorable end," yet he is certain that the upcoming elections over there are a fraud.

A national leader simply cannot afford the luxury of merely wallowing about in a heap of adjectives; he has to make decisions and offer solutions and plans. This may be the reason the Kennedy boom remains a boomlet.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 31, 1967]

TAX REFORM PROPOSALS FALL SHORT OF NEEDS

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

The brave noises that Congressional liberals are making about closing tax loopholes would be more impressive if they didn't have such a hollow ring.

Some liberal Democrats are demanding that Congress vote tax reforms to raise the money that President Johnson wants to get from adoption of a 10 per cent Vietnam surtax. Others are insisting that the needed revenues be obtained partly from the reforms and partly from a watered-down surtax measure.

Both groups are displaying remarkably short memories and are showing as little respect for reality as the Republicans who have been pretending that the Administration can solve its deficit troubles by slashing $10-to-$15 billion from Government spending.

The need is for quick Congressional action and for the enactment of tax changes that will begin producing billions of dollars of additional revenue immediately after they became law. Loophole closing does not meet either requirement.

BITTERLY CONTROVERSIAL

What the Congressional liberals know well and blandly are choosing to ignore is that tax reforms are bitterly controversial, enormously complex proposals that can be pushed through Congress only after months of

lengthy hearings, intensive Committee work and acrimonious floor debate.

What they know equally well is that some of their most cherished reforms are likely to be rejected by substantial majorities in both Houses, as indeed they were only a few years ago during Congressional action on the historic Kennedy-Johnson omnibus tax reduction bill.

Some of these same proposals and an assortment of other reforms will be included in a loophole-closing message that the President repeatedly has promised both publicly and privately to send Congress later this year. The clamoring liberals are fully aware of Mr. Johnson's intentions and they have received the same firm assurances from Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler and Budget Director Charles L. Schultze.

PROPOSAL MISSES

Apart from their unrealistic insistence that Congress could be persuaded to act quickly on loophole closing, the liberals' reform proposal misses badly on another count: Even if they finally managed to wrestle a complicated reform bill through Congress this year, it would not give the Government the money that it must have to reduce its big deficit and to curb the threat of an inflationary boom.

The great advantage of prompt passage of the President's clean-cut, 10 per cent surcharge plan is that the levy almost immediately would start to bring in needed money from individual income tax withholding and from both individual and corporate estimated tax payments.

But the revenue from tax reforms would come in slowly and it would come in too late.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD GREECE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is now over 4 months since a military takeover in Greece ended democratic constitutional government, apparently surprising the Palace since the rumored coup was supposed to come from a different echelon of the military. Since the "coup of the colonels," it has become clearer every day that they do not intend to gracefully relinquish power. They have been purging the officer corps on a wholesale scale, removing local officials and effectively destroying any potential political opposition. Thousands of prisoners are still being held on the island of Youra and elsewhere after brutal midnight arrests. Newspapers may print only what the dictatorship permits. Gatherings of more than five people even in a private home are illegal and a former conservative member of Parliament was recently sentenced to 5 years in prison for a violation.

Mr. Speaker, recent visitors to Greece report that even their own relatives are afraid to talk to them. There is an ominous silence on the streets and in the taverns. Meanwhile, Patakos proudly announces that the buses run on time, reminding those of our generation of the same braggadocio from Mussolini about Italian trains under Fascist rule. It is rather obvious that Patakos does not have a sophisticated public relations expert from his recent announcement that 250 Greek women have chosen to remain in jail rather than sign pledges to refrain from political activities after their release.

How such announcements can improve his public image is hard to fathom. But we cannot afford to laugh at such bumbling, Mr. Speaker. These are the ludicrous statements that only highlight the depth of the real tragedy.

I am sure that our Department of State and our President, who will be meeting with the King of Greece a few days from now, are as appalled as we are by the ruthlessness of the dictatorship. The question for our Government is what we should do to assist the return of constitutional government in Greece. We are not without fault in the creation of a climate which made the coup possible. Our most serious guilt lies in fostering the opinion that the United States considered the Papandreous, and especially Andreas, as dangerous radicals. By allowing such an attitude to be accepted as the position of the United States, we encouraged a military seizure of power. The measure of blame which can be properly laid at our door is yet to be properly assessed. I fear it is not negligible.

The "colonels" also could rely on our concern for the NATO bases and our own military position in the Mediterranean. Since the coup, our only action has been to withhold a small amount of military hardware. I am afraid that the hopes of an orderly return to constitutional government, once the new Constitution is written, is a mirage. There was nothing wrong with the old Constitution. Rewriting the Constitution is merely a dodge to gain time for a solidification of the power of the junta.

Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly hope that our policy will not rest on such a chimera. I include in the RECORD an article from the Washington Daily News of August 7, 1967:

BASIC AIM—TO RETAIN POWER UNTIL NATION IS REMADE: GREEK JUNTA SET FOR LONG STAY

(By B. J. Cutler)

ATHENS, August 7.—The army Junta which took over Greece in a bloodless coup April 21 has settled in for a long stay in power.

Its basic aim is to consolidate its hold, not to restore the democracy that Greeks had—and abused.

Nudged by young King Constantine, the U.S. and World opinion, the Junta has named a committee of jurists to draft a new Constitution by Dec. 1.

But the military regime itself will put the final touches on the constitution and will decide when to have it approved by the people in a referendum.

Privately, Junta members foresee elections in which no real political opposition will be allowed. This is to lead to a rubberstamp parliament, which will permit the military inner circle to rule as it does now.

Altho they say they seized power to prevent a communist insurrection, Junta members show no taste for returning to their barracks now that the communist apparatus has been decapitated.

Instead, they insist they must retain power until the Greek nation is remade to their moralistic specifications. This means no mini-skirts, beatle haircuts, or coffee houses for youths, but plenty of church-going and compulsory schools. For grown-ups their goals are discipline, order, hard work, support of the crown, religion, nationalism, and distaste for the old political parties.

Since the Greeks are no more saintly than other people, it may be many years before the Junta considers them ready for self-government.

In the meantime, the regime is continuing to retire forcibly, Greek military officers who were not in the coup. It apparently wishes to insure that they do not rally around the King, who opposed the coup, in a counter move.

No one Junta member has emerged as a single power holder. The leaders still are Col. George Papadopoulos, 48, who runs the Premier's office; Brig. Gen. Stylianos Patakos, 53, whose tanks backed the coup and who is now Interior Minister; and Col. Nicolas Mararezos, 47, who stays in the background and directs the economy.

King Constantine, at 26, seems to be gaining prestige as the nation realizes he is cautiously pressing the Junta for a return of democratic government.

On a recent tour of the provinces, he was more warmly received than before. He is looked on as one stable factor that may lead the people back from dictatorship.

Under such a regime one doesn't take public opinion polls and people do not speak freely. Nevertheless the man in the street is viewed as neither for nor against the regime. He accepts it but is worried about how long it will last.

BETTER

In several ways the ordinary man is better off than under the elastic and corrupt government of the past few years. He is not harassed by almost daily strikes and politically-activated mobs surging in the streets.

His bus comes on time and the fare is lower. Jostling to get aboard is forbidden—Greeks now stand in queues. Prices have been frozen and some, including that of bread, rolled back. At squares in poor neighborhoods free movies are shown.

Tickets are not given for traffic violations and the driving has improved from terrifying to hair-raising. Employers who had the quaint habit of pocketing their workers' social security payments are now repaying millions to the state.

The press, which was buyable and lively, is now censored and dull. Books, plays, and "communist music" are banned. A few people are arrested for criticizing the regime, but some 2500 communists and suspects are still broiling in the sun on a prison island in the Aegean.

Today many Greeks agree that they were brawling, stumbling, and perhaps failing on the road to democracy. Now they are being taken on a journey thru stability and mild dictatorship. What they disagree on is: "was this trip necessary?"

VITAL REQUIREMENT FOR AIR TRANSPORT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill which is intended to define a truly vital requirement in the area of air transport, including a proposal to promote a method for transporting outsize objects such as missile and rocket boosters and sustainers; for use in the U.S. aerospace program as a recovery vehicle in lieu of the present highly expensive system of deploying

fleets of vessels and aircraft for that important mission; for the purpose of transporting fabricated building sections—HUD—preassembled bridge and tower sections, earthmoving machinery, industrial generators and transformers, storage tanks, radomes, field hospitals, airborne command-control communications centers, and, finally, for use in oceanographic research and exploration, lumbering, and petroleum prospecting.

The bill and other material follow:

H.R. 12744

A bill to provide for a temporary program of Federal assistance for research and development relating to a certain rigid airship, and for other purposes

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

(1) The term "rigid airship" means an aircraft comprised of a fully rigid airframe contained in an envelope filled with helium gas, and shall include engines, airframes, propellers, rotors, instruments, accessories, and other ancillary equipment.

(2) The term "testing" means the operation of a rigid airship incident to the procurement of a type certificate for such an aircraft and the operation of a rigid airship, whether or not it has a type certificate, under actual or simulated conditions for the purpose of determining the operating and utility characteristics of such an aircraft.

(3) The term "modification" means any adjustment or change necessary for and incident to carrying out the development and testing of rigid airships under this Act.

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is in the national interest to promote safety, economy, and efficiency in the national transportation system and to that end, it is the purpose of this Act to assist in the development of a rigid airship designed to transport outsized objects free from the usual constraints and hazards encountered in their transportation by land or water by providing for a temporary program of Federal assistance in the development, testing, and modification of such an airship.

SEC. 3. (a) In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized—

(1) To prepare operating and general utility characteristics and specifications for a type of rigid airship which he determines represents a potential advance over existing modes of air and surface transportation;

(2) to provide for the development of a rigid airship for use by the Department of Defense and National Aeronautics and Space Administration as a means of transporting rocket boosters and sustainers and other outsize objects and for possible use in the United States space program as a recovery vehicle in lieu of the present costly system of deployment of vessels and aircraft;

(3) to determine the potentials of a rigid airship for use by other departments and agencies of the Federal Government and by private industry for the transportation of outsized objects, including but not limited to fabricated building sections, preassembled bridge and tower sections, earth-moving machinery, industrial generators and transformers, storage tanks, radomes, field hospitals, airborne command-control communications centers, and the possible uses of such an airstrip in oceanographic research and exploration, lumbering, and petroleum prospecting;

(4) to provide, by contract or otherwise, for the operation of a rigid airship developed under this Act and for the utilization of the experience and knowledge of persons involved in the operation of similar aircraft.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall consult with interested Federal agencies, including but not limited to the Department of Defense, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and with representatives of the aviation manufacturing industry and the air transport industry.

Section 4 (a) The Secretary is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. The Secretary is authorized to use, with their consent, the available services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of other civilian or military agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of section 3 of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts with or without advertising or competitive bidding, upon determination that the price is fair and reasonable, and with or without performance or other bonds. The Secretary may make advance, progress, and other payments under contracts entered into under this section without regard to Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 529).

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress, on or before June 15 of each year, a detailed report of his activities and expenditures under this Act, together with such recommendations, including recommendations with respect to additional legislation, as he may deem appropriate.

SEC. 6. This Act shall terminate upon the expiration of the five-year period beginning on the date of its enactment.

SEC. 7. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

STATISTICS ON AEREON

Length: 340'.
Span: 255'.
Height: 80'.
Power: 4 Rolls-Royce "Tyne" turbo-prop engines @ 5500 e.s.h.p.
Cruising Speed: 150 mph.
Takeoff run: 3,000 ft. at max. load.
Payload (Max.) 300,000 lbs.
Range (Max.) 7,000 mi.
Operating Cost (Total) 1½¢ per ton-mile (@ 1,750 mi. range).
Estimated Cost: $8,400,000.

PAYLOAD

Six (6) 40 ft. containers (300,000 lbs.) range: 1,750 mi. @ total operating cost of 1½¢ per ton-mile.

Four (4) 40 ft. containers (200,000 lbs.) range: 4,000 mi. @ total operating cost of 2¢ per ton-mile.

The above bill is introduced with my absolute conviction that such a mode of transportation is vitally important to our economy and to the image of the United States as a presumed leader in the sphere of world transportation. I have long actively advocated a rigid airship and current revolutionary advances in its design and potential, to the Department of Defense and its military departments, and to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I have received polite answers indicating generally that consideration will be accorded my proposals. In the meantime, the Soviet Union is moving apace in this field and, by its own admission, is seriously researching the use of rigid airships for the same purposes as outlined in my bill. In fact, I considered it entirely possible that the Russians would display a radically new type of airship at the Paris airshow in May and June of this year. This could well be another embarrassing "first" for the Soviets—and I do not doubt their capability for a moment.

Why has the United States failed to fill an obviously glaring gap in our overall transportation system?

I sincerely urge that you give this bill serious consideration. I have readily available much conclusive information in this matter which can be presented before any committee to which it may be referred.

VEGA CLUB OF BROCKTON, MASS., OBSERVES 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Vega Club of Brockton, Mass., is about to observe its 75th anniversary, and will mark the occasion with a diamond jubilee celebration on September 9. I know that all of my colleagues here will want to join me in saluting this fine organization which numbers among its membership some of the most public-spirited and devoted citizens of that city. I have long been aware of their generous activities in the community, and hope that the efforts of the Vega members and their women's auxiliary, the Valkyrian Club will receive the encouragement they deserve to continue for a long time to come.

Among the many activities which have given areawide prominence to the club, are its Vega Male Chorus, the Vega Quartet, and the Vega Scholarships. Throughout the years, the club has been outstanding among the community's fraternal groups, and can be especially proud of its two-generation membership of fathers and sons. Founded on September 11, 1892, with 32 charter members, the club was organized "to advance and promote the social and civic interests of its members." It was incorporated on December 6, 1904, 2 years after the purchase of the site on which the present clubhouse stands. This handsome building was completed and dedicated December 14, 1917. In addition, the club acquired a fishing camp on a pond in Plymouth in 1953, and also owns the Vega Grove in West Bridgewater, the gift of Phillip Pearson of that town.

The September 9 celebration will begin with a social hour from 6:30 until 7:30 p.m., followed by dinner and dancing with a brief anniversary program. Honored guests will be widows of past members, and special guest invitations have been extended to Gov. John A. Volpe, former Senator Leverett P. Saltonstall, Mayor Sims, of Brockton, former Mayor Hjalmar Peterson, and Miss Anne Margos, as well as to myself.

Clarence Christenson will be the official host, and Fred V. Hinrichs will introduce the program as master of ceremonies. A special exhibit, the Historic Room, will offer guests a display of historic pictures, the club's history, and displays of memorabilia.

Ronald E. Hermanson is chairman of the anniversary committee, and serving with him are historians Arnold W. Ahlborg, Anders A. Lyman, Olof W. Olson, and Ivar E. Lyman. The souvenir program is being handled by Leslie E. Pearson, Everett B. Hedin, and catering by Warren R. Carlson and Edward W. Beale.

Other members who have devoted time and energy to the assured success of the occasion are: George H. Burgenson, Jean Kyhn, Gerald P. Johnson, W. Emery Samuelson, Mrs. John A. Johnson, Mrs. Bert Akesson, Mrs. Ronald E. Hermanson, Mrs. Donald E. Johnson, Mrs. Allen O'Brien, Mrs. Hilding Olson, Alton P. Nelson, Sr., Fred V. Hinrichs, Richard E. Youngberg, Donald E. Johnson, Robert L. Wessa, and club officers Donald E. Johnson, president, Barry Rogerson, vice president, Anders A. Lyman, secretary, Jean Kyhn, financial secretary, Robert Swanson, treasurer, Everett B. Hedin, marshal, Jon Ortendahl, club news editor, and directors George H. Burgenson, Richard E. Younger, Leslie E. Pearson, and Ronald E. Hermanson.

Again, I express my very best wishes to every member of the Vega Club, and congratulations on this notable milestone in its history. May the club continue to preserve the standards of community responsibility and citizenship which have earned it the esteem and high regard of all who know of its reputation.

EXPORT OF ARMS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there are many countries today which are desperately in need of resources for the development of their country, but which are devoting much of their capital and resources to large amounts of expensive military equipment. In many cases the need for military equipment is more imaginary than real, but the burden on these struggling countries is real.

The burden of the military effort in this, the richest country in the world, is felt in every sector of our society. We have found it necessary to cut many vital programs at home to maintain our effort in Vietnam. Consider the effect of even a fraction of the U.S. expenditure on the economy of a country whose needs are relatively much greater and whose means are relatively much less than ours.

The shipment of arms to such countries surely creates fears in the minds of neighboring countries, which then feel the need to protect themselves with similar buildups—either for reasons of military defense or of simple prestige. Further, the presence of arms, and the mistrust of one's neighbor, leads to a greater expectation of violence, and then a greater acceptance of violence. The mechanics of preparing a country for war, even a defensive war, are such that they are hard to reverse.

I would like to join the more than 20 of my distinguished colleagues who have introduced a concurrent resolution stating the sense of Congress that the President, acting through the U.S. delegation to the United Nations should first, seek, in the appropriate forums of the United Nations, agreements among the principal arms suppliers to insure that sales and gifts of arms are restricted to minimum levels; and, second, seek to establish in and through the United Nations a procedure for full public registration of all transactions of this character.

I urge the Foreign Affairs Committee to move forward on this resolution.

This resolution seems to me a logical parallel to the nuclear nonproliferation treaty recently proposed by the United States and the Soviet Union. I believe that this would mark an important advance in our efforts toward world peace.

THE GREEK POLITICAL CRISIS

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, 18 weeks have passed since the April 21 military coup in Greece.

In view of the deteriorating situation there and in view of King Constantine's visit to Washington next week, I believe we should today take another look at the Greek political crisis. I would like to share with you some of my thoughts in this regard.

The "colonels' junta" has arrested thousands of people and held them without formal charge, dissolved the political parties, forbade strikes, imposed a censorship of the press and the arts, voided the Constitution, and abandoned any semblance of due process of law.

They rule by force of arms—and the arms were supplied by the United States.

Who are these people?

The inner group of the junta apparently numbers no more than two dozen colonels. They had served together as junior officers within the Army over a period of many years, through both conservative and liberal administrations. They appear to be nonestablishment types, coming primarily from impoverished rural families. Contrary to some accounts, they do not appear to be either thugs or bloodthirsty tyrants. They do, however, show a contempt for politics and politicians—and the workings of democracy. There are few signs that they possess the talent of government over the long haul. They rule by decree and by the gun. And their public pronouncements indicate they have no intention of stepping down.

The strong men of the junta, Papadopoulos and Patakos, are by reliable accounts politically naive and provincial. But they are sincere. They genuinely believe their own words when they say that the coup was staged to save Greece from communism and to "purify" the nation. They are puzzled, therefore, when Western democracies show some disapproval of their actions, for they believe their actions were not inconsistent with our interests.

The coup itself was not a surprise; the organizers of the coup were. For months prior to the coup, there had been widespread talk in Athens that senior Army officers and the palace, two elements which had long enjoyed U.S. backing, would move to prevent the expected electoral victory of George Papandreou's non-Communist, liberal Center Union Party. Five weeks before the scheduled election, with the Center Union apparently heading for a record majority, the sudden coup killed democracy in Greece. The colonels had swiped the plan of the palace and the generals and executed it themselves.

After the first flurry of disapproving editorials in the press of Western Europe and the United States, and some critical statements in Congress, concern for the fate of Greek democracy gradually dwindled. American policymakers, who had quite properly cut military aid to Greece, appeared on the verge of resuming it, as articles in the July 7 issues of the New York Times and Baltimore Sun indicated.

Precisely at this moment, when events were moving in their favor, the junta pulled a major public relations blunder. They revoked the citizenship of the world-renowned Greek actress, Melina Mercouri, because of critical statements she had been making.

American public opinion was again aroused, making resumption of U.S. aid untenable. Now the indications are that the United States will not resume military aid at least until the new Greek Constitution is completed in November 1967.

But let us be clear about what this new Constitution is all about. It is a device, a mechanism encouraged by the United States as a test of the junta's intentions and perhaps as a vessel for some return to partial democracy. There was nothing significantly wrong with the old Constitution. It would be an illusion to believe that the junta seized power because they had a passion for constitutional reform.

Even if the Constitution is completed as scheduled by the 20 experts who were ordered to serve on the drafting panel there is no guarantee that it will be put into effect. Patakos has publicly stated that the junta reserves the right to alter or reject it. Furthermore, the junta will choose the time for a referendum on the Constitution and then may not accept the result of the referendum or delay its effect.

What is likely to happen? What can the United States do? Were there shortcomings in our Greek policy prior to the coup? These are legitimate questions for Congress to ask.

What is likely to happen? These are the apparent possibilities:

First. The junta will solidify itself in power and run the country indefinitely;

Second. There will be a countercoup;

Third. Disorders, terrorist attacks, and guerrilla warfare will break out, with the leadership taken by the Communists;

Fourth. The junta will honor its original pledge, and, having "purified" the nation and restored "true democracy," will return to the barracks.

On the first possibility, the junta is working hard to counter threats to it. It has no popular base, but it has the arms. Not only has the apparatus of the far left been dismantled, but over 800 military officers also have been retired. The junta is trying to defuse the power of the potentially proestablishment officers.

In the face of these developments, one might conclude that the logic of the situation points to the second possibility, a countercoup. This movement could be expected to represent the palace, some Army officers, the Navy and Air Force, and conservative interests. Presumably out of a successful countercoup would come some sort of a guided, rightwing "democracy." This analysis is based on an evaluation of what the United States seemed to favor in the 2 years of crisis which led to the April 21 coup.

If a countercoup of what may be termed the "respectable right" does not take place, or is defeated, the initiative of opposition is likely to pass to the far left. While the Communists received only 10 percent of the vote in the last election and while much of their apparatus was destroyed in the first hours of the coup, it nevertheless has the only underground organization. The Center Union is democratic—and powerless. All it had was a majority of the people. It lacks the financial and military might of the palace and the right and it lacks the conspiratorial character and foreign support of the Communists.

The fourth possibility is the most remote of all.

What can we do?

We must continue to press for the release of the several thousand political prisoners. This especially includes the former U.S. economist, Andreas Papandreou, the man who had emerged as the strongest long-run figure of the Center Union and against whose "new politics" the coup was largely directed.

We should continue to withhold military aid, or at least limit it so severely that we show that we disapprove of dictatorship in the cradle of democracy. Admittedly, there is a delicate balance beyond which we lose our leverage. But the junta will likely bend quite a way before risking a total break.

Third, we must look back and review our precoup policies, painful as this may be for some.

Our policy in Greece was cautious, conservative, King-centered, and contrary to the majority of the people. Our undisguised hostility to the Center Union, and to Andreas Papandreou particularly, can only have contributed to the atmosphere which encouraged a coup.

In the Greece of the 1960's, two strong, fairly responsible non-Communist parties had emerged, the conservative E.R.E. and the liberal Center Union. Both seemed capable of governing. Indeed, George Papandreou had seemed to prove that progressive liberalism is the best antidote to communism. Whereas in 1961 the Communist-front E.D.A. had received 24 percent of the vote in an election rigged against them, in 1964 Papandreou's Center Union triumph reduced the E.D.A. vote to 10 percent. Had the May 1967 election been held, E.D.A.'s vote probably would have shrunk further.

The normal swing of public feeling in a democracy would have probably led to a conservative victory in a year or two. But the King's action in ousting George Papandreou in June 1963—against U.S. advice, it must be said—helped make the 78-year-old political spellbinder the most popular man in modern Greek political history. Subsequently we lent our encouragement to all sorts of patched-up coalitions and stalling actions to thwart an election—and a predicted Center Union victory.

Ironically, the King may recoup his fortunes as he seems to be the most likely vehicle for a return to some kind of democracy.

Political polarization is taking place in Greece and U.S. policymakers contributed to it. Once again, "playing it safe" with "solid," anti-Communist conservatives, meant playing it dangerously in the long run.

Our options at the moment are narrow, but only if we realize the mistakes of the past will we be able to seize the opportunities of the future—when whatever action we take or do not take will influence and affect the character of Greece's return to democracy.

ADMINISTRATION FARM POLICY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are reviving—again—the tired, tortured logic and the twisted facts regarding administration farm policy, statements that have been laid to rest—again and again—by the simple truth.

I can only surmise that these Republicans hope to wear out the defenders of the American farmer by sheer verbiage, and in that way to accomplish the "policy" of no policy that they seem to want.

Hanging its threadbare case on the tenuous hook of a meeting of the National Farmers Organization called to discuss bargaining for prices, the research sector of the minority party has issued a list of what it chooses to call "harsh economic blows" that it says have been dealt the farmer by this administration.

Before once again knocking down these long-since familiar strawmen, I would like to note with great interest that the statement by the opposition's task force chairman makes no mention at all of the collective bargaining plans of the NFO at its Des Moines meeting. This is not surprising, Mr. Speaker. The minority party has never been a champion of collective bargaining, whether for industrial workers or for farmers.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to tell from the gentleman's statement whether the Republican Party is a champion of anything. There is not one constructive proposal in the entire statement. Rather, it consists of a series of hysterical negatives.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic administration, led by President Johnson, realizes full well that the farmer is not getting his just share of the national wealth; it realizes that he is entitled to it, and that without farm programs he will not get it because, as a seller, he is, in effect, a prisoner of his buyer. This administration is looking for better ways in which to help him.

One of these possibilities is collective bargaining for farmers, a principle that has been endorsed both by President Johnson and by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman as worthy of serious study.

There has been a beginning of interest in exploring this approach among several farm groups. A study of this approach would seem to me to be a more constructive assignment for the staff of the task force on agriculture of the Republican planning and research committee than using up reams of paper and wearing out mimeograph machines reprinting old adjectives, about old events and applying the old illogic. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of accuracy, it is time they dropped the "G" from the GOP.

If you are old, and if you are weary, and if the application of hard intellect to hard problems is a chore, the easiest path is to lay the burden on someone else, and then head for the hills.

For the task force chairman to blame this administration for the current slump in commodity prices is like blaming the home team's manager when the ball game is rained out.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that because of farm programs fought for and won by this administration, often in bitter struggles, the burdensome surpluses of the fifties are gone, the market is freer of Government now than it has been for 30 years, and nearer supply-demand balance than it has been for half a century. Most of our farm programs are now voluntary.

Net farm income in all probability will be down this year, but it will be down because of factors outside administration control, such as world and domestic production and weather, and the marketing practices of farmers themselves. Do not forget that it will be down from an all-time record gross last year. And do not forget, either, that it still will exceed the best income year under the Republican rule of the fifties.

But this decline is a cause of deep concern to the President, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the entire administration.

Doing what he can to bolster prices, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has been stumping the country urging farmers to adopt careful marketing practices.

This new challenge to farmers requires more active orderly marketing.

He is saying:

It requires restraint on the part of farmers in the quantities of a commodity moving into the market at any one time.

He cites the price-support program as an aid in the holding process, urging farmers to hold onto their products "and make the market work for you instead of against you."

In this connection, it is interesting to note a story in the Forum at Fargo, N. Dak., in the heart of the Red River Valley, which quotes the owner of a large seed and grain company as urging the same thing.

Here is what it says:

He said elevator operators should, in good conscience, urge farmers to hold as much grain as possible on their farms until a better market prevails.

The Secretary is concerned, and the President is concerned.

When the task force chairman says the USDA and the administration "aimed to depress farm prices," I would like to quote this, spoken by President Johnson last April:

Anyone who believes that a Democratic President, who was born and raised in a democratic country, in a farm area, who grew up on a farm, walked four miles to school, and who spent 35 years among Congressmen and Senators from farm states, can look with any pleasure on declining farm incomes, is either pretty naive, or pretty misinformed, or he is looking for a political issue that doesn't exist. . . .

We are on a long uphill climb, and we are going to make it. The stakes are high. Years of continued prosperity for all of our people must be built in a healthy agriculture.

There are six of these tired old fellows, and they have been blown down so many times that I feel that just one small puff apiece will do the job.

First. Poor old "grain dumping" has been making the rounds since last year, accused of depressing prices. The CCC sold its corn in the winter and spring of 1966. By May 1966, corn was up 17 cents from the previous November and by the October harvest it was up 10 cents more. This is price depressing?

Second. In the matter of dairy imports, the administration acts within the bounds of law enacted by Congress. The law says that imports can be restricted when they interfere with the price support program. When that time came the President acted.

Third. The task force chairman has credited the USDA with estimating 2 million more cattle than it actually had estimated when he says it overestimated by 4 million. The overestimate was 2 million, or 2 percent, not an anomoly in statistical circles—and the principal effect on prices came because the cattle were there, not because of their estimated numbers. Incidentally, Chicago choice steer prices today are $2.50 higher than they were in April, and $1.38 higher than they were a year ago.

Fourth. As to the pork purchase issue: When hog prices rose to $30 per hundredweight—which is about 122 percent of parity—Secretary Freeman recommended that the Defense Department buy less pork and more of those meat products which needed price strengthening.

This was done because the Defense Department, like all departments of our Federal Establishment, is charged with the responsibility of economizing whenever and wherever possible to save taxpayers' dollars.

But the economizing was not done at the expense of the hog producer.

As soon as hog prices were stabilized, the Defense Department restored pork purchases to the previous level. And, in actual practice the original cutback had no effect whatsoever, for in the first 3 months of 1966 the Defense Department actually bought 7 million more pounds of pork than it did in the first quarter of 1965.

The critics and the nitpickers of the pork purchase cut have chosen, conveniently, to forget that USDA policy of shopping for the best buys also helps raise prices.

They forget that in 1944 when cattle prices had plunged to a dangerous level, the Defense Department and the USDA spent hundreds of millions of dollars buying beef. And what did this do? It reduced the temporary surplus of beef—elevated cattle prices substantially.

Fifth. On export of hides, the facts are that hide exports were only mildly restricted, for a very short time and were lifted a year ago.

Sixth. Market prices for domestic production have not been held down by higher imports of raw sugar. The price of raw sugar is now 7.33 cents per pound, which is in line with the price objective of the Sugar Act. Prices averaged 6.99 cents per pound last year, started this year at 7.1, and moved gradually to 7.35 the second week of June. They have not been below 7.30 since.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we have seen the last of these old strawmen. I hope the Republicans, when it comes to farm programs, might at least try to restore the "G" to the GOP.

IF YOU WERE L. B. J.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered what would be left of the acrimonious debate on Vietnam policies, if all of those who throw alternatives and criticism into the air suddenly had to trade places with Lyndon Johnson. How vocal would they be if they had to make the hard, tough, crucial decisions the President makes which affect the lives and welfare of American fighting men and the existence of 15 million South Vietnamese?

What would they do—the critics and the naysayers?

Would they withdraw American forces immediately; repudiate the SEATO treaty; stop American aid to South Vietnam; sit back and see what happened?

Does anyone doubt that within months, perhaps weeks, there would be a Communist government in South Vietnam?

Does anyone doubt what would happen to millions of innocent nonpolitical South Vietnamese?

Does anyone question what the Communists might do to soldiers of the South Vietnam Army who had fought against them?

Does anyone ask what the people of Thailand, or Cambodia, or the Philippines or Malaysia—watching the giant that is Red China—might say about an American withdrawal—for whatever reasons the critics might give?

These are some of the questions posed by the editor-emeritus of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader, F. C. Christopherson, in a column entitled "If You Were L. B. J., What Would You Do?"

It is a most thought-provoking article, Mr. Speaker, and I insert it into the RECORD. It places a much needed perspective on the life-or-death decisions that our President faces every day of the week. It inspires renewed awe at the complexities of the office and the demands on the man who occupies it.

The article follows:

IF YOU WERE L. B. J., WHAT WOULD YOU DO?

Let's do a bit of assuming this morning. Assume that by some odd quirk of fate you—yes, you—are thrust into the White House with full authority to act on Vietnam.

What would you do? Why be hesitant? You've been talking freely about this on the street corners, over the coffee cups and the backyard fence. Repeatedly you have said that we should do this or that and said so with emphasis and without circumlocution.

Now you're on the spot. You can replace talk with action. It's in your power to determine the policy of the United States in respect to Vietnam. No longer can you say that if you were LBJ you would do this. In effect you are LBJ. You can't erase what has been done in the past. You can't settle anything merely by saying you would have done differently one year or five years ago. You are confronted by the reality of what the situation is. You must proceed from now, not from yesterday.

You may have been saying that either we should get out of Vietnam or hit harder. But that isn't the type of command you can give the military commanders in Vietnam. You must specify.

The decision is yours. Is it to hit harder or to get out? Or do you compromise in between the two extremes?

IF WE GET OUT

So we assume some more. Assume you decide we should get out. You telephone the military commanders to pack their bags, put their troops and equipment on ships and planes and hurry home.

Now what happens? The South Vietnamese are no match alone for the combined forces to the north. In come the marauders to punish those who have been on the wrong side. The blood bath could be tremendous and perhaps would be despite some effort to exercise restraint.

And what of the reaction in Thailand? In India? In the Philippines? In Australia? In southeast Asia generally? What about West Berlin? What about other areas that have acquired a respect for American might and will?

Might not these countries, peoples and regions assume the United States is a paper tiger? A weak-kneed people who pulled out when the going got tough?

Yes, these questions seem remote to us out here, on the plains and prairies of South Dakota as well as elsewhere in the United States. But they are very real to the people directly involved. And let us not for one

moment assume that the world of today is the world of yesterday. Now we aren't remote from anything, any place, any people. The world is small and compact. It is growing smaller and more compact every day.

WE GO ALL OUT

Well, instead of just withdrawing, you decide to work out an honorable peace. But don't assume that that hasn't been attempted not once but a hundred and more times by President Johnson and Secretary Rusk.

All right, then we decide to go all out to win the war. Our airplanes zero in on all of the military targets. They crack at Hanoi and the big harbor where many nations, including some who are supposedly our good friends, are unloading supplies. We sink ships, we kill literally thousands of people.

Now we have aroused Red China more than ever. Russia is on the spot because it is regarded as the foremost defender of communism in the world just as we are appraised as the major supporter of democracy.

So Russia feels it must do something to justify its image. Red China is led by a fanatic with complete power to act. It has a limited amount of crude nuclear power. It rushes in where sensible men refuse to tread. It explodes a bomb. Do we retaliate in kind? If so, does Russia restrain itself? What about the attitude of various nations whose ships we damaged in the harbor? Does President Charles de Gaulle of France decide that this is the time to assert himself?

DOWN THE MIDDLE

With President Johnson, it isn't a matter of assumption. He is in the White House. He doesn't have dictatorial powers but he is in a position at least to direct the policy on Vietnam as of now. And, of course, instead of assuming, he has been doing what he and his primary advisors deemed wise.

He hasn't ordered a withdrawal from Vietnam. He hasn't ordered an all-out assault against the north and its sources of supply. What he is doing may best be described as a middle-of-the-road policy. One may be sure there are times when he is perplexed, uncertain and confused.

The purpose of this review of the situation in Vietnam is not so much to present an answer as it is to emphasize the problem, as agonizing as it is complicated. You may ask: "What would you do if you were LBJ?" My answer: "I don't know. Perhaps I would do what LBJ is doing."—F. C. CHRISTOPHERSON.

ADDRESS OF CHAIRMAN JOHN M. BAILEY, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE AT WESTERN STATES DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Chairman John M. Bailey of the Democratic National Committee addressed the Western States Democratic Conference last week in Los Angeles with some remarks of vital importance.

I am sure that many of my colleagues will find Chairman Bailey's speech interesting and informative:

I want to thank you for inviting me to participate in your Conference.

All of you who are instrumental in planning it and putting it on are to be commended. It has been an interesting and productive meeting.

The Conferences and work shops of this kind that are currently being held around the country complement some of the meetings we have been holding in Washington. We of the Democratic National Committee plan to increase and expand our work in this area of activity, and we intend to see more of these "nuts and bolts" sessions throughout the country at every level.

I am a politician and I have come here tonight to talk to you about politics.

I think that my credentials of having served and still serving as a State Chairman who has held that position longer than anyone else currently heading a State Party, and as National Chairman, qualify me.

I do not come here with all the answers. I wish that I did. What I most want to do is to throw some thoughts out to you this evening as I will at other similar conferences. And as a result of this, I hope that there will be suggestions and ideas forthcoming to the Democratic National Committee that will be helpful in the future.

Just as an opener, I think that the coming 1968 campaign on all levels will take a freshness of approach, an originality of thinking, more than any other campaign anyone in this room has experienced in the past.

And I will tell you why.

In the first place, there has never been a campaign conducted in this nation's history preceded by such a long and vigorous period of economic prosperity. Barring unforeseen circumstances, that period of prosperity will have passed seven and a half years by the time the campaign starts in 1968. There is no precedent for it in either wartime or peacetime since our country was founded.

This prosperity is certainly one of the proudest achievements of the seven and a half years of the Administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson. It has brought high wages, lower unemployment, and a greater productivity than was almost beyond our imagination a few years ago.

But to put it in perspective, let us examine the realities of this prosperity beyond an achievement to which we can "point with pride."

Perhaps the most significant reality is that this prosperity has virtually eliminated for the present—and perhaps forever—many of the ties of traditional political leadership. To ignore this would be truly to ignore the facts of life. For the "last hurrah" has literally been sounded.

To be specific, let me zero in on just one area of traditional Democratic support—the labor movement.

In the past of less prosperous times, the power of union leadership generally could be counted on for a certain candidate's support. The Democratic Party has made some great contributions to the furthering of the labor movement, and the labor movement has certainly made some great contributions in support of the Democratic Party. So it has been a two-way street. But what do we find today?

Earlier this year, the AFL–CIO had a poll taken of its membership. Some 1,700 union members were questioned. Of that number, the poll found that 46% were in the $7,500 to $15,000 a year bracket. What this means is that a large segment of the union membership has become to some extent financially independent. They have had a long period of plentiful jobs at good wages. When a man works and has good wages he can be independent of candidates endorsed by union leadership. He can ignore the candidate who has a good union record. And the legislation and issues that once meant bread and butter to him are no longer so vital when he casts his ballot.

Let me give you just one dramatic example of how this can happen. In Michigan in 1964 there were five outstanding new men elected to the Congress. During the 2 years of the 89th Congress they were strong supporters of the Johnson Administration programs sent to Capitol Hill. These programs included Medicare, aid to education, and other social welfare programs that unions have been advocating to be passed for years. And they included the repeal of Section 14(B) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

These 5 Congressmen came from districts in Michigan with substantial Democratic registration. They had the endorsement of the United Autoworkers and other powerful unions in Michigan. But on election day in November of 1966, all 5 of them went down to defeat. And they suffered their defeat by Republican candidates supported by conservative groups.

Another factor that is rapidly changing the traditional political situation is the revolution in education.

Thirty years ago, for example, a college degree was still a fairly rare commodity. Today, that has changed and it's changed in a great part thanks to the Johnson Administration programs for higher education. And today in the average household in America, it's unthinkable that Johnny and Susie will not go on to college after high school graduation.

When they get there, contrary to what many parents and professors may believe, these young people not only think to learn, but they also learn to think. And what they think is rather disturbing to a political pro.

George Gallup found in a campus poll not long ago that 26% of the students identified themselves as Republicans, 35% identified themselves as Democrats, and a whopping 39% said they were independents.

Now, contrast this with another Gallup Poll measuring party affiliations of all ages. It found that 55% were Democrats, 34% Republicans, and only 9% identified themselves as independents. So there are 30% more of the young people in college identifying themselves as independents than there is in the general voting populace.

As President Johnson said of the young people at the Democratic National Committee meeting in March:

"It will not suffice to tell them the Democratic Party is responsible for the many measures that aid in their education, housing, health, transportation, and recreation.

"Nor can we assume the party label will be handed down to them from one generation to the next.

"These young people want to be a part of what is happening. They want to have a voice and have it heard. They want to create a response and they want to have responsibility. And they are going to turn to the party that will offer these things to them."

Still another factor that is affecting politics is travel. Travel at home and travel abroad. In this country the great changes in roads brought about by the interstate highway system, plus ample dollars to pay the hotel and restaurant bills, have Americans getting around as never before. And who do you know who hasn't been to Europe lately? Just for fun this week I had my secretary call three of the major overseas airlines to see when she could make a reservation on excursion fare to London. The earliest date any of the three could confirm a seat was the middle of September.

I am here to tell you that a farmer who has toured the agricultural areas of the Soviet Union, a student who has studied at the Sorbonne, a banker who has visited the financial district of London . . . they do not come back to this country with their thinking unchanged.

And we, my fellow Democrats, cannot keep thinking in the same old patterns and the same traditions and expect to win their votes.

Certainly one of the greatest changes that has come about on the political scene is the use of television. And who more than the Democrats of California have experienced the results of this phenomenon? We know, and it is perfectly obvious, that no candidate for a major political office in any populated area

can ignore the medium of television in his campaign, regardless of the cost.

But, I wonder, do we fully recognize the other aspects of television and the impact that it makes upon our minds? If we do not, then I think another finding of the AFL-CIO poll brings this into focus much more sharply than the fine tuner of our TV sets.

This poll reveals that 47% of the union membership looks to television for their most reliable political information. To be more specific, by far the highest percentage of them rely on Walter Cronkite. What I'm afraid this means is that by a mere inflection of his deep baritone voice, or by a lifting of his well-known bushy eyebrows, Cronkite might well change the vote of thousands of people around the country.

I do not in any way question Mr. Cronkite's sincerity or his objectivity as a television news man. But with the vast power that he obviously holds over the nationwide television audience, I hope that he never becomes too unhappy with my candidate.

This business of television news extends far beyond the commentators. This is a time when wars are covered on the scene almost instantaneously. And when parents are seeing their sons shot on the screen before their very eyes. This is a time when a television newsman would ignore a thousand people met in good faith for a good cause to cover two pickets with long hair and long beards who are protesting something. This is a time when the deeds of the Ralph Bunches are being ignored for coverage of the misdeeds of the Rap Browns.

I think I can say tonight with near absolute certainty that the news judgments of the men responsible is not going to change.

It is going to be up to us to change and to change fast to compensate for these many new developments.

And I also can say with absolute certainty that neither Lyndon Johnson nor Hubert Humphrey, nor John Bailey, is going to ride a political dinosaur to defeat in 1968.

I think that one of the highest priorities we have is going to be given to finding a more lucid method of contrasting both achievements and goals of Democrats versus Republicans.

I cannot believe, for example, that the great populace of this country is opposed to progress. Yet it is up to us to devise interesting and imaginary ways to tell the American voters the true story of Republican opposition to virtually all progress. And no more dramatic example of Republican opposition could be found than in the sad events of recent weeks.

Much of the attention and publicity have been focused on the rat control bill, a measure establishing a $40 million Federal grant program to aid localities in controlling and exterminating rats.

And where do most of the estimated 90 million rats live? In the slums and ghettos of our cities.

When this bill came before your Congress in the House of Representatives, 148 out of 160 Republicans recorded cast their votes against it. Four days later, the National Republican Coordinating Committee issued a statement blaming the Administration for the riots.

In all this long statement of charges and accusations, there was not one word suggesting remedies for the cities. The closest they came was in this statement:

"The root causes of discontent are of immediate and continuing concern to us all."

Let me tell you just how concerned they have been: In a sampling of 396 House roll call votes on urban affairs, taken from votes from between 1955 and May of 1967, Republicans voted unfavorably 59.9% of the time.

The Republicans were especially concerned during the 89th Congress.

Ninety-six percent of the House Republicans voted to kill the Department of Housing.

Ninety-seven percent voted to kill the Omnibus Housing Bill.

And ninety-six percent voted to kill the Department of Transportation.

At the press conference where the Republicans statement was read, a reporter asked if that was the first time the riots had been made a partisan issue. I quote the next paragraph in the reporter's story:

"House Minority Leader Gerald Ford (R-Mich.), who shares the spotlight with Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen (R-Ill.), said that that was a mistaken conclusion. 'We have a good record on civil rights. . .' he said."

What is the Republican record on civil rights?

Sixty-three percent voted to kill the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

Eighty-five percent voted to kill the Voting Rights Bill.

But as Mary McGrory wrote in the Washington Evening Star, ". . . the Republican Coordinating Committee is not interested in what causes riots. It simply insists that they stop. And, to judge from its statement, it wishes to exploit the fear and outrage of the white community while pointing out, as Dirksen said, 'the Negroes are the real victims.' "

In another area I think we must become involved and be very vigorous in our activities where the GOP will be holding Presidential primaries.

The eyes and ears of the nation will be on each of these primaries and the candidates running in them.

The people should know, for example, about George Romney's "pendulum policy" on Viet Nam—his swinging back and forth from one day to the next, according to the way the polls blow.

They should know about all the foolish statements Dick Nixon has made abroad at his country's expense in his quest for publicity.

They should be reminded that Ronald Reagan's right-wing philosophy is only being hidden by a makeup man's powder and paint.

As a matter of fact, I feel rather optimistic about 1968 when I view the broad scope of activities leading up to the Republican National Convention next year.

They have at least six leading men who are going to be cutting and slashing each other from coast to coast between now and then.

And National Chairman Ray Bliss apparently holds no hope his party will have settled on one man by convention time. When he looked over Houston as a possible convention site about six weeks ago, I understand his first requirement was that the city have at least 12 hotels to serve as headquarters for candidates.

Moreover, I think that many of the political pundits have overlooked the power the right-wing forces still hold over the Republican Party.

The right-wingers made substantial gains in statehouses and in Congress in the 1966 elections. While the more liberal glamour boys like Percy and Brooke get the publicity, the Goldwater element has shown itself to be very much in command at the recent national meetings of Young Republicans and the Federation of Republican Women.

And contrary to predictions that the large class of freshmen Republican Congressmen would be progressive, they are as conservative and as negative as any of the old crowd.

All of this leads up to one possibility that is becoming more and more evident every day: That Barry's boy, Ronald Reagan, may well end up as the GOP nominee.

But if we Democrats will mount a united, enthusiastic effort, I am positive that we can defeat any ticket put together by the Republican Party.

We have the great Democratic leadership team of President Lyondon B. Johnson and Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey. Over and over again they have earned the trust the American people placed in them in 1964.

I am also positive that this trust will be renewed when the voters go to the polls in 1968 and we will have another smashing Democratic victory in November 1968.

Thank you.

CONSUMER WRITER SIDNEY MARGOLIUS TRACES THE FORBIDDING JOURNEY OF THE HAPLESS CONSUMER THROUGH THE JUNGLE PATHWAYS OF CONSUMER CREDIT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sidney Margolius is best known to Members of Congress through his weekly columns on consumer economics published in the prize-winning newspaper of the Machinists Union, and also appearing in many other labor publications and consumer periodicals. He has served as a member of the President's Consumer Advisory Council, and is one of the outstanding experts in the United States on the bread-and-butter issues of consumer budgeting and finance.

From his broad knowledge in this field and his extensive correspondence with the people who read his columns and look to him for advice and guidance, he brought to the hearings of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency a wealth of information on the subject of consumer credit—its uses and abuses.

Should we ban garnishment as a device for unscrupulous merchants in collecting debts which never should have been contracted for in the first place—for credit extended to people who can repay only at the expense of seizure of most or all of their weekly pay check? Mr. Margolius made a very good case before our subcommittee for enactment of the antigarnishment provision of H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act.

Do consumers, particularly the poor, often become enmeshed in credit deals they do not understand and find themselves hopelessly entrapped in situations from which they cannot escape? Mr. Margolius told us about numerous such cases.

CREDIT NECESSARY AND DESIRABLE BUT SHOULD BE REGULATED FAIRLY

Mr. Speaker, consumer credit is an essential and socially desirable economic tool in this country. It has made possible a vast expansion in purchasing power and thus in employment and in family comfort. The automobile industry would never have grown to its fantastic size in this country if some imaginative dealer long ago had not figured out a method under which the purchaser could pay while enjoying the use of the automobile. Few Americans could have purchased cars or homes if the purchase had to be paid for in cash.

But it is because the consumer credit

industry is now so vast and so important in our day-to-day life that we must make sure it operates for the benefit of the public and not as a form of victimization of the public. Mr. Margolius discussed these factors in his testimony before us on credit disclosure and consumer credit regulation, as called for in my bill, H.R. 11601, and I recommend a reading of his statement, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SIDNEY MARGOLIUS ON H.R. 11601, THE CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, AUGUST 14, 1967

My name is Sidney Margolius. I reside at 74 Davis Road, Port Washington, New York. I am a writer specializing in consumer economic problems. In addition to books, pamphlets and magazine articles, I write a syndicated consumer column published by 105 trade-union, consumer co-op, credit-union and other newspapers with a combined circulation of 14 million. I have devoted myself solely to reporting on consumer economic problems for over 30 years.

In the light of this experience, I would say to this committee that family money losses arising from high-pressure credit selling today have become a serious national problem, damaging not only the families themselves, but causing a diversion of family resources that is helping to frustrate vital family and national goals such as advanced education, better housing and the anti-poverty program.

Never before have there been so many pressures on the public to buy on installments and to borrow money; never before have so many families used credit so extensively; never have they paid as high rates for it, and never have they been subjected to as many deceptions stemming from obsolete state credit laws which originally were designed to protect sellers and lenders, not buyers, and which some unscrupulous sellers have learned to use for outright deception.

For this reason, H.R. 11601, the proposed Consumer Credit Protection Act has significance beyond even the urgent need to give consumers honest and reasonably accurate information about installment and loan terms. This is a perceptive, intelligent, practical, public-spirited bill in the best national interest. Your sub-committee is to be congratulated for drafting and offering this bill which is as patriotic and practical as it is humane. This bill as it now stands would benefit America's families, help our national and local economies in a number of ways, and aid reputable businessmen.

This bill would especially benefit small businessmen who now must cope with hard-driving competition on one hand from national chains and mail-order houses who are inexorably pushing their extensive credit plans, and on the other hand, from fringe sellers who divert a surprising volume of sales from scrupluous business through deceptive credit-selling methods. Scrupulous businessmen should welcome this bill. Some leading businessmen themselves have said credit reforms are needed. Any scrupulous business spokesman who fights this bill is fronting—either unwittingly or short-sightedly—for the disreputable fringe sellers.

It has become increasingly difficult for small businessmen to compete with the chains and mail-order sellers who peg their cash prices low, but then drive to get buyers to use their credit plans on which they make an additional profit.

The damage to consumers themselves is greater than many of us may realize. To a large extent—and this may seem a little strong to swallow at first—consumer exploitation has replaced labor exploitation as the real problem of our times. We would not permit the things to be done to people as workers that we allow to be done to them as consumers.

Consider this incident that happened to one working woman. A salesman knocked on her door and showed her a set of stainless steel tableware at a price of $65. He said she didn't have to decide immediately, but after delivery could take a few days to decide whether to keep it. When the tableware arrived, the woman signed what was described as a receipt". But on closer inspection the set did not appear to be the same quality she had been shown. She wrote the seller to take it back. The only answer was a demand for payment.

The "receipt" turned out to be an installment contract. The woman went to the Legal Aid Society, which was willing to intercede. But her employer's personnel office called her in and told her that a garnishee had been filed for $120, including finance charges and legal costs, and that the employer would not tolerate garnishees. To keep her job she had to settle with the seller. She settled for $75 for a set of tableware which another retailer subsequently estimated was worth $15. This woman earns just $60 a week. So she really had worked one week without pay because of the $60 she had overpaid for the tableware.

If an employer had forced her to work a week without pay, we would all cry: "This is peonage". Congressmen would not tolerate labor peonage. But in many cases today we have substituted consumer peonage for labor peonage.

This is not an isolated example. Thousands of such incidents occur each week across the country, often involving much larger amounts. Some families even are forced into bankruptcy or on welfare because they are snared by deceptive sellers who use the coercive levers provided by most state laws to set their traps.

As is well known, there are more consumer bankruptcies today, than in the big depression of the 1930's. Such personal bankruptcies have increased every year for the past 14 years; in fact have jumped 240 per cent in the past ten years.

But even more widespread, though better hidden from public awareness, is the number of people whose wages are attached or garnisheed because of debts. Several million wage-earners a year suffer such garnishees. Various cities such as Chicago, Washington, Birmingham, Detroit, Akron, Portland (Oregon), and others, have reported anywhere from 12,000 to 100,000 garnishees a year each.

Often the debts for which these workers are garnisheed were incurred through deceptive selling tactics as evidenced both by examination of specific cases and because a high percentage of garnishees are filed each year by the same sellers and finance companies in various cities.

Even when families do not reach the bankruptcy or garnishment stage, the habitual installment buying indulged in by about half of all families, causes a steady erosion of family income.

In the ten years from the mid-1950's to the 60's, the country's population increased 18 per cent and disposable income rose 59 per cent. But installment debts jumped 130 per cent. Not only are American families buying more goods on credit, including small items traditionally bought for cash, but they are paying high finance rates and taking longer to pay. A family that usually carries $2000 of installment debts very likely pays in the neighborhood of $300 a year in finance charges, or a total of about $9000 over its major buying years. This family, if it is carrying a $16,000–$17,000 mortgage on its home at 6 per cent for 30 years, will pay an additional $20,000 just in interest fees on the mortgage. Altogether a typical wage-earner today works four or five years of his life just to pay interest fees on installment debts and mortgages.

I want to address myself particularly to two sections of the bill—the inclusion of revolving credit in the requirement that true annual interest rates be disclosed, and the prohibition on garnishment of wages.

There is real danger in omitting revolving credit from coverage. It is true that revolving credit represents only 5 per cent of all consumer credit. But it is the fastest-growing kind.

Sears Roebuck, one of the earlier and most active promoters of revolving credit, now does approximately as much business on revolving credit as on the traditonal installment contracts. Sears now sells almost $4 billion worth of good on credit (about 58 per cent of all its sales). About 40 per cent is for "soft goods" like clothing and domestic textiles which families traditionally bought for cash, but now often buy on revolving credit.

Spiegel's, a mail-order house owned by Beneficial Finance Company, actually does 90 per cent of its business on various types of credit plans including revolving credit.

Too, even though the Senate bill provides some safeguards against conversion of installment accounts to revolving accounts, more retailers are expected to shift over to revolving credit if they don't have to tell the true interest rates. The president of one retail furniture merchandising group already has advised his stores to set up revolving plans in view of the passage of truth-in-lending laws in several states, and the proposed federal law.

Some of America's largest merchandisers and manufacturers in effect have become combination stores and finance companies, including many who until a few years ago sold very little on credit.

Sears, Montgomery Ward, Penney's (traditionally a cash store and the last large holdout from credit), W. T. Grant, City Stores, Alden's, Gamble-Skogmo, and other large chains and catalog houses, now all own their own finance companies.

In reverse, some loan companies have been buying control of chains of stores which generate credit accounts for them. Beneficial Finance Co. now owns Western Auto Supply Stores as well as Spiegel's. Household Finance Company now owns the White Stores, Coast-to-Coast Stores, Ben Franklin stores and the Colby Furniture stores in Illinois—a total of over 4,500 stores.

Most of these large retailers now are promoting revolving credit especially hard. Montgomery Ward, for example, devotes more than twice as much space in its catalog to its revolving credit plan than to its three traditional installment plans put together. I have no breakdown on the proportion of its credit business Ward now does through revolving credit, but Ward now makes 47 per cent of all its sales on credit even though it was a relatively late starter in pushing revolving credit. Even a variety chain like W. T. Grant which has broadened into a junior department store type of operation now does 25 per cent of its business on credit, especially pushing a type of revolving credit called coupon books for small purchases. The true annual rate on coupon books—which you spend like cash in the store—can amount to as much as 31 per cent for the smaller denominations.

You almost have to specify that you don't want to use a fee-charging revolving credit account when you seek to open an ordinary charge account these days. One alert woman told a New York department store credit clerk, "I want to pay my bills monthly. I don't want a revolving charge account." The clerk responded, "It's a good thing you told me, because we automatically put you on revolving credit unless you ask for a regular charge account."

In another case, a woman bought a $9 bedspread from one of the large mail-order houses. When the bill arrived it gave her a choice of paying the $9 in 20 days or paying it on revolving credit—$5 now and $4 next month.

An Akron family who had made purchases

of a number of small items on a revolving credit account from Alden's found themselves behind in payments because of a work cutback. One day a letter arrived from the mail-order house warning that they would have to go to the man's employer. While the family was worrying because they knew that the employer fires for a garnishee, in the next mail another letter arrived from the same retailer urging them to make more purchases on their revolving credit account.

Now I would like to mention just a few incidents to show the effect of this heavy promotion of revolving credit on American families.

A college-educated Atlanta housewife wrote me: "As we added up the interest we paid last year we found we were paying 18 per cent, and had been persuaded into extended payments by phrases in the catalog like 'No lump sum interest charge, only a small 1½ per cent a month service charge with each payment.'"

A Portland mother of 26, who has three little girls, wrote that she has gone back to work to help pay off accumulated debts of $4721. Her husband's take-home pay is $420 a month. They have 20 debts, including obligations to six department stores.

A Haverhill, Massachusetts couple with only $300 a month income obligated themselves for monthly payments of $224 for bank notes and a revolving charge account, bank loans, plus accumulated bills for oil, insurance and other needs. "The creditors are getting hard to handle," the wife wrote me. "I am ready to jump in the river if I don't find a solution soon."

For the many young families who are led into serious overindebtedness, the effect often is a sense of despair and a shattering loss of self-confidence.

"Panic accompanies the writing of every check," the wife of a Lansing, Michigan, school teacher wrote me. "After two and a half years of marriage and two babies, we are paying 20 percent of our income on our debts. But what happens when the house needs repair, the transmission in your car collapses and your child is hospitalized—all in one month?"

A young wife in Phoenix with two small children, still in her early twenties looks forward only to a lifetime of debt: "It has finally hit us hard enough so that we have to face the fact that no matter what, we will never get out of debt."

She and her husband married right out of high school. They were active and confident consumers. They bought so much on credit that she ended up going to work as a secretary, for a finance company, appropriately enough. "With my working, we decided we could get out of debt easily. But due to always seeing things we wanted, and with our 'good' credit, we got in deeper. With the second baby I lost my job. Now my husband is working only part time. We are constantly hounded by bill collectors."

Now there are additional pressures to buy on revolving credit through the bank credit-card plans being promoted extensively. Obviously, excusing revolving credit from disclosing the true annual interest rate would leave a very large loophole.

Of course young families will still buy on credit, and some will overbuy. But at least the Atlanta housewife and others would know beforehand what annual interest rate they will have to pay, and decide whether it is better to leave funds in a bank earning 4 or 5 percent while they pay a presumed 18 percent for revolving credit; whether it is preferable to pay 18 percent for a credit card plan when they could take out a personal loan from the same bank for a true annual 10 or 12 percent, or put more down, or pay moderate balances immediately, or use cash to buy small items instead of coupons "which you spend like cash,"—almost like play money.

Many excuses are being advanced for seeking exemption of revolving credit. Some of these seem to be a little academic. There would be nothing wrong with stating that there are free days and variations in billing as long as the seller complies with the requirement to state that when he does start charging for the credit, the rate is 1½ per cent a month or *approximately* 18 per cent a year. The seller would be able to make it clear that if the buyer pays up in one month, for example, there is no charge.

The bill as written provides for reasonable tolerances and also permits the proposed administering agency to make adjustments and exceptions for any class of transactions if the agency finds this necessary to secure compliance. If a revolving credit seller maintains that his charge of 1½ per cent a month is actually lower in terms of simple annual interest, because of his method of calculating these charges, then as I read this bill—he can make a showing of why his annual rate differs (if 12 x 1½ actually can differ from 18) and what tolerances, adjustments and exceptions may be fair and reasonable.

After the seller states the required formula he still has the right to make a reasonable and accurate explanation of why one plan may have advantages over another even though both charge the same periodic rate.

Another useful addition in the House bill is the inclusion of debts on which the finance charge is $10 or less. Otherwise not only many of the high-rate "payday loans," but such fees as an extra charge if you arrange to pay part of your auto insurance later, would not be covered. The insurance company would not have to tell you that a charge of $2 of repaying, say, $40 three months later, is really the equivalent of a true annual interest rate of 20 per cent.

Another danger is that the practice of loan companies in some areas, of making several small loans rather than one loan, will spread. Selma Cash Paty, a Chattanooga lawyer reported a $39 loan renewed 18 times. The borrower got a total of $443 and repaid $653 including $63.88 in "investigation fees."

With regard to the proposed ban on garnishments, this ban would do more to eliminate many of the credit deceptions now used on working people than any other action Congress or the individual states might take. There are a number of potential tools of deception written into most state laws which high-pressure sellers use. These include the right to repossess and also get a deficiency judgment; the confession of judgment note which waives any defenses the buyer may have and the "holder in due course" provision which absolves the finance company or bank of any responsibility for the seller's lack of performance or even outright verbal misrepresentation, even though the finance company may be perfectly aware of what is going on.

But the garnishment is the lever of final coercion that makes most of these other tools of deception work. Often an unscrupulous seller does not even have to get a garnishee. He can merely threaten it and the victim often is frightened into paying even an unfair bill for fear of job loss. Often even the actual threat is not necessary when the victim knows that his employer fires for a garnishee, or at best condones only two or three.

Here is the kind of awful incident that has been repeated actually hundreds of thousands of times in recent years in referral selling schemes, food freezer plans, carpet selling schemes, overpriced home improvement jobs, fake correspondence schools and so on, with no way to stop these schemes as long as the garnishee law exists. A woman in Kansas City, Mo., wrote me:

"A salesman came to my house with a camera. The setup was like this. You pay $20 for the camera and that is all you have to pay. Then you send the company customers and the camera is supposed to be yours. I sent the company over 20 customers and received no credit. Now they say I must pay for the camera because I signed the paper. I have a witness that I told the man if there was any more money involved I could not take the camera. These people sold the papers to a finance company. They have come four times to the company where I work, to garnishee my wages. I sent the camera back because I told them I could not afford to pay such a price—over $400.

"The company has the camera but they say I still have to pay. I have talked to three lawyers and I get no help. They say I still have to pay. So far I have lost four days work over this matter, with all kinds of trouble at work. I am a woman of 50 with a 12-year-old child to support. I need the little bit I make for living expenses."

This woman is caught like a mouse in a trap. The trap is the state credit laws—stacked on the side of the seller and the finance company.

She has no place to turn. She went, not only to the lawyers, but to the Better Business Bureau and the Legal Aid. "No one seems to be able to help me," she says.

Many times working people return partly paid for goods in the belief that this will square off the debt, or because the machine does not work, or because they really did not save money on food by having a freezer. They found they still have to pay the whole bill though they no longer have the goods. Sometimes people signed contracts for lessons or gymnasium courses, and even though a health reason may require them to drop out, even though the gym or judo club closed up, they still had to pay for all the lessons plus the finance charge. The things that go on are really incredible. Florence Rice, a New York antipoverty worker, tells about a woman who bought a TV set. It turned out to be for DC current. She had AC in her apartment. The seller refused to take it back. She threw it out. The seller simply threatened to get a garnishee. The woman now is paying off a total of $516, at $7 a week, even though she has nothing to show for it. Can you believe consumer peonage?

Another woman bought a watch priced for $59. When she fell behind in payments she was garnished for $113 including finance charges and legal fees. Another jeweler valued the watch at $19. Is it any wonder that in riots in Detroit and other cities, rioters also destroyed installment records in local credit stores?

One can say that these people should be more careful, and should buy from reputable merchants. Without doubt such buyers are innocent and trusting. But the question before this country today, is whether we should permit laws that enable unscrupulous sellers to take advantage of innocence and trust.

It is noticeable that the states with the toughest garishment laws have the highest bankruptcy rates including California, Ohio, Virginia, Michigan and Minnesota. Colorado, with much less population, had about 4300 bankruptcies and wage-earner plans in one recent year, compared to only about 1000 in Texas and Pennsylvania which do not permit garnishees. Virginia, with less population than Florida which does not permit garnishees, has eight times as many bankruptcies. Ohio, with about the same population as Texas, has about 50 times the bankruptcies.

Certain installment dealers and finance companies in various cities alone produce hundreds of garnishees. A study reported by Dr. Milton Huber, of the University of Wisconsin, found that in Milwaukee County, of 6744 garnishees in one year, 805 of them were by one finance and loan company; 783 were by one credit clothing and jewelry store; 640 came from one furniture and appliance store.

Jasper Rowland, Manager of the Akron Better Business reports: "We have two retail establishments and two used-car dealers who entice poor credit risks into further debts

and then use the garnishee route to enforce their collections."

In one recent year just one Akron retailer filed 1500 garnishments. This and another store accounted for almost 20 per cent of all garnishments in Akron.

In Detroit, where 52,000 garnishments were filed in 1965, Jerry Dale reported in the United Auto Workers *Solidarity*, that the top filers included five leading small-loan chains and a group of large credit clothiers, credit jewelers, furniture and television stores.

The New York City Labor Commissioner in 1966 said that some installment sellers deliberately run their businesses on the basis of getting garnishes if a buyer misses just one payment.

If businessmen are against government intervention in their affairs, and in dealings between buyer and seller, then they should absolutely agree to eliminate garnishments. For garnishments are state intervention in its most drastic and naked form. This is government intervention on behalf of the seller and lender to compel a debtor virtually forcibly, to pay debt, without his agreement, often without even a fair trial by court, without usually a genuine examination of the seller's claims.

There just is no need at all for garnishments, from any point of view—that of legitimate business as well as consumers. Sellers and lenders in the few states which do not permit garnishees do not suffer any greater losses than those in others. Garnishees are not permitted in Texas. I have a letter on file from the Fort Worth Credit Bureau stating that Texas merchants have no greater credit losses than those elsewhere.

Nor does the credit business really suffer. Berkeley Municipal Judge George Brunn points out that the ratio of installment credit to total sales varies little among hard-garnishee law California, Colorado and Alabama; mild-law New York, and no-garnishee Texas, Florida and North Carolina.

H.R. 11601, the consumer credit protection bill your subcommittee has produced, is the real bill of rights for consumers, and equally of benefit to business and the nation itself. Its passage would be the first real step yet taken toward eliminating some of the worst and most unnecessary evils that have plagued American families in modern times.

LOOPHOLES IN "TRUTH IN LENDING" DESCRIBED BY ROBERT J. KLEIN, ECONOMICS EDITOR OF CONSUMERS UNION MAGAZINE, CONSUMER REPORTS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Consumer Reports magazine, published by Consumers Union of U.S., Inc., Mount Vernon, N.Y., has been waging for many years an active and effective battle on behalf of the right of consumers to know the full and accurate cost of credit, particularly since the Honorable Paul H. Douglas introduced the first truth-in-lending bill in the Senate of the United States 7 years ago. Consequently, the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs was most anxious to hear the testimony of the economics editor of that publication, Mr. Robert J. Klein, as a witness on H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, and on related bills dealing with the disclosure of credit costs or the regulation of credit transactions.

Consumer Reports, in its latest issue, has an extensive article on the Senate-passed truth-in-lending bill, S. 5, which discusses the gaps in that bill as they relate to department store revolving charges and to the exemption from annual rate disclosure of transactions in which the credit charge is less than $10. Mr. Klein, in his testimony before us, elaborated on these points and provided us with a substantial amount of additional information and material which I know will be of great interest to every Member of Congress who has been weighing the arguments pro and con on the type of consumer credit and credit disclosure law we should pass.

His statement, on August 14, follows:

STATEMENT BY ROBERT J. KLEIN, ECONOMICS EDITOR OF CONSUMER REPORTS, AT THE HEARINGS BEFORE THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS ON S. 5 AND H.R. 11601, BILLS GENERALLY ENTITLED "TRUTH-IN-LENDING"

My name is Robert J. Klein. I am economics editor of Consumer Reports, a monthly publication of Consumers Union of the U.S., Inc., located at 256 Washington Street, Mount Vernon, New York. Consumers Union is a nonprofit membership organization chartered in 1936 under the laws of the State of New York for the purpose of providing information and counsel to consumers about goods and services and about the management of family expenditures. The financial support of the organization comes from its more than one million members, subscribers and newsstand buyers of its publications. Consumers Union accepts no support from any commercial organization. Consumer Reports carries no advertising.

In addition to testing and reporting test results on products Consumer Reports provides information on other aspects of the consumers' problems. Nearly every issue contains articles on economic matters as they affect the market place, and legislative and other governmental developments which consumers ought to know about for their own protection and welfare.

Consumers Union's close attention to the current obstacles to rational use of credit date back to 1957, when the late Mildred Edie Brady, an eminent member of our staff, wrote the first of several pioneering articles on the subject. It was CU's judgment then, as it is now, that full disclosure of interest costs held out by far the best promise for stabilization of the national economy, which, then as now, suffered erratic growth partly because of the use of installment credit to hypo sales in periods of surplus inventories. For example, in several recent years the consumer debt has expanded most steeply in the late months of the auto model year, July through September, as dealers frantically attempted to dispose of their heavily floor planned new car quotas. The sales tactics are familiar—slashing of the quoted prices, with the dealer's profit retrieved through high credit charges concealed in easy (so-called) monthly payments.

Mrs. Brady reported on the failure of Federal consumer credit controls under Regulation W during the Korean conflict. There were simply too many ingenious ways of concealing credit in other costs. Let the market have a chance to work, she said. Give the consumer the information he needs in order to borrow rationally, and he will help the credit economy to regulate itself.

The readers of Consumer Reports are not a typical cross-section of consumers. By their very interest in our publication, they show a special interest in managing their income wisely and a consciousness of the difficulties involved. They are, as you might imagine, better educated and better paid than the average American. It's no surprise, either, that they rely on the installment plan less frequently and less heavily than most consumers do.

Yet they do use credit. Response to our Annual Questionnaire for 1965 showed that 25% of the respondents were paying off automobile loans. Most noteworthy to these proceedings, 58% of our questionnaire respondents in 1965 used 30-day charge accounts and 29% used revolving credit charge accounts. A steady stream of letters to the editor recited complaints against these accounts, indicating glimmerings of awareness that the service charges are not as small as the buyer was led to think. Several such letters have been appended to this testimony. They reveal a state of serious confusion—serious for the credit merchant and serious for a consumer-oriented economy. If this elite group of consumers is confused, we would think the vast majority are hopelessly confused.

Senate passage of the Truth-in-Lending Bill last month represented a 92-to-0 vote of confidence in the ability of consumers to shop wisely for credit when given the essential facts. Those facts concern the true price of money, whether borrowed directly from a lending institution or indirectly through the purchase of goods and services on the installment plan.

Except in the realm of consumer credit, the price of money is everywhere expressed as an annual interest rate—the percentage of principal the borrower must pay for a year's use of someone else's money. Truth-in-Lending legislation would simply give consumers the same information that has always formed the basis for nonconsumer borrowing. For the first time in the history of this buy-now-pay-later economy, consumers would be able to make accurate price comparisons in shopping for most types of credit. The one major exception—and it could easily become a gaping hole in the dike—is revolving credit.

Fortunately, the House of Representatives still has an opportunity to repair the leak. H.R. 11601 already goes part of the way toward requiring the type of annual rate disclosure that would most help consumers to compare revolving credit costs with those of credit from other sources. Serious problems would nevertheless continue to confront the consumer, in his attempt to compare the costs of competing revolving credit contracts. As you know, charge accounts have long been a promotional tool of competing department stores and mail-order houses. The contest for revolving credit business has recently been much intensified by the large-scale promotion of bank revolving credit cards and revolving credit checking account schemes. Later in this testimony, we will attempt to show that accurate cost comparisons among the various, often-competing, revolving credit plans will require more information than merely the equivalent annual rate derived from a stated monthly or other periodic rate.

It is a great virtue of H.R. 11601 that it opens fresh avenues of approach to problems of installment-credit users scarcely touched on in the six years of Senate hearings and debate. Highly praiseworthy, for instance, are the bill's proposed remedies for the consumer who faces high-handed collection and repossession methods; it is time to raise serious questions about the workings of legal mills grinding out judgments, repossessions, garnishments and wage assignments, for which state, county and local taxpayer must foot the administrative bill.

Some excellent studies have been made into the social ills and the rank inequities visited especially on the underprivileged consumer by these collection methods. I would call the committee's attention especially to a report to the Mayor of Chicago, the Hon. Richard J. Daley, by Jerome Schur, special assistant to Chief Judge Boyle for Consumer Credit.

The report released on December 15, 1966, examines confession of judgment complaints filed in the Municipal Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County during two weeks in June 1966. The study uncovered interest rates for used cars as high as 283%. Finance charges on money advanced to pay insurance premiums ranged up to 97%. The premiums themselves were found to be as high as $794 for 12 months' accident, credit life and health coverage. The study found that the courts had routinely processed judgments based on improperly drawn, incomplete or otherwise illegal credit contracts.

If Mr. Schur's report is not yet a part of your record, it should be, albeit that record is already rich with evidence. I refer especially to the 1965 Hearings of the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance into servicemen's credit problems. One outgrowth of these hearings was the Department of Defense directives on standards of fairness and full disclosure of credit terms offered to members of the Armed Forces. The directives represent a very big step toward a Truth-in-Lending Bill. House Banking and Currency Subcommittees are thus performing indispensable work toward the achievement of truth and equity in lending.

THE ECONOMIC GOALS

The strengths and weaknesses of the bill as it shapes up thus far can be properly understood only in terms of the purposes underlying it. Behind the progress of the Truth-in-Lending Bill is a vital need for marketing tools to help stabilize a most turbulent sector of the national economy.

Total short-term consumer debt has been growing at a furious pace. In the past 15 years, it has quadrupled to a present level of around $95 billion. About $75 billion is installment debt, on which repayments last year were $73 billion. By comparison, total personal income has only a little more than doubled in the same 15 years, and now stands at about $505 billion, after taxes. Plain arithmetic thus says that about every seventh dollar in the average pay envelope is spent before it's earned.

And plain arithmetic understates the case. You must add interest charges of about $12.5 billion per year. You must also take into account that only about half of the nation's wage earners have short-term installment debts. Installment debt alone, plus its interest, is generally estimated as laying prior claim to one dollar of every four in an *average debtor's* pay.

Some observers of the economy fear that, with so large a part of future income committed in advance, any serious rise in unemployment or drop in wages would snowball into a major recession. For many people would have all they could do to make their payments; they would be in no position to increase their debts, and their cash buying power would be harshly curtailed. Nevertheless, the present long-term economic boom has been stimulated by the huge and expanding wave of consumer credit. It is therefore understandable that nobody in the Government has come out against the fast-growing consumer installment debt as such.

It's the turbulent fluctuations in credit expansions that cause official concern. Like Robert Louis Stevenson's little shadow, the rate of increase in consumer credit sometimes shoots up taller like an India-rubber ball, and sometimes gets so little that there's none of it at all. The pattern of sharp rises and falls over the past 15 years is shown in the accompanying graph. It traces three periods of extraordinary credit growth. After the first two peaks, in 1955 and 1959, the rate of borrowing fell to around the break-even point, where, over a year's time, the total of new borrowing very nearly equaled the total of repayments.

Do purchasing intentions normally fluctuate so wildly? Or does some outside force radically change them?

Looking back from the vantage point of the recession year 1958, CU saw signs of the lender's hand at work. "Seven million high-priced autos were moved out of dealers' inventories [in 1955] in one of the biggest sales blitzes of all time," we noted, "and some 60% or better of those cars were sold on the cuff. Moreover, one of the tools of the blitz was an extension of installment contracts to 36 months. Other sellers, competing with autos for their share of the consumer dollars, also offered terms of nothing down and 36 months to pay for rugs, furniture, etc."

The chief symptom of recession is a slackening of economic growth. Thus, in 1958 there was no increase in the Gross National Product. Credit expansion hit another new high in 1959, followed by almost no credit expansion in 1961. Again, the trough on the graph was accompanied by a sharp tapering off of economic growth. To put it mildly, more orderly use of credit might have a less unsettling effect on the general economy.

The Truth-in-Lending Bills make no bones about it. Their first-mentioned purpose is "economic stabilization." Underlying full disclosure of credit costs is a two-part theory to which CU has long subscribed. First, disclosure of true annual interest rates will make people more sensitive to the high price they pay for most installment loans. When 800 CU members reported a few years ago to the National Bureau of Economic Research on recent credit deals ("Consumer Sensitivity to Finance Rates: an Empirical and Analytical Investigation" by F. Thomas Juster and Robert P. Shay, NBER, 1964), only a minority of them said they had any idea of the interest rate they had paid. Within that minority, the average rate they *thought* they had paid was about 8%. The rate they had actually paid averaged about 23%.

The second part of the theory holds that people who are conscious of the price of credit will shop, compare and buy that credit at as low a rate as they can find. Again, the data obtained from CU members accords with the theory. Those who were able to report the true rate of interest on their loans paid an average, for loans of under $500, of about 12%. Those who had no idea of the rate paid a startling average of about 37%.

In its report on the Truth-in-Lending Bill, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee took cognizance of that and other evidence. The Senate's vote of confidence in the consumer says, in so many words, "Here is the information you need. Now don't make waves."

SPECIAL TREATMENT FOR REVOLVING CREDIT

The Senate bill falls short, however, of requiring all the information consumers will need if they are to compare credit costs.

At Senate hearings last spring, a number of opponents of the bill concentrated their fire on one provision in particular. They sought to knock out any requirement for annual rate disclosure on revolving credit charge accounts. And they largely succeeded. Under the Senate bill, revolving credit as applied to most department store accounts and most of the new wave of revolving bank credit cards would continue to be labeled, as it usually is now, with a deceptively low monthly percentage figure.

Revolving credit is one kind of consumer credit most people are familiar with, whether or not they make a practice of buying on time. People who buy at all regularly in most department stores or from big mail order houses usually open charge accounts. It's convenient to pay the bill once a month, and, besides, there's usually no credit charge if you pay the bill within 30 days. Every customer, whether he pays cash over the counter or says charge it, foots the costs of 30-day credit as part of the overhead built into the price of the goods.

Of course, most stores offer a choice of paying in full or making a payment of, usually 10% per month. It's what's called a "line of credit" or an "open-end" credit account. Each new purchase is added to the bill, and 10% of the total balance at the end of each billing period is all you have to pay ad infinitum—all, that is, except for a "small" monthly service charge. Many states set a service charge ceiling of 1½% per month, and stores almost invariably charge the maximum. A rate of 1½% a month equals an annual interest of 1½ times 12, or 18%.

The balance due on the nation's charge accounts has been running at $10.5 billion. About $3.5 billion is revolving credit. That's not much next to the total installment credit outstanding. But it is probably not an accurate figure at present, and it certainly won't be an accurate one in the future, because it omits, among other things, the revolving credit schemes now being heavily merchandised by banks. Until last year, bank revolving credit was probably not a major factor, although it has been on the scene at least since 1950. But in only the past year or two, according to the Federal Reserve Board, the number of banks issuing credit cards or operating open-end credit plans reached 627, plus several hundred local banks acting as agents for large city banks' credit plans.

"The enthusiasm with which the supposedly conservative banking profession has greeted this relatively new consumer service is unparalleled in the pages of modern banking history," the American Bankers Association was told by a Chicago banker. And he explained why: "We are beginning with this first step to recapture a larger share of the credit business which heretofore conceivably could have fallen into nonbanking hands by default."

The bank credit card, unlike the department store card, can be used to charge purchases at many different stores—as many as can be recruited by the sponsoring bank. It is the poor man's version of the American Express or Diners' Club card. As The Wall Street Journal has reported, "Bank cards are issued largely to lower-income consumers. . . ."

A number of Midwest banks, operating jointly, "mailed mounds of credit cards unsolicited to each other's customers and former customers, some 4 million families in all," the Journal said. C. A. Agemian, executive vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, told why in a recent speech:

"If you want to get cardholders, your card has to have value. The cardholder needs stores to use it at. If you want to attract merchants, you have to be able to show or promise them a healthy looking number of cardholding shoppers. What comes first, the chicken or the egg? To choke off competition, you must flood the market with cards. Everybody gets cards from every bank he does or does not do business with. People who may have a capacity to repay $500 may have received cards from various banks that could permit them to charge up to $3000 or $4000!"

Were the final Truth-in-Lending law to exempt bank, department store and mail-order charge accounts from annual rate disclosure, it would quite obviously withhold from the consumer an important tool he needs to shop wisely for credit. Yet the Senate bill exempts those accounts, in most instances.

If the exemption is allowed to stand, only the monthly rate will be disclosed on most revolving credit deals. To compare the price of revolving credit with that of other forms of credit you would have to convert the monthly rate to an annual rate by multiplying it by 12. Many people don't know that, however, and they might assume that a 1½% service charge is lower than, say, the 12% annual rate generally charged by credit unions. There is thus some likelihood that the exemption would help accelerate the growth of revolving credit.

To escape annual rate disclosure for revolving credit, merchants and bankers used

a shrewd argument on the Senate subcommittee considering Truth-in-Lending and you will doubtless hear it repeated. A charge account customer, they said, often gets the use of their money at 1½% for more than one month. Someone who buys something shortly after his monthly bill has been made out, for instance, would have as long as 59 days of free time before incurring a service charge, because he would not receive his next bill, with the new item posted on it, for up to 29 days and would have 30 additional days after that to pay it. Therefore, the argument goes, a 1½% service charge does not accurately translate as 18% per annum and is usually lower.

The argument has a cute premise: Up to 59 days of credit time are available interest-free, but only on condition that the bill is paid in full on the 59th day. If you don't pay in full, time runs backward to the date of purchase.

Well, maybe an accountant can really make the calendar run in reverse. But one name for that sort of magic is account juggling.

The only reason for mentioning it here is that there are many different sets of rules for juggling revolving credit. Different stores use different rules, and they are not just playing games. A revolving charge account can cost considerably more at one store or bank than another, though both seem to be charging 18% annual interest.

Professor Richard L. D. Morse of Kansas State University has illustrated the situation dramatically in a recent pamphlet (see Appendix A). He demonstrates six different revolving credit billing systems, all of them examples of systems in use, and he showed how service charges can run more than twice as high in some stores as in others.

The drafters of the Senate Truth-in-Lending Bill recognized this obstacle to credit price comparisons. Their solution is to require each revolving credit contract and monthly statement to explain its billing system. The Federal Reserve Board which will have to write the necessary regulations, has its work cut out. Here are excerpts from the contract applications of three mail-order houses explaining their billing systems:

Sears, Roebuck and Co.: "an amount of time price differential computed at 1½% of balance at the beginning of each monthly billing period until the full amount of all purchases and time price differential thereon are paid in full."

Montgomery Ward: "a time price differential or service charge of 1½% per month on the opening monthly balance of any account on amounts up to $500 and 1% per month on amounts in excess of $500."

J. C. Penney Co.: "a time price differential ('service charge') computed by applying the rate of 1½% to the unpaid balance of the cash sale price and any unpaid service charge on each of any monthly billing dates (pursuant to your then current billing schedule) commencing with the second monthly billing date following the date of purchase . . ."

Professor Morse, being an expert on such things, was able to show that a certain six-month series of transactions costing $2.28 in service charges at Penneys could cost $2.74 at Sears or Wards and upwards of $5 at some other stores. Most people wouldn't get the message right away. A number of them, including a professor of economics and a professor of philosophy, have written to CU within the past year or so. One person wrote: "I hate to admit after many years of using my Sears account that I was never aware of paying such a high rate of interest."

One of the main areas of confusion plaguing consumers has to do with the amount of his balance due to which the revolving credit service charge rate is being applied. The following letter from a Consumer Reports reader eloquently expresses the confusion, which in this instance led to an unfair but nonetheless understandable presumption of unethical treatment:

"I have recently been the victim of unethical practices and I think your other readers might appreciate a warning in your magazine.

"As you know, Sears, Roebuck & Company charges an announced rate of 1½% interest a month on the unpaid balance. I discovered recently that the credit department in our local store was only applying a portion of the money I paid them and giving me credit for the balance. For example (and this is exactly what they did to me), I had an unpaid balance of $80.00 and made a payment of $50.00. This left me a balance of $30.00—the interest on which should have been 45¢. When I got my monthly statement, however, I found my service charge was 3 times as much as it should have been.

"When I complained to the credit manager, he first lied to me and then explained that he had done me the service of crediting my account with only $10.00 of the amount I had paid. The balance was applied as credit that I could use later. This unethical practice meant in my case that they were, in effect, charging me an interest rate of over 5% a month or 60% a year.

"I have noticed that other chain stores (like W. T. Grant) will do this if they can get away with it. I certainly hope you will find some way of drawing this dishonest policy to the attention of your readers.

"BOWLING GREEN, KY.

"R. N."

A number of similar letters are appended to this testimony. They keep coming in quite regularly, and in our opinion they should be a cause for concern both to the retail community and to this subcommittee.

The point, of course, is that hardly anyone can fathom the billing methods of revolving charge accounts. Help is needed, and the need will become more and more pressing as banks and stores, spurred on by the availability of computerized billing systems, contend for revolving credit business. H.R. 11601 would put revolving credit back under full-disclosure provisions. With slight amending, it could assign the Federal Reserve Board to tackle the billing problem.

We recognize that it would be no simple problem in rules making. But it must be solved. J. C. Penney, now claims, in a suit aimed against the Massachusetts rate disclosure law, that "Despite the difference in actual finance charge rates charged by the Plaintiff [Penneys] and certain of its major competitors, all are required to state the identical 'simple interest per annum rate.' The Plaintiff thereby suffers substantial injury to its business by reason of the misleading and distorted rate which results from the use of the statutory formula, the statement of which misleads Plaintiff's customers and prevents them from being informed as to the substantial savings to be gained by Plaintiff's regular charge account plan."

It would seem to be in Penney's best interest as well as its customers' to have some simple yardstick for pricing the revolving credit at competing stores and banks. Consumers Union is convinced that a satisfactory way can be found to solve the problem. Several come to mind: a single standardized billing system for all revolving credit accounts would be one approach, though certainly not the most desirable from the standpoint of innovation. Another approach might be a thorough statistical analysis of the various billing methods, with an eye to establishing their relative cost to the borrower. Perhaps the most logical avenue of attack, however, would be to view the matter the same way any well-managed retail business must already be viewing it—in terms of its yield. Testimony by retail executives at the Senate hearings leaves no doubt that they know approximately how much of their charge account volume consists of purchases on revolving credit. To that volume they can apply an annual rate to project their gross service charge revenues. If, as appears to be the case, the actual cost of revolving credit varies significantly from store to store, then there must be different rates of yield. Each store presumably has a fair idea of its own yield, and probably shares with others in the trade a good understanding of how various billing methods would affect that yield.

May I quote an excerpt from the "Financial Rate Translater and Guide to Legal Installment Sales Rates," published by the Financial Publishing Company of Boston for their use by the credit industry:

"Traditionally the return on money invested is stated as annual interest rate on the funds actually in use. For monthly payment loans the interest rate per month is 1/12 of the annual interest rate. In these tables we shall call this *annual* interest rate the actuarial rate . . . The *actuarial* rate expresses the true return on investment."

Gentlemen, we submit that the consumer shopping for revolving credit, or any kind of credit, should be allowed to share the knowledge belonging to those doing the lending. As so often is true, the consumer is the only participant in the transaction who is deprived of full information. He very badly needs that information. One unwise deal, after all, means little to a business conducting transactions by the thousands. But one unwise credit deal can be ruinous to the individual across the counter.

Plainly, if the present Congress does not set the Federal Reserve Board to work on the problem of differentiating amount actual revolving credit rates, you will be leaving unfinished business for some future Congress—business that needs attending to right away.

CLOSING OTHER LOOPHOLES

Consumers Union is especially pleased to see that H.R. 11601 closes other loopholes left in the Senate bill as it treats rate disclosure. We will mention here a few of the failings of S. 5.

First mortgages on houses are exempt from disclosure regulations. It is true that mortgage interest is already stated as a true annual rate. But certain fees are usually left out of the rate picture—such as mortgage placement and appraisal fees, credit report fees and points, or discounts, paid by the purchaser. According to recent figures from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, just the placement fees and points on conventional new-home mortgages are now averaging almost 1% of the amount of the loan. In effect, the interest rate is higher than it looks. It should be fully disclosed. H.R. 11601 only partly remedies the situation. In our opinion, it should count appraisal fees and credit reports as part of the finance charge on a mortgage.

Premiums for credit life insurance would not be considered as finance charges or included in the annual interest rate. Yet many lenders and credit merchants require you to buy insurance for their protection. Unless the option to buy is the borrower's, credit life insurance premiums should be counted as part of the interest rate. H.R. 11601 does the job.

Insurance commissions earned by used car dealers when they sell an accident policy as part of the credit package on a car sale would not be counted in the interest rate. Some dealers have close ties with insurance agencies and pad the price of car financing with overpriced premiums. If accident insurance is part of a car deal, the dealer's take should be included in the interest rate. H.R. 11601 does not include it.

There is no regulation of credit advertising. Familiar and phony slogans like "low bank rates" and "no money down—easy monthly payments" would continue to gull the unwary. Massachusetts law requires

credit merchants to post the true annual interest rate in any advertisement making reference to credit terms. Federal law should follow suit. H.R. 11601 does the job quite admirably.

If the finance charge is $10 or less, the lender doesn't have to disclose his annual interest rate. Example: A vacuum cleaner salesman knocks on the door with an offer of an $80 machine for $10 down and 12 monthly payments of $6.65. The payments total $89.80. The finance charge is $9.80 for $70 for one-year installment credit. The well-concealed true annual interest is 25%. Truth-in-Lending should apply to small deals as well as big ones. H.R. 11601 does the job.

The Senate bill would not go into effect until July 1, 1969. There is no reason, according to testimony at the Senate hearings, why the effective date could not be set much sooner after enactment. H.R. 11601's effective date of July 1, 1968 seems quite reasonable for most provisions of the bill.

Credit sellers could judge their rate disclosure by stating it as dollars per hundred rather than as a percentage until January 1, 1972. H.R. 11601 dispenses with such nonsense as this.

Confidence in the consumer will be rewarded best if he is given a good yardstick, if *all* credit sellers must adhere to its standard of measurement, and if the standard is invoke as soon as possible. This requires a Federal Truth-in-Lending Bill without holes.

APPENDIX A

REVOLVING CREDIT BILLING SYSTEMS

Service charges on revolving credit accounts vary widely from store to store and from bank to bank, even though the stated interest rate is usually the same. The explanation for this apparent contradiction is fairly simple. The service charge is the product of the balance due times the monthly interest rate. But different department stores, mail-order houses and credit-card banks have different methods of determining the part of your monthly balance against which a service charge is assessed.

A recent survey conducted by Richard L. D. Morse, professor of family economics at Kansas State University* make two things quite clear. First, it is next to impossible to tell which revolving credit account offers the best deal. "Methods of figuring service charges were too complex not only for the local management to understand and relay to customers who wanted to know how it would work in practice, but for national [store chain] offices to interpret in terms of an annual percentage rate of service charge," Professor Morse wrote.

Second, store-to-store differences in credit costs can be quite significant. The Morse survey isolated six billing methods, each arriving at a different total of service charges for a given series of hypothetical transactions. The customer began with a clean slate—no balance due—on the first of the year. He then did business with the store as follows:

	Purchases	Returns	Payments
January	$30	$10	----------
February	120	30	$20
March	90	40	80
April	10	----------	10
May	10	----------	10
June	10	----------	10

Here, from lowest to highest, is the total of service charges, at 1½% per month, depending on which of the six billing methods is applied:

*"Truth in Lending," the Council on Consumer Information, 15 Gwynn Hall, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 65201.

Method: Option to pay in full within 30 days of the billing date without incurring any service charge. Interest rate is applied to the previous month's closing balance, less any payment and returns. Total service charge—$2.28.

Method: Same as preceding except returns are not credited before the interest rate is applied. Total service charge—$2.43.

Method: Same as preceding except neither returns nor a payment is credited before interest rate is applied, unless the total of returns and payment equals or is higher than the previous month's closing balance. Total service charge—$2.74.

Method: Same as preceding except returns are never credited to the previous month's closing balance. Total service charge—$4.16.

Method: No 30-day option to pay in full without incurring a service charge. Interest rate is applied to the previous month's closing balance. Total service charge—$4.47.

Method: Same as preceding, except interest rate is applied to the balance at the end of the current month. Total service charge—$5.44.

Although typical, the six billing methods by no means exhaust the possibilities. And all variations, with the possible exception of return credits, are open to bank revolving credit plans. Obviously, you can't make the most economic use of a charge account unless you understand its billing system thoroughly. But, as Professor Morse found, the essential facts cannot readily be obtained.

APPENDIX B

The following is a selection of letters written to Consumers Union by readers in 1966 and 1967, all complaining about revolving credit billing methods.

Reading your magazine has made us increasingly aware of deceptive practices such as the one mentioned in the following letter.

MACY'S,
Customer Relations,
Herald Square, New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of 1/21/67 confirmed the fact that your service charge of 1½% per month is applied to items at their initial billing. This in fact means that, on the initial billing, customers having a C–T type account are actually paying up to 45% per month service charge depending on the date they charge items in relation to your billing date.

I can only assume that some loophole in New York law permits this seemingly usurious practice as this is not true of *any* of the several extended payment plan accounts which I hold in New Jersey, e.g. Sears, Bambergers, Chase. *All* the other accounts charge a 1½% per month service charge on the unpaid balance from the previous billing.

Accordingly, I am herewith returning my Macy's charge plate together with a check for $57.87 to cover the balance due on my account. Please close my account immediately. I realize that this misunderstanding is most likely my own fault as I should have read the *fine print* more carefully. However, I wonder how many of your C–T account customers realize the true amount of service charge they are paying. Let the buyer beware!

SUMMIT, N.J.

P. G.

In your May [1967] issue a reader brought to your attention confusing statements issued by Sears Roebuck & Co. in regards to interest charges.

I was recently surprised to learn that the Sears method of charging interest on 30-day or revolving accounts is not what it appears to be. Most customers and most Sears employees, including those in the credit department, assume that the method used by Sears is the same as that used by other department stores and by oil company credit card systems. This is not true. Sears does not charge 1½% per month on the unpaid balance. It charges interest on the total amount of the previous billing, regardless of the size of payment made, exclusive of a full payment.

As an example: a purchase of $100 is made and a billing is sent to the customer. The customer then pays $50. The next billing shows a $50 balance due plus $1.50 (1½% x $100) service charge, not $0.75 (1½% x $50) as one would expect. Thus, it is theoretically possible for a customer to pay the full $100 and then receive a billing with a balance of $0.00 but an interest charge of $1.50. Fortunately, Sears does not go that far in this unscrupulous practice.

I hate to admit that after many years of using my Sears account I was never aware that I was paying such a high rate of interest. How many of your readers are aware of this?

NORWALK, CALIF.

W. L.

To add more fuel to your truth in lending campaign, it may be of interest to your readers that even such an otherwise reputable store as Sears may charge interest rates as high as *72 percent* per annum. Sears basic rate of interest on a revolving charge is 18 per cent per annum (1½% per month) but it is based on the end of month balance. If a customer bought a $200 item on January 23 and was billed for this on January 30, and he paid $100 on the same day, he would pay 1½ per cent on $200 or $3, the equivalent of 72 per cent simple interest per annum.

If this is what reputable stores are charging, what are the less reputable doing?

PITTSBURGH, PA.

R. T.

Enclosed is a copy of my letter to Klein's Department Store requesting that they close my account and stating the reason therefore. I am confident that Klein's will not give me much trouble over this, but it occurred to me that thousands of customers accept these charges without realizing the true interest, especially if the "minimum" service charge is applied where the time payment plan is actually being used.

(The enclosed letter follows:)

PRESIDENT,
S. Klein on the Square,
Stamford, Conn.

SIR: The enclosed statement reflects a balance which is comprised entirely of service charges. Since I pay my entire purchase invoices due on the 15th day of every month, I do not pay or honor service charges. Unfortunately, I am quite busy and I must select one monthly remitting date for all accounts (this is the 15th.). If your organization finds it convenient to choose the 15th, or 17th, as a billing date that is your concern. However, I will not honor erroneous service charges arising from this practice.

The enclosed statement contains a service charge of $0.50 on a balance of $4.25, all of which consists of previous erroneous service charges. This comes to interest *annual* of *141.7%* charged on prior interest. This usurious practice of Klein's is by far the worst I have encountered in all my experience with department stores, discount stores, credit cards, etc. You are competing successfully with the loan sharks if this type of item is generally collectable in your experience.

I am destroying my charge card. Please close my account and I refuse to be responsible for any charges after the above date. (End of enclosed letter.)

Another practice that I have noticed, is that some stores will compute the service charge on the entire balance carried forward from the previous month, even though they may have entered a credit for a substantial payment. Thus charges are made on the amount remitted which obviously should not be included in the time balance.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

S. W.

I had a revealing experience with the Sears Roebuck credit system recently. It involved the purchase of two chairs on January 12th, and the monthly statement on the 18th that listed them accurately at $175. We were temporarily short, so I figured that a check for $100 would leave only $75 which at 1½% for a month would cost me about $1.13. So on February 2nd we mailed a check for $100. Imagine our surprise when the statement arrived on February 18th. It showed a balance owed of $75 which was correct, and a service charge for $2.63!

Inquiries at the local store established that the charge was figured on the previous month's balance, that is 1½% on $175. I protested that the initial $100 had been paid well within the 30-day limit for cash-charge conditions but the only response was that the system was set up on the previous month's balance. I finally reached one official who read a regulation to the effect that since this was my first experience with their system, they would refund the fee charged on the $100 that I had paid, but they could not be this generous the next time.

After reaching the hierarchy in the Chicago office, I established that my first payment was unusually large and thus the system slipped and charged me what seemed too much. They would be glad to adjust this, and if ever this occurred again, just call. I was left with the impression that if we had paid just $20, they would have assessed me for 1½% of $175 and I would not have noticed the difference, in the February billing.

Upon reading the fine print in the catalog, it is clear that Sears does indeed charge 1½% on the previous month's billing without adjusting for what was paid by the customer on that statement. The balance, however, on the next statement reflects what is truly owed—not the basis for calculating the service charge. It appears that Sears actually does much better than 1½% on service charges. Had we not complained, we would have paid 3½% for $75 for a month.

By contrast Penney's catalog says 1½% of the unpaid balance. Is Sears openly conducting a deception about their true service charge percentage, or is this just called sharp business? After doing our buying there for 30 years, we are not so sure about our Sears charge card. Have you any comments on this unusual way to do business?

MOUNT PROSPECT, ILL.

R. L.

Although aware of the exorbitant interest rates charged by department stores, I purchased a new house and needed about $1,500 worth of odds and ends to make it livable. I compared the interest rates of several companies and noted the following in a Ward's catalog: "I will pay . . . charge of 1½% per month on the opening monthly balance of my account on amounts up to $500 and ¾% per month on amounts in excess of $500." This made sense—much like the all-electric home does—the rates decrease as increased use is made of the service, I assumed that the cost of carrying an account was absorbed in the higher rate for the first $500 and then reasonably expected the lower interest as an expression of their lower costs. Thus, I placed all $1500 in purchases with Ward's rather than seeking to divide the purchases among several stores.

When the bill came I found that I was charged interest at the full 1½%. Upon inquiry, I was told that the figures in the catalog pertain only to people who live in Missouri. I insisted that their catalogs (which arrived via mails unsolicited at my home) induced me to make the indicated purchases. Their reply was that when I first made a catalog order I was handed a small card to sign which had different interest figures on it—namely that I would pay 1½% of the unpaid balance regardless of how high it went.

Letters to Ward's are rewarded by condescending letters which refuse to even consider the possibility of misleading. In recent months I purchased another $2500 worth of merchandise, nothing to be sure from Ward's.

Having long been a reader of Consumer Reports I should not have permitted myself to be trapped into these high interests. But, I had assumed my investigation of the rates as printed on the back of the contracts attached to the catalog was adequate. Apparently not.

EDMOND, OKLA.

G. M.

I would like to call your attention to what appears to be usury practiced by Montgomery Ward in their billing system. This company adds interest at the rate of 1½% per month to the unpaid balance existing at the beginning of a billing period without deducting payments made during the billing period. In effect they are charging interest on money which has already been paid on the account during the billing period and prior to the billing date. Why don't they calculate interest on the balance remaining on the account at the end of the billing date?

As an example, the following is my bill dated 5-25-67.

Last month's balance	$157.82
Service charge added	2.37
Payments and credits	118.82
New balance	41.37

The $118.82 was paid on the account during the billing period yet interest is still charged to it. The actual interest rate charged on this bill is almost 6% per month calculated on the balance remaining at the end of the month.

I have already written Montgomery Ward regarding this practice but, as expected, I have received no reply. I am sure that Montgomery Ward would be among the first to state that government controls are not needed in this area, but I would advise them to institute fair practices prior to such a statement.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

R. M.

Have any of the readers experienced Sears Roebuck's latest trick to increase their carrying charge?—Simple—just don't bother to post credits to your account until after the billing date. In this way they can collect your money and charge you interest on it also. It must be very prevalent as I caught it 3 times in 1 year on my account. Needless to say it's now closed.

GLENVIEW, ILL.

W. S.

Why don't you mention the deceptive billing practices currently used by such large companies as Sears. Not only can't you read their statements (unless you look VERY closely) but they add their "carrying charges" whether or not the bill is paid in 30 days!

I have already returned one credit card from a local chain (Valu-Mart) because they added carrying charges upon carrying charges, and I no longer shop at their local outlet.

Currently (due to a change in billing practice from local to Los Angeles) I am fighting the same battle with Sears. At present I "owe" them $1.28 in carrying charges over the past two months although I paid the bills within 10 days of receiving them. Although I have written two letters, with a third to go out with this mail, I have yet to see the courtesy of an answer. I may miss the convenience of shopping by phone, but Sears will probably get their credit card back too! The convenience is the only reason why I have a card anyway.

Incidentally, I do not have a Montgomery Ward credit card. Their latest practice is to add carrying charges immediately. There is another local outfit that charges *you* for the dubious "pleasure," before you even buy, of having their credit card!

Maybe I'm naive, but have 30 day charge accounts gone out of style? I may become a cash customer completely, and forget about writing checks! I just don't like being taken.

FEDERAL WAY, WASH.

M. C.

BORDERS WITHOUT A WALL—A CENTURY OF FRIENDSHIP

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had the pleasure of serving as a judge in an essay contest conducted in 22 District of Columbia schools, honoring Canada's centennial of confederation. As cochairman of the U.S. delegation to the United States-Canadian interparliamentary group, I have long been interested in increasing knowledge of Canada here in the United States. Canada's very similarity to the United States, as well as the ease of travel between the two countries, has caused many American to regard our neighbor to the north as a reflection of American society.

This essay contest, sponsored by the Canadian Centennial Commission in cooperation with PACE project 370 and approved by the District of Columbia board of education, gave hundreds of District youngsters an opportunity to dispel their own preconceptions about Canada. I would hope that those who read the four winning essays will benefit from the talent, imagination, and research of Sarah Jane Taylor, 11; Robert B. Giffin, 12; Sterling A. Green, 18; and Marvin DeWitt Williams, 18. These District of Columbia students have just returned from a tour of Canada as guests of the Canadian Centennial Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this year's program will become a part of many school districts around the country. Any project designed to promote, stimulate, and strengthen communication between nations, particularly at the student level, should be strongly encouraged. It has also come to my attention that this project has had an affect on the current curriculum of District of Columbia schools. I quote here briefly from a letter from the exceptionally able supervising director of PACE project 370, a special communicative skills program in the District of Columbia schools:

All facets of the essay contest have made their mark on the participants. One fact we discovered was quite revealing. Students were suddenly confronted with the realization that their knowledge of Canada was, in most instances, sketchy at best. As a staff, we studied the time allotted to the study of Canada and concluded that it did not provide sufficiently for in-depth concentration. As a result, we have made recommendations for curriculum area changes to the Department of Social Studies of the D.C. Board of Education. These recommendations are being favorably received and we hope to introduce this change in our schools in the fall.

Mr. Speaker, the title of this essay contest was "Border Without a Wall—A Century of Friendship." We have seen from the letter just quoted that a small wall in an American school system may have been breached as a result of the contest. It is my hope that the next 100 years will see United States-Canadian relations continue over the longest unfortified frontier in the world, and that Americans may further appreciate the unique nature and freedom-loving vitality of our Canadian friends.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the American people the four winning essays, for they are instructive examples of the intelligence of young Americans as well as a creative salute to Canada on her centennial.

DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES AS PROMOTERS OF INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

(By Andy Green, Western High School, Washington, D.C.)

Canada and the United States, the two largest nations in North America, share a heritage of democratic principles and laws and are entering a new era of friendship and cooperation. The Soviet Union and Communist China, on the other hand, are both committed to the establishment of communism throughout the world. Yet relations between those two nations are worse now than at any other time in their history. Using Canadian-American friendship as an example, the world could learn a great deal.

Today's situation with respect to Sino-Soviet and Canadian-American relations is somewhat paradoxical. A brief examination of history will show why:

Until the advent of Communism, the two great Asian nations had little to do with one another. Completely unto themselves in a quiet, though somewhat medieval society, the Chinese, a naturally isolationistic people, did nothing to antagonize their Russian neighbors. The Great Wall of China is itself a lasting symbol of their isolationism. Russia, for her part, reciprocated this policy.

In 1917, Russians established communism as a force to be reckoned with in the world. The Chinese followed thirty years later. For a time, the two nations were in complete accord, signing in 1950 a thirty-year treaty of friendship and cooperation. This treaty has been largely forgotten in the turmoil of the Sino-Soviet ideological split. The Russians prefer a policy of peaceful coexistence with non-communist nations, favoring economic, political, and propagandistic methods for self-aggrandizement, while the Chinese are actively committed to fostering worldwide "revolutions" for communism. As a result of this disagreement, Sino-Soviet relations never have been poorer.

Let us look now at Canada and America. Both believe in a system of basic self-determination. This is their common English heritage which maintains that the people shall be the chief factor in their government. The history of relations between these two countries before Canada's confederation in 1867, and for some time after, was one of great hostility. Because Canada was a British colony, she endured a great deal of the American anti-British sentiment of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. Border disputes were common until about 1850. American Northerners were wary of any Canadian support of the South during the Civil War. Trade disagreements and Canadian fear of American encroachments on Canadian soil were both common. This situation was certainly not a firm basis for international cooperation.[1]

The paradox mentioned earlier is simply this: Because China and the Soviet Union have been steeped in communist ideology, one would expect them to be united in that crusade which calls for the oppressed peoples of the world to unite against the ruling class to achieve a classless, equal society. (Such a society has never been achieved.) One would also suppose that self-determination for a nation, and for the people of that nation, leaves a good deal of room for international antagonism arising from nationalistic feelings within the countries involved. Current French-American disagreements are an example of this.

The logical conclusions to be drawn from the above discussion are, first, that China and the Soviet Union should get along quite well with one another, being dedicated to a common goal; and second, that Canada and the United States should be somewhat antagonistic towards each other. The paradox is that just the opposite is actually true.

It can be argued that the Sino-Soviet rift is not the fault of communist doctrines to which the two nations are committed, but rather of natural differences, such as race, language, and basic attitudes toward life in general. But if the two most populous nations in the world cannot agree on how the world will become communist, then certainly the "workers of the world"[2] can never be won over to their doctrines.

Democracy, by its very nature, is not pledged to the support of any ideology as such. If the people, through their elected officials, happen to support a particular social or political school of thought, they do so on their own volition and not in response to any grand design set up for them to follow. Therefore, nations with elective governments are seldom at variance with one another; they are content with their own systems and are not committed to world domination.

The chief importance of Canadian-American friendship is not merely the satisfaction of the two nations at its existence, although satisfaction is desirable. The chief importance is the example for the people of the world, who should take notice of what two nations can accomplish together when they have the freedom to do it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berlin, Isaiah, *Karl Marx, His Life and Environment*, Oxford University Press, New York, N.Y., 1963.

McInnes, Edgar, *Canada, A Political and Social History*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, N.Y., 1964.

Pearson, Lester B., *The Four Faces of Peace*, Dodd, Meade & Company, New York, N.Y., 1964.

BORDER WITHOUT A WALL—A CENTURY OF FRIENDSHIP

(By Marvin D. Williams, Western High School, Washington, D.C.)

North of the Great Lakes there is a vast land mass larger than all of Europe. It cramps southward into the temperate climate of the lower lakes and then stretches northward in a wild movement to the coldest Arctic regions. You may travel across this land by dog-sled or by jet. You may travel from one sea, across the prairies, through the majestic mountains, to the other sea. You may dig into the rich fields of oil and you may mine the coal. You may trap for fur and you may temper the steel. And then you may cross 3,800 miles of unrestricted border to reach the United States. Yes, you may call it Canada.

Canadian history began by sea as Europe expanded over the oceans. First came the French whose influences are enduring elements in Canadian life. Next came the British whose strong traditions advanced Canada to self-government. The new British Colony grew and enriched the sea-trading empire.

The hard Canadians, from their hard land and hard lives, began to carve farms and cities out of this vast glorification of God on earth. The Canadian people had their differences but their goals were the same. They had come to build half a world into a free and spirited nation. Unlike the United States the Canadians didn't have the help of brainpower and financing from the outside. The building was done from within outward.

In 1867 a proud but weary, historic but fresh, people came together and under law united the North.

Since the main geographic barriers in North America run north and south they do not block the way into the various parts of Canada from the United States, and the boundary between the two countries is on the whole simply a man-made line. Conditions of every-day life may be much the same on either side of the border. The common problems that are met in living in the same kind of land, the similar outlooks thereby produced, and the constant movement of trade and people to and fro across the border result in Canada being readily open to American influences, and Canadian history being closely tied to that of the United States.

Geography has decreed that the United States should be much stronger than Canada. Geography has scattered the Canadian people, made the cost of developing the country higher than that of developing the American republic and has given it fewer men and less money to work with. Geography has also decreed that Canada should be rich, but not endowed with the variety of the United States; and it has sharply restricted the northern nation in regard to soil and climate. Canada's achievements may be great, especially for twenty million people, but the mighty American neighbor still towers above the northern nation.

No other Commonwealth country has had to grow up beside a tremendously powerful state. This inequity poses special problems for Canada today. It has meant in Canada both a tendency to copy American ways and to be suspicious of American influences and power to dominate. In the more remote past it has meant two wars to repel American conquests and many periods of alarm.

But most recently and most important, the relationship between Canada and the United States has come to mean a striking record of close co-operation between nations, a long era of peace and an unfortified American-Canadian border.

Pioneer ancestors of both peoples, by their adventurous spirit, their character, and faith in what they were doing, opened up a continent. Their descendants pushed on westward until they had reached the Pacific and created two nations extending from sea to sea. Each of these nations received a flood of immigrants from Europe, seeking opportunity in the New World, and they have both experienced the problems of assimilating many nationalities.

Each in their own way, the people of both nations have followed their profound instinct for freedom and self-government. Their will to control the government under which they live takes the form of political democracy in both countries. Throughout the histories of these nations there has been a close relationship between them. There have been disagreements, politicians have grown hot and angry over controversial questions, but the governments have always managed to work things out through discussion and compromise because they had the will, fundamentally, to be good neighbors. Both peoples are proud of the undefended border.

With all its shortcomings and difficulties, it is the way of life they have chosen, so that

---

[1] Edgar McInnes, *Canada, A Political and Social History*, 1963, chapters 8–9.

[2] Karl Marx, "The Communist Manifesto," quoted in *Karl Marx, His Life and Environment*, by Isaiah Berlin, chapter 8.

both Canadians and Americans have the job of making democracy and peace work through their example.

BORDER WITHOUT A WALL—A CENTURY OF FRIENDSHIP

(By Robert B. Griffin, Ben Murch School)

The Canadian and United States relations have been of the friendliest for more than a hundred years. Though there have been disputes and disagreements in the past the two countries share prosperity, power, exploration, and like ways of living. Canadians take for granted that they may be watching an American movie or listening to an American song.

Canadian history provides Canada with English and French speaking people. Unlike the United States the two official languages are separated. Quebec's French is confined to just about Quebec but is minutely scattered elsewhere.

In search of China John Cabot found little but codfish but did claim Canada for England. French explorers came and developed settlements where Quebec is now and claimed the land to be theirs. This brought on a war. The Colonies and Canada both had their own part in the war. The Colonies had to protect their border in the French and Indian War as in other times.

Without doubt friendly neighbors sometimes get angry. When the American Revolution broke out in the states Loyalists fled to the eastern provinces which caused much chaos and difficulties for the Canadians. The Americans tried to convince the Canadians to side with the United States in their revolt against England. Of course Canada felt differently about England and refused to comply with any of the United States' requests.

In the War of 1812 both nations' bullets flew at each other though now they both regret their unfortunate disputes. Since the War of 1812 there has been 150 years of friendship between the United States and Canada.

When Britain declared war on Germany, Canada immediately aided the mother country, later to receive help from the United States.

In World War II Canada supplied the United States with aid in the war against Japan. The Royal Canadian Air Force played a most important part in the war. Canada supplied ammunition, artillery, planes, ships and numbers of other supplies for the United States. The Second World War proved that international cooperation and friendship could make very good results.

During the years between the First and Second World War Canada became known to the world. The United States sent men into Canada to tap never touched resources which would invite industry and produce billions of dollars worth of goods. It brought in manufacturing and industry and sent manufactured goods throughout the world.

Canada suddenly realized that it had to keep up with the world powers. Then a completely new Canada of progress and modernization came forth from the country that was little known to many. Progress and tradition are shown at Expo '67 in various ways. In pavilions the cooperation between the United States and Canada in the Space program is demonstrated to people of many countries. The history of Canada, traditions and overall summary may be illustrated very well in the Confederation Train.

The youth of the modern age will be sharing their culture in Expo '67 Youth Pavilion with other countries. We people from the United States enjoy Canadian Folk groups such as Ian and Sylvia while they enjoy our "Rock".

All of these are examples of our friendly relations and cooperation with Canada but the greatest cooperative project between the United States and Canada was the St. Lawrence Seaway. The project was a plan to dig a deep-water channel from Lake Superior to the Atlantic ocean by way of the St. Lawrence River. It would enable products from the central part of both countries to be shipped around the world faster and more easily.

The two countries requested that the Joint International Commission look into a seaway for highest navigation efficiency and water power. There were three members on the commission for each country and three more engineers elected. Also a business committee to take care of the financial division was set up. In 1932 the United States and Canada signed a treaty authorizing the construction of the canal. Both countries will profit from the hydroelectric power from the dams and less expensive exporting. The seaway took years, patience, and cooperation. The St. Lawrence Seaway was a model of international cooperative achievement that nations may follow. Maybe the United States and Canada's friendship will set an example for other nations and perhaps bring other nations a little closer together.

BORDER WITHOUT A WALL

(By Sarah Jane Taylor, Washington, D.C.)

Across the vast blue sea, two pioneer families sailed in a primative ship three centuries ago. After several months they came to the new, virgin land that was to be their home.

Over the years their families grew and the pioneer fathers moved their families westward through dense forests, over great rivers and around great lakes. They built sod houses in the middle of the great plains where elk, moose and buffalo grazed. Each family farmed and grazed their animals without a fence to divide them and the children of each family grew strong and tall, but lived in the way of their own fathers.

They worked for each other and many a strip of salt pork was borrowed and lent between the two families in those early days on the plains.

Both families prospered as the years went by and lovely homes replaced the old sod houses. But one day two brothers of one family fell to quarreling and they fought most cruelly. The sons of the other family begged their father to let them join on the side of their favorite brother: their mother entreated her husband to put up a fence so her sons could not join the quarreling neighbor boys but the father wisely said, "My neighbor and I have carved this land out of the wilderness and each has tilled his own fields and we will not loose our friendship over the quarrels of our sons."

The brothers fought until one was slain. Both families mourned then they set about bringing in the harvest and helping each other as they had done before.

The winters were cold and the summers hot. Locust, tornadoes and floods came but the families survived and grew strong.

One winter when they had laid in their provisions, the storms and blizzards continued through April and then their once well stocked cellers were running short they heard from the mountains the howling and call of wolves and coyotes. The snow grew deeper and the wild animals came close to the homes of the pioneer families.

The sons of both families asked each other what should be done in case the wolves would become so hungry that they would kill the lambs and calves in their barns.

"Together, we can kill them," they said.

They took their axes and guns and went to the mountains and did not return until they had chased down and killed every wolf that threatened their homesteads.

The spring came and the years passed. Villages became towns and cities near the old home farms, with never a wall or fence to divide them. And to this day the two families, Canada and the United States, live side by side helping each other to build two great families in the family of nations.

THE NATION'S POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien addressed the national convention of the National Association of Post Office Mail Handlers-Watchmen, Messengers, & Group Leaders, AFL–CIO, in Detroit, Mich., last night, Wednesday, August 30. I believe the Postmaster General's remarks merit the attention of the Congress, and I insert his speech in the RECORD.

I would particularly like to direct attention to the Postmaster General's comments regarding equal employment opportunities in the Nation and in the postal service. This is a most commendable report.

The Postmaster General's remarks follow:

POSTMASTER GENERAL ADDRESSES POSTAL WORKERS

(Address by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien Before the National Convention of the National Association of Post Office Mail Handlers-Watchmen, Messengers and Group Leaders, AFL–CIO, Statler Hilton Hotel, Detroit, Mich., August 30, 1967)

This is my first opportunity to address your convention, and I very much appreciate this chance to tell you of the state of your postal service. I was pleased that President Johnson sent his personal message to this convention and he asked me to tell you that he considers every man and woman involved in moving the nation's mail to be doing work of utmost importance to our economy, to the free flow of ideas, and to the successful operation of the American system.

I certainly want to thank my good friend and your President, Harold McAvoy, for inviting me to join with you. I hope I don't unduly embarrass Harold if I repeat what is well known in Washington: that Harold McAvoy is without doubt one of the most effective leaders of *any* employee organization. He's a fighter and a doer. That's important. And, more important, he's fighting and doing his very best for *your* interests, *your* programs, *your* benefits. And I know too that his ability to come out right on target stems to a large degree from the support he has received from Andrew Carniato and other members of your able and representative Executive Board.

You have the kind of leadership that generates cooperation, the leadership that generates benefits.

During the past few years your leadership has produced many significant gains for your membership:

Over 4,000 additional career mailhandler positions in a six month period; a uniform allowance; placing label slip employees in the mail handler craft and filling level 4 label facing slip technician positions by bid; level 4 group leader position by bid; level 5 label unit group leader positions by bid; level 4 mail processing machine operator positions on the Mark II Facer-Canceler by bid; mail handler group leaders accorded the opportunity to move up to civil service examiner-in-charge by bid; all these positions qualifying for immediate higher level pay on details; and mail handlers who pass the clerk-carrier examination now have the

opportunity to compete in the supervisory examination along with other employees.

This, plus a 50% increase in starting pay since January 1962, is a record of accomplishment that your National Association can be proud of.

But I believe it is only the beginning. As our modernization and mechanization program picks up speed, as new machines, such as the Mark II Facer-Canceler, are introduced in more and more offices, I look forward to additional opportunities for the membership of this organization.

The other day I picked up a magazine and read a very interesting article debating whether the Post Office Department should be turned over to a private corporation.

It was a well written article. But it had absolutely no relation to the proposal I made last April, and now under study by a special Presidential commission, to provide better service by removing the Post Office from the Cabinet and turning it into a *public*, government-owned corporation responsive to national policy and the will of the people, a corporation perhaps designed along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Another misconception is that my proposal was concerned with organization and not with the people who are the heart and soul of any organization.

I want to assure you that a primary reason why I suggested setting up a government postal corporation is that our employees would find far greater opportunities and a larger voice in postal personnel management. Employee organizations would be counted on to help us plan our personnel policies and, indeed, any changes that might affect the postal worker. In fact, the entire process of collective bargaining would become much more meaningful and satisfying to both labor and management.

Now, I must admit that there would be one job abolished should my proposal be adopted. That job is the one presently held by me. No other job would be affected in any way.

Every right and benefit presently enjoyed by our dedicated postal workers would be protected. Pay, status, retirement, job security, sick leave, fringe benefits—every one of these elements, which are naturally of vital concern to you and your families—would be maintained and strengthened.

The misunderstandings about the true nature of my corporation proposal seem to stem largely from the nature of the proposal itself: it would be the most extensive change ever made in the American postal system.

I am convinced this change would unlock talent and potential leadership that now exists among our employees, talent and leadership that, under present circumstances, are not fully utilized.

In my mind, despite dramatic gains in recent years, very few of our more than 700,000 employees, very few of you, have had the kind of opportunity all employees should have for promotion or for true careers in the postal service. Why? Because the system inhibits our effort to develop programs, to make promotions, to provide full scope for the exercise of ability. I would like to see the day when a mail handler, or any other member of this organization, could look forward to moving up through the ranks to the job of running a major post office—or indeed, the entire postal service. I want to see promotions—such as the one just announced for the president of your Chicago local—become a frequent occurrence, not just a rarity.

My friends, opportunity is the key to achievement of the American dream.

President Johnson is pledged to solve the problems that beset this nation in the American way, not by the repressive tactics being suggested by some men of little vision, but by clearing out every last barrier to equal opportunity.

Our nation still has blemishes. How could it be any different? For we are a living experiment. We are at the very frontier of every advance in science, in human relations, in social life. If a new problem comes to the attention of the world, such as the urban crisis, nine times out of ten we can say, "It started here first." Leadership and comfort are often strangers in a time of revolutionary change, when today's truth may be tomorrow's error, when the jest—"if it works it's obsolete"—is just too true to be good.

We are still the world's greatest melting pot.

We are a nation of many races, creeds, and national origins.

We span a continent. We spill out into the Pacific. We have a partnership with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in the Atlantic.

We did not ask to be the guardians at the gate, but no other nation of the Free World has the power to stop the spread of terror and violence abroad.

And, here at home, we see that problems, too long neglected, conditions too long overlooked, tensions too long festering, have exploded into violence that benefits no one, Negro or white, violence that merely strengthens the hand of extremists of both races.

I want to take a few moments to remind you of the efforts that have been made in the past few years, in the Postal Service, and in the nation at large, to provide greater opportunities for all our citizens, opportunities to learn, opportunities to live in a decent environment, opportunities to express grievances in the American way through the ballot box rather than with the fire bomb.

I'm proud of how we have followed the lead of President Johnson in the Post Office Department.

The Post Office Department recognizes one standard and one standard alone in hiring, in promotion—and that is the American Standard of ability.

On the basis of advice from Harold McAvoy and other concerned leaders, the President and I have taken a number of steps to assure that this American Standard of equal opportunity exists not alone in Washington, not alone in our 15 Regional Offices, not alone in our three largest cities—New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago—where, for the first time, we have Negro Postmasters, but in every one of our 33,000 post offices and in every postal installation in the country.

For the first time, we have upgraded our Office of Equal Employment Opportunities to a separate division in the Bureau of Personnel. We have named five field coordinators to strengthen this program throughout our postal regions.

And, to assure that no area is overlooked, next month in Washington, on the suggestion of the President, we will hold an Equal Employment Opportunities Conference.

Ladies and gentlemen, your postal service is proud of the fact that it is a leader among all Federal agencies in equal employment. We now employ 130,000 members of minority groups, a figure that constitutes almost 20% of our total employment.

Though we have come far in recent years, I can assure you that we are not sitting still.

We are not getting our exercise by resting on our laurels or patting ourselves on the back.

Rather, we intend to continue the momentum we have gained. We intend to assure that every post office in the land meets the American Standard.

We intend to run a postal service that not only serves a democratic people but that serves them in a truly democratic way.

There is no doubt that we have come far in extending equal opportunity in the postal service.

But we are all Americans as well as postal employees.

Greater opportunities in the postal service can only exist in the context of a nation that extends greater opportunity in every area of life.

And I think we must recognize how President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and President Lyndon Baines Johnson have succeeded in opening up new opportunities for all our people.

In the basic area of education, we have seen created in a four year period, more legislation for our schools—24 separate measures—than in the previous 178 years of our national history. These education programs run from funds to improve primary education to scholarships that enable students to enter college. The door to opportunity through education is wider than ever before. And I can assure you that the President is going to fight every effort to close that door.

President Johnson is pledged to a program to give every American the opportunity to live in a healthful, decent environment, where the streets will be safe, the air clean, the transportation swift, the homes a source of satisfaction, the way to the ballot box open to all. That is why he has mounted the greatest attack on air pollution in our history; that is why he proposed the most massive Federal anti-crime program in our history; that is why he has undertaken the greatest rapid mass transportation program in our history; that is why he broke new ground in rebuilding our cities. His Model Cities and Rent Supplements programs were bold new ideas to combat the decay that has turned far too many of our cities into drab deserts.

America has problems. Plenty of them. But we also have a priceless resource: a vigorous, striving, imaginative people—the same kind of people that built a civilization from a wilderness, won the battle against the most evil tyrannies since Attila, restored shattered nations overseas, solved the mystery of the atom, and is now reaching out into space.

We have solved our problems in the past and, in fact, translated difficulties into opportunities.

If we reject the advice of frightened men, men of little faith in the American system, if we push on to new solutions, then the days of frustration, of antagonism, of violence through which we now pass will be seen for what they are: the alarm, waking us up to do what *needs* to be done, what *should* be done, and, given vision, leadership, and ability, what *will* be done.

LOUD DENUNCIATIONS OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON DO NOT PASS NATIONAL PROGRAMS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Roy Wilkins, writing in the New York Post on August 26 made the telling point, that while the great debate rages in the United States on Vietnam, measures to help deprived groups move up in our society are slipping by the boards for lack of united support.

He made a point of the death of the civil rights bill of 1966, defeated while civil rights advocates were taking potshots at President Johnson and moaning about Vietnam.

There is a broader lesson to be learned from Mr. Wilkins' perceptive comment:

It requires skill and toughness and persistence (backed by voting power) to shepherd legislation to passage. It requires only a closed mind and a loud voice to denounce the handiest target of all, the President of the United States.

The liberal and progressive forces in this country ought to take this admonition to mind.

While some of them are railing against President Johnson on foreign policy, the conservative-reactionary coalition at home mount their forces and defeat rent supplements or the rat control measure or the Teacher Corps.

The moral of Mr. Wilkins' article is this: Let us get together and support Lyndon B. Johnson in the great urban reform program he has put together. Let us not permit that program to go down to defeat because of one issue. Let us not permit reactionary forces to control the Congress or the country by default.

There are billions of dollars in badly needed national programs before the *Senate and the* House waiting for action in the next few months—programs for education, social security, juvenile delinquency control, model cities, rent supplements, civil rights, housing, and a host of others.

Let us take Roy Wilkins' advice, and unite behind them and the President whose labors have brought them to the consideration of the Congress.

I insert in the RECORD an article by Roy Wilkins, entitled "The Critics of L. B. J."

THE CRITICS OF L. B. J.

(By Roy Wilkins)

The almost incredible story of the thus far unsuccessful efforts of two Negro sisters to buy a home in New York City's borough of Brooklyn and the decline in the popularity of President Johnson in a public opinion poll are, in a way, related.

The oddity is that some people of the same race as that of the thwarted sisters are joining in the criticism of the President who has called for fair housing legislation.

The runaround began in 1964 when the two women, both employed, found a new two-family house at $38,490. The owner upped the price to $42,500 after initially declaring that the house had been sold. After 17 months of delay, the sisters got a court order branding the price as excessive and ordering prompt procedure with the sale. Nothing has happened.

A recent study tabulates a noticeably larger percentage of complaints from ghetto residents about housing discrimination than about even job discrimination. Yet President Johnson's proposal on fair housing was rebuffed last fall and his 1967 bill is threatened by the present Congress.

All this, of course, escapes the shouters. They are not interested in the treatment accorded the two sisters in Brooklyn and the thousands of home-seeking Negro families elsewhere. They are interested in the much easier tactic of blasting away at LBJ. It requires skill and toughness and persistence (backed by voting power) to shepherd legislation to passage. It requires only a closed mind and a loud voice to denounce the handiest target of all, the President of the United States.

True, New York State has a fair housing law. But a national policy backing it up would be desirable, adding one more weapon to the arsenal of freedom fighters. Most of the complaints on the treatment of the Negro are justified and can be supported by thousands of cases like that of the Brooklyn sisters.

The point is that when a President proposes remedies for these ills, none of the critics appears in Washington to confer with representatives or writes letters or makes supporting speeches.

While some Negro leaders were moaning about Vietnam, the 1966 civil rights bill was killed, largely through the smoothly functioning Washington lobby of the National Assn. of Real Estate Boards.

This year some groups are again occupied with Asia and Africa while, here in the U.S.A. (not Vietnam) the President has proposed rent supplements to aid families in low income housing. He has pushed the Teacher Corps plan to aid low-income school districts. His programs on Head Start, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps and Model Cities aid Negroes directly.

These items bearing the Presidential blessing have been trimmed or killed. The white people who are blocking them claim L. B. J. is pro-Negro. The Negroes who do nothing to unblock the measures claim L. B. J. is anti-Negro. It could be, of course, that Negro citizens are not aware of how their emotions are being manipulated for the benefit of causes connected only in an oratorical fashion to Negro jobs, schools, voting and slums here at home.

Allowing for all the normal political compromises, the record seems to indicate that L. B. J. on civil rights has been furnishing the kind of leadership that has evoked opposition from the still strategically powerful die-hard whites.

But some elements among Negroes are giving this leadership—and the Brooklyn sisters—the back of their hands—the same gesture given by the Klan!

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. ROGERS of Florida, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of New York (at the request of Mr. GROSS), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. PUCINSKI in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GROSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GROVER.

Mr. BUTTON.

Mr. SCHWEIKER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRADEMAS in two instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. RESNICK.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. DOW.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 510. An act providing for full disclosure of corporate equity ownership of securities under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1763. An act to promote the economic development of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 547. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif., and to provide for the establishment of a plant materials center at a more suitable location to replace the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3717. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. M. Richwine;

H.R. 5876. An act to amend titles 5, 14, and 37, United States Code, to codify recent law, and to improve the code; and

H.R. 11945. An act to amend the college work-study program with respect to institutional matching and permissible hours of work.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 497, the 90th Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until Monday, September 11, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 497, the House adjourned until Monday, September 11, 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:

1035. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the initial stage of the Oahe unit, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, pursuant to the provisions of 53 Stat. 1187 (H. Doc. No. 163); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1036. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts awarded during the period January 1 through June 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82-557; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1037. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the

Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1038. 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 July 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.

1039. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for revision of Foreign Service travel regulations to achieve a reduction in per diem costs, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1040. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of Federal participation in the cost of airport projects involving donated land, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1041. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings from more economical use of communication facilities between Alaska and the U.S. mainland, Department of the Air Force, Alaska Communication System; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1042. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 31, 1934 (68 Stat. 1026), providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1043. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915), establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4451. A bill to reimburse owners of vessels of the United States for losses and costs incurred incident to the seizure of such vessels by foreign countries, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 862. An act to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 159. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12735. A bill to provide for equitable acquisition practices, fair compensation, and effective relocation assistance in real property acquisitions for Federal and federally assisted programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 12736. A bill to authorize the appropriation for the contribution by the United States for the support of the International Union for the Publication of Customs Tariffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 12737. A bill to provide counsel in the District of Columbia juvenile court, to provide for representation of the community by the Corporation Counsel in juvenile court proceedings, to limit the period for which juveniles may be detained without a hearing, to prohibit unauthorized mixing of dependents and delinquents in juvenile institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12738. A bill to increase the number and salaries of judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the salaries of judges of the District of Columbia court of appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12739. A bill to abolish criminal actions for paternity and nonsupport in the District of Columbia and to confer exclusive civil jurisdiction over paternity and nonsupport matters in the domestic relations branch of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 12740. A bill to amend the rules pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States by requiring the display thereof whenever the flag of a State, or of a political subdivision thereof, or the flag or pennant of a society is displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12741. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12742. A bill to provide incentives for the creation by private industry of additional employment opportunities for residents of urban poverty areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12743. A bill to encourage and assist private enterprise to provide adequate housing in urban poverty areas for low income and lower middle income persons; to the Committee on Way and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 12744. A bill to provide for a temporary program of Federal assistance for research and development relating to certain rigid airships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commence.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12745. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 12746. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 12747. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 12748. A bill to extend for 3 years the special milk program for the Armed Forces' and veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12749. A bill to amend the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act relating to the discontinuance of passenger train operations and to impose an 18-month moratorium on the discontinuance of any passenger service by rail; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 12750. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12751. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the basic workweeks of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12752. A bill to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 12753. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the percentage depletion method for determining the deduction for depletion of oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 12754. A bill to extend for 2 years the authority for more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends, higher reserve requirements, and open market operations in agency issues, and to provide for a regular audit of the Federal Reserve System by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 12755. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prohibit use of Federal funds in programs utilizing the services of persons who engage in certain disloyal, disrespectful, or antireligious conduct; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 12756. A bill to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act to migrant health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 12757. A bill to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. DIGGS, and Mr. HAWKINS):

H.R. 12758. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Negro History and Culture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEIGER or Wisconsin:

H.R. 12759. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize comprehensive pilot programs in lake pollution prevention and control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12760. A bill to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 12761. A bill to prevent interstate smuggling of cigarettes by requiring cigarette

manufacturers and importers to affix a label to cigarette packages indicating the State of final use, and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to collect State and eligible city cigarette taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12762. A bill to prevent interstate smuggling of cigarettes by requiring cigarette manufacturers and importers to affix a label to cigarette packages indicating the State of final use, and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to collect State and eligible city cigarette taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 12763. A bill to prevent interstate smuggling of cigarettes by requiring cigarette manufacturers and importers to affix a label to cigarette packages indicating the State of final use, and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to collect State and eligible city cigarette taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 12764. A bill to prevent interstate smuggling of cigarettes by requiring cigarette manufacturers and importers to affix a label to cigarette packages indicating the State of final use, and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to collect State and eligible city cigarette taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 501. Concurrent resolution to stop U.S. bombing of North Vietnam as a necessary first step to get peace talks started; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Con. Res. 502. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment at the United Nations of a registration system for international armaments transactions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. Con. Res. 503. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should seek the creation of a United Nations Factfinding Commission for Peace in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12765. A bill for the relief of Rubena Ramsay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 12766. A bill to permit the vessel *Marpole* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12767. A bill for the relief of Florentino S. Gomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

149. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Association for Grand Jury Action, Inc., Rochester, N.Y., relative to reassignment of a petition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call special attention to the 3 million people throughout the United States and Canada who devote a great deal of their spare time to drum and bugle corps activities. The week of September 2 through 9 has been designated as National Drum Corps Week in recognition of those who participate in the colorful and entertaining drum and bugle corps activities. One fine example is the Greater Norristown Junior Drum and Bugle Corps in my congressional district.

Many an American history student will recall the memorable part the drum and bugle corps have played in our heritage. The American Revolution began as the drummer, William Dinman, beat the call "To Arms on Lexington Common." During World War I, drum signals continued to be prescribed in our military manuals. The drum corps continue to offer their participants enjoyment and an invaluable opportunity for character growth.

To qualify for one of today's units, our young people must be willing to acquire a keen sense of duty and responsibility, both to themselves and others. They must learn the importance of cooperation, self-discipline, and reliability—qualities which are badly needed in a country with a rising rate of juvenile crime. Our young people in the drum corps are taught fair play, the rules of sportmanship, and how to follow orders. Their participation in these units provides them with valuable training and experience in developing disciplined minds and bodies essential for future leadership in our country.

It seems appropriate during the National Drum Corps Week to give special praise to the millions who add color and spirited music to our parades and public events and who add enthusiasm and public spirit to our Nation.

Invasion of Poland: 1939–67

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago tonight, the world stood on the brink of a terrible war—a war that was begun with the invasion of Poland by the Nazi Armies on September 1, 1939.

This invasion was brought about by the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact—a treaty which has become well known to all those who have felt the oppressive weight of tyrants.

The world has other cares today, many of them great and awesome in their ability to rain incalculable destruction upon the heads of all men. Although the Molotov-Ribbentrop perfidy is now history, it is history which should remind us constantly of the need to be on our guard. Because our strength is great, we must never suffer the delusion that there are not other men and other nations who would challenge it willingly, if given the opportunity.

Our position in Vietnam is difficult and enormously complex. But if we yield and withdraw without firm guarantees, we will reap the whirlwind. Everyone who really knows the trustworthiness of tyrants and dictators knows this. Southeast Asia will relentlessly fall beneath the weight of the Red Chinese advances. We must help the South Vietnamese to stem this inevitable invasion before it has an opportunity to develop. Let Poland, and the terrible havoc wreaked on Poland, serve as a warning to all free nations who believe they can have any faith in the promises of conquerors.

International Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the rapidly increasing numbers of such events as "Flag Day," "American Education Week," "Be Kind to Animals Week," "Drive Safe Week," "Teacher Recognition Day," ad infinitum. Regrettably, but understandably, many of us have grown so overtired with this surfeit of commemorative days and weeks that we accord them only indifferent attention at best, and do not pause to consider the worthy causes and groups which they honor.

In particular I would hope that we would accord "International Drum Corps Week"—September 2–9—honoring the more than 1 million persons actively engaged in drum corps activity, the notice and support it deserves.

Especially in these troubled times, drum and bugle corps serve a useful purpose. Their inspiring performances remind us of our brave young men who have fought and who fight today to defend freedom. Further, by providing a healthy outlet for youthful energies, the activity helps fight a major problem—juvenile delinquency. And perhaps not the least of their accomplishments, they are wonderfully entertaining, as I can attest from having the privilege of hearing a group from my own district, Babylon's "Islanders."

I, therefore, congratulate the drum and bugle corps around the country on their valuable contribution and urge that you support—as I do—"International Drum Corps Week."

South Bend, Ind., Man Is Now Successful Proprietor Thanks to Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, speaking at the Democratic Governors conference in St. Louis, President Johnson reasserted his faith that Americans, working together, will provide jobs for disadvantaged persons. The President stated:

Earlier this week, I visited a center in Philadelphia where I was the next logical American step after protest.

It was a center for disadvantaged citizens. The leaders of that center had protested—with full justice—a lack of job opportunities for Negroes. The business community listened—and made more opportunities available. But then the protesters found that there were not enough men and women with skills to fill the jobs that opened up.

Their response should inspire us all with deep pride—and faith in our future. They did not react in bitter frustration against the dead past. They set their eyes to the future. They rolled up their sleeves, and they built a place where Americans who might have lived out lives without hope could be trained, and made more productive, contributing members of our society.

Your Government helped to provide funds for that center—and there is no investment of which I am prouder. Business is contributing as well—and some labor and foundations and city government.

That can happen all over America. And it will—if we work to make it happen.

HELP FOR DISADVANTAGED

The Small Business Administration is an agency of the Federal Government that is working closely in cooperation with various national, State, and local agencies and groups to help disadvantaged persons acquire a business of their own.

I know no better way for Americans to fight poverty and assist disadvantaged persons to achieve dignity and stature than by making it possible for them to be successful small businessmen.

It is for that reason that I should like to recount briefly the story of one disadvantaged person in my home city of South Bend, Ind., and explain how the Small Business Administration, through its Indianapolis regional office, helped him become the proprietor of his own small business.

James E. Williams held a variety of jobs with the Studebaker Co. in South Bend until 1963, when the plant was shut down. He was but one of a large number of men and women who found themselves without a means of livelihood when that unfortunate shutdown occurred.

But Mr. Williams' predicament was particularly acute since he was a Negro with a limited education. In the fierce competition for jobs, he was at a particular disadvantage. But he was not idle. To provide a meager living for his family, he set up a home workshop where he repaired automobiles, and also worked part time at a service station. He also obtained employment with the city street department.

NEEDS $9,000 LOAN

In 1965, Mr. Williams had an opportunity to become the operator of his own filling station. But he would require $9,000 to purchase inventory and for working capital. This he did not have.

Mr. Williams applied to SBA for a loan. SBA was convinced that Mr. Williams was a hard worker and that he could make a success of the filling station. A $9,000 economic opportunity loan was made.

Mr. Williams now is the proprietor of his own small business. His filling station is making a nice profit and he is repaying the loan. He has one full-time employee and four who work part time.

Many South Bend residents have learned that they can depend upon James E. Williams' service. That is why Jim's Six Point Shell Service at 1224 East Corby Street is a prosperous enterprise.

International Drum Corps Week September 2–9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the week of September 2–9 will be celebrated throughout the Nation in honor of the more than 1 million persons actively engaged in drum and bugle corps activities. Drum Corps Week will be commemorated with competitions, concerts, colorful parades, and other activities.

As a youth activity, the drum corps offer an opportunity for our young to engage in an exciting and challenging project of music, action, and sportsmanship. The corps provide character growth, discipline, personal reliability, and pride in accomplishment to youngsters.

They add entertainment to charitable affairs, perform at hospitals, and cheer up patients. It would be difficult to imagine a parade or public event without the spirited pageantry and stirring music these groups contribute.

I am especially proud of drum corps activities in my 22d District of the Bronx, N.Y. Many of us have had the pleasure of hearing the Midshipmen, the Kingsmen, and the Mother Butler High School Girls Corps at official events in the Bronx, including the stirring pageantry of our annual Memorial Day parade. We are fortunate to have as a resident of the Bronx, Mr. Harvey N. Berish, a noted educator and youth worker who is the national chairman of International Drum Corps Week.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are witnessing turmoil in our cities, and as we strive to give our young people the educational and recreational activities they urgently need, the drum and bugle corps is playing an important role. Through their exemplary motto of "Pageantry and Patriotism" they are working to combat delinquency and to give our youth a productive channel for their energies—and one which is both exciting and educational.

I congratulate the drum and bugle corps for their fine work and wish them success in future achievements.

Robert King High: Dedicated American, Mayor of Miami, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Robert King High, the fighting, red-haired mayor of Miami, died yesterday. At 43 he had apparently regained his health after a previous heart attack suffered some 4 years ago. Mayor High's death is a tragic loss to the people of Miami, the State of Florida, and to the country. He was a dedicated public servant, always in the mainstream of public life. Small in stature, big in heart and courage, he was the little man's hero.

In politics he took on all the giants. Elected first in 1957 as mayor, he immediately started out as a crimebuster, taking on the political consequences of all the powerful gamblers. He took on utility companies and forced them to lower their rates. He fought with the powerful Florida East Coast Railroad. The "powerful" were the "special interest" groups that ganged up against the "little man," and the mayor as their champion always waged courageous fights.

He was the standard bearer for the Democratic Party in the last gubernatorial election. He was a staunch Democrat; always active in local, State and National Democratic affairs. He was one of the first high-ranking public officials in Florida to publicly announce his support of Senator Jack Kennedy prior to the Democratic Convention at which Senator Kennedy became the presidential nominee. He became a vigorous and active supporter of President Johnson in the last presidential race.

Robert High loved politics; the hard work, the challenge, the excitement, the accomplishments and the defeats all, were part of the fabric of his life.

His interests ranged far beyond purely domestic politics. He learned to speak Spanish. He became extremely well-

known throughout South America, where he traveled extensively, spoke frequently, and otherwise became as Mayor of Miami, America's ambassador of good will. He was a favorite of Miami's large Latin population, and Mayor High spent a great amount of time and effort in bridging the gap of understanding, not only between the diverse groups that existed in his community but also between North and South America.

His loss is a tragic one to the thousands who knew him and worked with him. I join all our citizens in extending our deepest sympathy and regret to his lovely wife, Faith, their children, and the rest of his family.

International Drum Corps Week, September 2–9, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, September 2, marks the beginning of International Drum Corps Week. It will be celebrated in all 50 States and Canada with parades, concerts, competitions, and civic and social events paying tribute to the thousands of young people who are members of these corps.

Last year, and again at the start of the 90th Congress, I introduced a resolution in this House to allow certain drum and bugle corps units selected by the President to travel abroad as goodwill ambassadors under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act.

My own district in Chicago is the home of the Cavaliers—a drum and bugle corps that has often won recognition as the best unit in the United States. Recently, in Boston, Mass., the Cavaliers once again were singled out for the national championship award.

In my travels throughout our country, I have met hundreds of young people who devote long hours each week to perfecting their precision and to demonstrating the spectacular effectiveness of teamwork. They have youth and zest and a keen appreciation of what they are doing for themselves, their schools and their communities. We are proud of them.

On the eve of this week which pays public tribute to these youngsters and the parents and communities which encourage them, I believe it is proper that the Congress take full notice of these activities. In an age of rising delinquency, crime rates, tension and civil strife, it is reassuring to remember all that is right with America.

Mr. Speaker, following is the language of House Resolution 85, my resolution in behalf of drum and bugle corps units. I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues for I believe it expresses the sincere enthusiasm and support we all feel for these outstanding young people:

Whereas drum and bugle corps units are a typically American institution; and

Whereas drum and bugle corps units are sponsored by schools, various veterans' groups and other patriotic organizations throughout the United States and accurately reflect American life and institutions; and

Whereas the boys and girls who are members of drum and bugle corps units are the flower of American youth: Patriotic, enthusiastic, physically fit, highly motivated, and well trained and disciplined with a respect for law and order; and

Whereas drum and bugle corps units provide excellent entertainment which would be well received in foreign countries; and

Whereas the boys and girls who are members of drum and bugle corps units would serve effectively as United States ambassadors of good will on a people-to-people basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should include drum and bugle corps units among those groups sent to foreign countries (including the countries of Eastern Europe) under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (the Fulbright-Hays Act): It is further

Resolved, That each year the champion drum and bugle corps unit selected at the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the champion drum and bugle corps unit selected at the annual convention of the American Legion shall be sent as ambassadors of good will to appropriate nations to be designated by the Department of State, with the time for such trip to be arranged with the mutual consent of the winning drum and bugle corps and the agency sponsoring such a trip: It is further

Resolved, That such funds as may be necessary are hereby authorized to be expended by the Department of State to pay for all travel and lodging for the respective drum and bugle corps units sent on such good will missions.

Secretary Freeman's Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, I have become increasingly disturbed by the efforts of those whose apparent objective is to discredit the Secretary of Agriculture and the President in the earnest endeavor they have made to help the American farmer. While I know that some depression has occurred for dairymen, I am surprised that ostensible spokesmen for our grain farmers should be so critical.

These critics are the same ones who supported the tired, do-nothing policies of the Benson regime—policies that caused farm income to steadily slide for 8 solid years while we built the most devastating surplus in history—policies that started the great mass movement of families from the farm to the city.

As a result of these policies, by 1960 overproduction had robbed the farmer not only of prestige, but had cost him dearly in dollars. By the close of that year, we had a stockpile of 1.4 billion bushels of wheat and 85 million tons of feed grains, and net farm income had plummeted $2.4 billion in just 8 short years.

In 1961, a new team, managed by two great Presidents and coached by the Secretary of Agriculture, has been largely responsible for the development, enactment and success of five major pieces of farm legislation, the elimination of surpluses, and a substantial improvement in farm income and farm living standards.

From the 1960 level of $11.7 billion, net farm income jumped to $16.4 billion in 1966—the second highest mark in history—and gross farm income at $49.5 billion and net income per farm at $5,049 set an all-time record.

The voices I hear today crying for the hide of Orville Freeman bear an eerie resemblance to those of the little men who since 1961 have cried "get the Government out of agriculture," and "let farmers go it alone so that farm prices can be set in the marketplace by the law of supply and demand."

Now that this administration has eliminated the surpluses their policies built, farmers this year are operating in what is essentially a supply-demand situation.

Under our voluntary farm programs, wheat and feed grain producers in 1967 were provided an opportunity to increase production by a prudent amount—an amount sufficient to provide for safe, adequate reserves without creating a surplus.

Farm production has increased this year—thanks not only to unusual growing weather all over the country but to the fact that we have witnessed once again the tremendous impact the technological revolution is having on American agricultural production.

Certainly farmers can ill afford lower prices and reduced income in the face of an ever-present cost-price squeeze.

But to point the finger and scream "surplus" in the face of current supply levels is to cry "wolf" when there is no wolf.

And it would appear to me that this kind of carping and sniping badly serves the farmers' cause.

I think the cause is better served by such sober, responsible evaluations and appraisals as I found this week in Secretary Freeman's "Agriculture 1967—A Situation Report."

In the course of this report, the Secretary made these important observations of the current agricultural picture:

It is impossible to predict, with absolute accuracy, what the weather will do around the world, or how much of any one commodity our competitors in world trade will produce in any one crop year. Yet our export business is a major outlet for U.S. farm commodities and the quantities needed are basic in making farm program policy decisions.

In 1966, after increased domestic wheat acreage had been announced for 1967, new information from the Soviet Union and Australia indicated bumper harvests. Despite a record global wheat crop, our commercial wheat exports reached a record 450 million bushels in 1966–67 and overall exports were over 742 million bushels, continuing the high levels of the past few years.

After consulting wheat farmers and others through informal hearings on 1968 wheat acreage levels, all evidence pointed to the need for a cutback in acreage to maintain a satisfactory relationship between production and needs. And the allotment for 1968 was set at 59.3 million acres, about 9 million acres less than for 1967. The actual 1968 outturn, of course, remains subject to weather factors.

No overall surplus of wheat resulted from the 1967 crop. The sharp drop in wheat prices in the summer of 1967 from a year earlier was not justified on the basis of 1967 production and prospective demand for wheat.

Unfortunately, too much wheat loaded into marketing channels at harvest resulted in temporary glut that pushed prices down.

This illustrates the changed marketing situation farmers face in the new era. With surpluses gone, yearly production will be keyed to needs for the entire marketing year. This means larger supplies available from the current crop than when production was being held in check to work off the surplus. Government stocks no longer provide the stabilizing market force they did when there was a market shortfall from yearly production that had to be made up from the surplus. Now, virtually all of the needs in commercial channels are coming from free stocks.

This new challenge to farmers requires more active orderly marketing. It requires restraint on the part of farmers in the quantities of a commodity moving into the market at any one time. The price-support program helps in the holding process. With a reseal program for on-the-farm and warehouse storage, farmers can hold on to their products and make the market work for them, rather than against them. Price supports and payments strengthen their holding power also. Direct and diversion payments in many of the basics make it possible for them to compete in world markets and, at the same time, maintain their income.

The fall of 1967 brought feed grain and soybean producers face to face with the same marketing problem wheat farmers confronted. But patient and hard-nosed marketing by farmers can avoid sharp harvest time price dips. Temporary market supplies can push prices down just as much as if there really were surpluses.

The course of feed grain production in 1967 brings out the problems and difficulties in matching production with needs. In the fall of 1966, it was apparent that the surplus era for feed grains was ended and acreage needed to be increased.

After long study by people both inside and outside the Department of Agriculture, the 1967 feed grain program was fashioned to bring about a reasonable increase. Following the first indications of spring plantings in March, many who felt production would be too low pressed for an increase. We stuck by the original decision, and what happened? The first report of production, as of July 1, indicated a corn crop of 4,580,000,000 bushels. Weather conditions were favorable and the next report showed an increase of nearly 150 million bushels to 4,651,000,000 bushels.

When the effort is to bring production in on a supply target, relatively slight weather variations can mean a plus or minus three bushels per acre. So slight a variation could mean a difference in the range of 400 million bushels in the total crop. It isn't always possible to hit the supply target exactly. It's important that farmers understand this and help in the decision-making process so that our judgments are as accurate as possible. After the fact is too late.

The newness of the New Era Programs is another factor that bothers farmers. Newness means uncertainty, which is always unpleasant. Under the old programs, the loan rate, in effect, set the market price. This was certain and comfortable. Now the market is jumpy, although above the support rate. This newness of the programs also relates to another problem. Farmers instinctively separate their program payments from market returns.

But wheat certificate payments and corn price-support payments are as much a part of the per-bushel return to farmers as are the market prices. Many farmers tend to forget that they receive a rather substantial payment for every bushel of wheat.

The program is designed to allow wheat to move in the market at the world competitive price while the participating farmer gets the parity price for his share of wheat used as domestic food. For 1967 this works out to about 47 cents per bushel on all the production on participating farms. For 1966, the combination of the market price and wheat certificate payment brought the wheat price average on participants' farms to $2.22 per bushel. The same principle is true for corn and for the 1966 crop the average value came to $1.40 per bushel, including an average price-support payment of 11 cents per bushel.

We're working hard to make these programs better. But they have already been effective in raising farm income. Compared to 1960, receipts in 1966 were up $500 million in wheat, and up $2.1 billion in feed grains.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Republican Congressmen from the grain belt might better serve their rural constituents by abandoning hyperbole and adopting the reasoned, responsible approach of the Secretary of Agriculture. As a Representative of an eastern farm region, where we have to pay the price of grain raised in the West, I cannot endorse the idea that growers of grain are suffering as some of their representatives would imply.

The President has said of Mr. Freeman:

Orville Freeman is one of the most dedicated and conscientious public servants in this country. His work in behalf of farmers' income—and of better living conditions throughout rural America—is known, or should be known, to every enlightened man and woman in this country. He has been a tower of strength for rural Americans, for the consuming public generally, and for two Presidents.

World Food Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, in these times when the problem of the sufficiency of our world food supply is so critical, it is interesting to note that Hayden, Stone Inc., on June 16, 1967, sponsored an important forum on world food sufficiency.

In an effort to stimulate the interest of world investors in the world food needs, Hayden, Stone Inc. asked the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, to speak on this challenge to the American business and financial interests. Responses from the investment community came from Mr. Patrick James, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Mr. Robert Price, executive vice president of the Dreyfus Corp.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD Secretary Freeman's remarks:

WORLD FOOD NEEDS

(By Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture)

I am impressed with the leadership that Hayden, Stone has shown in selecting this topic as the focus for our discussion today.

With the dramatic Middle East crisis, we have all had our eyes focused on the headlines. We have been more than normally conscious of the basic question of war or peace in the world. If that terrible day of total war should come, it would come not because we or the Soviet Union arbitrarily took the frightful final step. It would come because other nations, smaller nations, with their frustrated needs and aspirations brought us into it. I have asked myself: What can we do to prevent this? What can we do to stop World War III before it starts?

The President has stated again and again that his every-waking thought is "How can we accomplish both a stable world and a world at peace?" Obviously, there is no simple answer to that question, no easy blueprint, no button that anyone can push.

But we must hope.

Individually and collectively, mankind is restless and desires betterment. If everyone in the world believes that he can better himself, we might be sure that the peaceful world we want is possible.

Frankly, I think we would have to conclude that many, too many, are losing hope. If someone asked me, "What is the single biggest reason for such frustrated hope?", I might say, it's things as simple as transistor radios, because they have helped bring on a tremendous wave of rising expectations. Every thatched hut, every adobe village around the world, has these little radios; poor people have learned that there are other people living better. There poor people have aspirations, but in many cases few prospects of realizing them. This is another way of saying that there is a pitifully large gap around the world between the "haves" and "have-nots", the hopeful and the hopeless.

A gap has always existed, and perhaps that gap was worse in other times than it is in ours. But it has never been focused in such sharp relief, nor was it so widespread.

The economic gap and the recent war are closely connected. We might properly concentrate our attention on that gap.

There are 900,000,000 people in the so-called rich countries of the world. That includes Europe and the North American continent, Oceana, Japan and the U.S.S.R. There are two-and-a-half billion people in the poor countries, including mainland China. In the rich countries, the average income per person is $1,700 a year. In the poor countries, it is $110 a year, 1/15th as much. Of course, the gap between the richest and the poorest is very much greater. United States per capita income in 1960 was $2,300 and in India it was $70—which means that the average American is 33 times richer than the average Indian.

With these figures fresh in our minds, we focus sharply on the topic to which we direct our attention today—food and population.

By the year 1980 there will be at least one billion more people to feed around the world, most in the developing countries. In addition, any progress that is made in increasing per capita income is going to result in rising pressures for more food, because the elasticity of demand for food in these countries is indeed very great.

It isn't commonly known that these countries have not done so poorly in agricultural development. Their rate of increase is only

slightly less than ours. But their population and income growth have caused food demand to exceed food production increases.

The dangers implicit in this were well expressed centuries ago by the Roman philosopher, Seneca—"A hungry people listens not to reason, nor care for justice, nor is bent by prayer." That is applicable today.

If we look to the Old Testament, Isaiah, in the 8th Chapter, 21st Verse said, "And they shall pass through the land hard pressed and hungry; and in their hunger they shall become mad with rage, and shall curse their king and their God. . . ."

And so it has come to pass. In the past decade only one of the twenty-seven rich nations has suffered a major war on its own territory, and yet 32 out of the 38 poorest nations have known war on their home grounds.

Obviously, for both moral and practical reasons, closing the gap is an imperative both for us and for the poor nations. The sons of the rich and the sons of the poor alike are hostages of world hunger.

Can world hunger be prevented? All of us here have decisions to make which could help.

If we could put to work in the less developed countries the agricultural know-how that we have in the United States—where we have experienced the greatest productive marvel in the history of mankind—then every human being today, and the billion more in the year 2000, could have an adequate and nutritious diet.

But how do we go about exporting modern knowhow? How do we apply it to the lands which have not known modern agricultural techniques and inputs?

First, I might mention what we shouldn't do. We shouldn't start out trying to feed the world ourselves. It is true that for some time to come, the developed countries could produce enough to provide an adequate and relatively nutritious diet to the peoples of the world.

But could we distribute it? That would be an extremely difficult task. Just the logistics of having enough storage, rail and ocean transportation, loading and unloading facilities, and a distribution system are staggering. If we are willing to invest enough, we might have the know-how to accomplish it.

What it would take in terms of international politics is another question. I have never talked to a chief of state anywhere around the world who is willing to become dependent upon this country or any of the so-called more developed countries for the sustenance of his people. If we assumed, however, that a country was willing to become dependent upon us, and if we mobilized all our know-how, production and distribution to satisfy its needs, conceivably it could be done.

But even then, it would be the wrong thing to do because very quickly the less developed countries would become dependent upon us, and two serious problems would arise. They would relax their agricultural effort. They would fall short of making the necessary investment of both talent and resources. To put it rather crudely, the Finance Minister wouldn't give the Agricultural Minister much money and there would be, consequently, very little agricultural development. And, the food price structure would be destroyed, taking with it the inducement for local producers to apply modern techniques and inputs to raise production.

And if this doubly adverse effect occurred—and I'm quite confident it would—the developed countries would have the ability to produce enough to feed the rest of the world for only a very limited period. At some later date the world would literally run out of food. Long before that happened, I think we would have had our Armageddon. There could not be much hope. The outbursts that we have witnessed in the last decade around the world would grow in intensity until that last and ultimate horror of atomic war would overwhelm us.

I will be a little dogmatic and say that, in the absence of agricultural development, there won't be any economic development. The sine qua non of economic development is agricultural development. This is the number one economic prerequisite. This country, and the great developed countries of the world, have gotten to the stage of real economic progress only when they have developed a healthy, viable agriculture. That is the base on which progress rests.

So, too, we can see the crucial role of the private sector in every successful agricultural development example. This is obviously true of the great American agricultural complex.

The job of world agricultural development cannot, in my judgment, be done without the private sector of our economy exporting more of our agricultural know-how. It is a tough job. It is more difficult to build a strong agricultural economy than it is to accomplish industrial developments of various kinds.

There have been a lot of analogies drawn between industrial and agricultural development. But they are fundamentally different. In the first place, agricultural development depends on millions of individual enterprises in any one nation rather than a few industrial combines. The close supervision which is prevalent in factories is lacking on farms, and agriculture is subject to largely uncontrollable environmental and biological forces. It must be custom tailored to each country, or to each region within a country, and often to each farm.

We ought to face the fact that to move from a thin subsistence to a healthy commercial agriculture is a tough, exacting process. It is a complex task to get new discoveries down to the farmers, as the county agents and businessmen in this country do. It means fair pricing for farm products. It means credit at reasonable rates to farmers. It means transportation to move products.

It means processing and marketing. It means fertilizer plants and the availability of many other inputs. It means educational and cooperative institutions. The key to this is in the private agribusiness sector.

You can have all the inputs; but putting them together, understanding the targets, organizing and administering to achieve a goal—these are the key elements; the most limiting elements, the ones that somehow or other we have got to attract if we are going to bring hope to people and put know-how and capital to work where needed.

The time has come, the challenge is there. There is real opportunity for investment consistent with the responsibility that any corporate leader has to his stockholders to make a fair and reasonable profit. And, in the process of making a profitable investment, a corporation can create hope and enthusiasm which are so important if we are to build a peaceful world and avoid the ultimate horror.

The areas of investment opportunity are great because the potential demand for farm inputs is tremendous. In magnitude, the potential is really enormous, challenging and exciting.

In our country, farmers purchase $12.5 billion worth of inputs from the non-farm sector. American farmers cultivate 300 million acres and spend $42 per year per acre on supplies from the non-farm sector.

Even nations with very small holdings, such as Japan and Taiwan, with average farms of only about three acres, absorb a huge volume of inputs. As a matter of fact, spending per acre in Japan is greater than in the United States.

Last year, American farmers spent $600 million for improved seeds. Move that for a moment to India, Pakistan, Indonesia and other countries in terms of the magnitude of demand for improved seed.

Another component of demand is fertilizer. Today the world uses about 7,000,000 tons of plant nutrients. By 1980, it will need to use about 47,000,000 tons. Let us say that $150 buys a ton of nutrient. The prospective market could well expand from the present $1,000,000,000 a year to at least $7,000,000,000 a year. This is only 15 years away.

I could cite equally promising markets for other inputs. Chemicals, machines and implements, and a complex of other products from pumps to refrigeration equipment will be in demand. It is a challenge to every innovative, imaginative, creative business leader to meet this demand and in the process to make a fair profit.

Your government looks favorably upon private investment in the developing countries. Without going into great detail, this government is ready to offer credit, various kinds of risk insurance and political guarantees and technical and financial information to companies investing in these countries. We have been trying in a number of ways to reach leaders in the agribusiness investment communities to ask them, "Can you tell us specifically what the government can do further to lend you a helping hand?"

With other countries, our policies have become firm. The whole thrust of Public Law 480, "Food for Freedom—Food for Peace" is that in meeting the needs of hungry people through our food shipments, we ask the recipients to apply sound self-help principles to their own food production. We are *requiring* countries which have lagged and refused to invest in their agriculture to change their policies.

Many have responded. India is a good example. There has been almost a 180 degree turnaround in India. Agriculture is her number one topic. When they start cutting the budget because of financial pressures, agriculture is the one that is protected from cuts as they seek to move ahead.

This is reflected in other less developed countries. "Profit" has become a respectable word around the world. The free enterprise privately-owned business operations are outscoring, outcompeting, outdoing socialist enterprises on every front around the world. It is interesting to observe that even in the Soviet Union the word "profit" is becoming acceptable.

In country after country—Mexico, Israel, Costa Rica, Taiwan, Thailand, South Korea, Ivory Coast, Brazil and several others in Latin America—governments have taken and are taking steps to establish favorable investment climates. Tax preferences or exemptions, import privileges, guaranties on capital repatriation—in short a variety of laws—testify to their recognition that they need and are prepared to support investment and the management skills which come along with it.

I don't mean to overstate this picture. I do not mean to imply that prejudice has ceased and everywhere around the world there is agreement that foreign capital is indispensable or that investment laws will be carried out in the letter and the spirit of the law.

Economic development is a complex matter that is obviously not accomplished by fiat. But a great deal of progress has been made in the most recent years. Agriculture is beginning to assume its proper leading role. It is simply too important a matter to be deterred by blind prejudices.

Finally the stage is set. I would repeat by saying that soon you will explore this carefully and thoroughly. The influence of business and financial people is very significant. The effect that you could have—

when you decide to follow up some of the suggestions resulting from our gathering here today, and others that you know about—can be very important.

For a host of political, traditional, ideological and cultural reasons, agriculture doesn't rate very high on the prestige totem pole. The result has been that agriculture has been progressively ignored and the phantom of industrial development and the symbolism of prestige that goes with it have tended to downgrade agriculture. But today there is a change of attitude, a recognition of the farmer's importance, a recognition here and around the world. In the six years that I have been in Washington there has been a sharp reversal. That turnaround has been in part the recognition of agriculture's contribution to the progress we have enjoyed in this country.

Government has been involved in our agricultural miracle, but private enterprise has played the key and critical part in it. While the extension agent has been out in the boondocks, the salesman has traveled right along with him. As I have put it facetiously on occasion, when you get the salesman out there selling and the extension agent out there keeping him honest, you have a combination that can't be beat.

Our government has never gone in for producing farm production inputs. Our government has never gone in for processing or distribution. But our government has sponsored research, although today private industry is doing more agricultural research than public agencies. Likewise, government has organized education and credit systems and yet today the private sector is involved in both.

And our government has established a pricing arrangement that stimulates producers to maintain a reasonable working relationship in a free market between supply and demand. Blessed as we are with an enormous capacity to overproduce, we have had to learn by pragmatic trial and error how to do this.

We are now in a world where the need is so great that it is intolerable to have unmet needs and unused capacity. We must bring those two together. In the process of doing so, we have to keep our eye on the target. That is to export technical know-how and management techniques. We will export food for humanitarian purposes, food for nutrition purposes, food for capital, but not food to suffocate agricultural development and self-help.

Agricultural development will be accomplished only with a combination of capital, scientific and technical know-how, and equally and more important in my judgment, management. Creative leadership is always in short supply and is always hard to find, but it is the essence of a good business operation. This is what we need most.

Most of you here today counsel people on how to invest money. I think you do so as much as anything on your evaluation of the capacity and leadership of the people that will carry forward an enterprise. This is the key reason above all others why the private sector must be deeply involved in this challenge that lies right before us.

I close my remarks here today with a quotation from one of the truly great men of the world. I refer to Saint Paul. Paul said in his letter to James, Chapter I, Verse 22, "But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: For he beholdeth himself and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the word, this man shall be blessed in his deed."

In this room are assembled doers, and we are engaged in giving mankind freedom from hunger and pestilence and woe. There is nothing more important in the world.

The Ninth New Jersey District Voters Speak Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent out my annual questionnaire, "The Ninth District Voters' Voice in Congress," to the 149,000 households in the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, which I have the honor to represent in Congress. I have sought the opinions of my constituents on the vital issues which we, as Congressmen, face and must resolve in the best interests of our Nation and our constituents. I am extremely gratified that 28,408 people—actually representing families—in my congressional district have taken the time to return their questionnaires, providing me with a cross section of their opinions and views. It indicates their concern on the domestic and international issues of the day.

Now that the careful tabulation and analysis has been completed, I intend to have it circulated within my district so that my constituents may be apprised of the results. This compilation was an effort that required many college volunteers, in addition to my staff members. I wish to assure my constituents that their responses are of great value to me in making determinations and voting on the issues.

The subject of Vietnam has been given most considerate thought. In analyzing the present responses and comparing them with those of the past 2 years, I find that there is no significant change in the desire of my constituents on how to end this conflict: 80.7 percent advocate a greater effort and emphasis on diplomatic and peace initiatives in cooperation with other parties to secure an early termination of the conflict; 14.7 percent opposed this approach. Thus, a majority of my constituents feel as I do on this problem. I have advocated this method for some time.

In spite of the many demonstrations which have taken place in the United States in favor of getting out of Vietnam, the responses from my district indicate an opposition to this idea by a 56.3 percent to 34.9 percent ratio, with 8.8 percent undecided.

Fifty-nine and seven-tenths percent of my constituents feel that we should continue the bombing of North Vietnam, while 35.4 percent approve of the cessation of such bombing; 4.9 percent are undecided.

I have asked my constituents what other alternatives they suggest as a change in our policy to bring about an early and honorable termination. Of those answering this question, a lesser number than those answering question number 1, 34.1 percent stated that they desired no change in the present policy and 65.9 percent suggested other methods of concluding the war. The suggestions ran from "let the military run the war," "a concentration of military effort for achieving victory," to "allow the United Nations to resolve the matter," or "total withdrawal."

The fact that no radically new departures were suggested seems to indicate, to a degree, some frustration regarding the length of the conflict. Both the so-called "doves" and "hawks"—if this terminology is proper—have indicated a sincere desire to end the conflict and reestablish peace, except through different approaches.

One subject that has attracted much attention has been the question of President Johnson's efforts to increase trade and cultural relations with Eastern Europe. Fifty-three and nine-tenths percent of the responses indicated approval of such a program, with 35.1 percent dissenting and 11 percent undecided. These figures indicate an increase of 3 percent in favor as compared to last year's result. This slight change in attitude with respect to this proposal, perhaps reflects more positively this year because of the recent Johnson-Kosygin talks held at Glassboro, N.J., arranged by our Governor, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I feel that my constituents feel that the proposed trade, in nonstrategic goods, and cultural exchange programs, as an alternative to armed conflict, is in the long run a more valid approach to establish a lasting world peace.

President Johnson's proposal for a surtax could command only a 25.6 percent approval while 65.2 percent disapproved; 9.2 percent were undecided. As an alternative to this my constituents expressed a suggestion to cut some of the existing domestic programs: 20.6 percent want the antipoverty program cut; 17.9 percent do not desire aid to cities; 11.8 percent want cuts in the public works program and the same number showed a desire to reduce expenditures in our space program; 10.9 percent indicated cuts in other fields such as foreign aid, defense and military spending and Federal spending in general.

The problems of our senior citizens were reflected in the answers to the questions concerning social security benefits: 67.3 percent endorsed an immediate social security increase with 25.1 who were against it, while only 7.6 percent were undecided. Flexible payments to meet the increases in cost of living were approved by 70.8 percent to 21.4 percent; 7.8 percent gave no opinion. Another social security question on the abolition of the dollar limitation of earning capacity was endorsed by 67 percent of those who replied and disapproved by 20.8 percent; 12.2 percent were undecided on this approval.

Another question which drew much favorable attention was one on combat-

ing crime by aiding local law enforcement officials through Federal grants to improve their police departments, courts, and correctional institutions. This showed a 77.2 percent approval; 14.9 percent disapproval and only 7.9 percent undecided. Legislation to this effect was passed by the House. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have played a role in this legislation with the introduction of a bill similar to the one approved by the House. I also cosponsored legislation which would increase the financial grants by $30 million to States and local authorities for this purpose. This was incorporated in the measure passed by the House.

Finally, but not the least important topic on which my constituents were polled, was the suggested legislation to permit income tax deductions for parents of children attending college. I have also introduced legislation on this subject which is presently pending in the Ways and Means Committee. The results show an overwhelming 71.6 percent in accord, 23.4 percent disapproving, and a mere 5 percent undecided.

As I previously stated, the results of this poll will be sent to all of my constituents. I am very grateful for their participation because their answers reflect the time and effort they gave to the questionnaire. The results serve as a guide and an indication of their thoughts and opinions. I shall continue to respect their judgment when voting on the issues, and, as always, take into account the results before arriving at my decisions on any legislative matters.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the complete tabulation of the 22 questions covered in my 1967 questionnaire, showing the vote by totals and percentages:

THE 9TH NEW JERSEY DISTRICT VOTERS' VOICE IN CONGRESS

Question	Total response	Approve		Disapprove		Undecided	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FOREIGN AFFAIRS—VIETNAM							
Do you approve or disapprove of—							
1. A greater effort and emphasis on diplomatic and peace initiatives in cooperation with other parties in order to secure an early termination of the conflict	27,085	21,841	80.7	4,003	14.7	1,241	4.6
2. An unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam	27,526	9,763	35.4	16,441	59.7	1,322	4.9
3. A cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam only if Hanoi agrees to take some reciprocal measures	25,535	16,205	63.0	7,448	29.1	1,882	7.9
4. Deescalation of our military effort in South Vietnam with a gradual withdrawal of our troops	26,742	9,327	34.9	15,049	56.3	2,366	8.8
5. Further extension of the bombing to include other military targets in Hanoi and Haiphong	26,812	15,802	58.9	8,886	33.1	2,124	8.0
6. What do you suggest as a change of policy to bring about an end to the conflict?	24,043	------	----	------	----	------	----
No change. Pursue present policy since it is adequate	------	8,281	34.1	------	----	------	----
Other—Let military run war, all-out fight, let U.N. resolve problem, pull out completely, etc	------	15,762	65.9	------	----	------	----
DOMESTIC AFFAIRS							
Do you approve or disapprove of—							
7. Immediate social security increases to bring benefits in line with the cost of living	27,563	18,562	67.3	7,160	25.1	1,841	7.6
8. Flexible payments which would increase automatically with cost-of-living increases	26,543	18,811	70.8	5,686	21.4	2,046	7.8
9. Abolish the dollar limitation of earning capacity for people employed while receiving social security benefits	27,328	18,326	67.0	7,442	27.2	1,560	5.8
10. Help offset the proposed budget deficit with a 6-percent (surtax) tax increase	26,414	6,761	25.6	17,241	65.2	2,412	9.2
11. A cutback in the following existing programs in lieu of the surtax proposal	50,500	------	----	------	----	------	---
Health	------	2,481	4.9	------	----	------	---
Antipoverty	------	11,446	20.6	------	----	------	---
Education	------	2,082	4.1	------	----	------	---
Space	------	9,962	11.8	------	----	------	---
Aid to cities	------	9,045	17.9	------	----	------	---
Public works	------	5,961	11.8	------	----	------	---
Other—Foreign aid, defense and military spending, Federal spending	------	9,523	10.9	------	----	------	---
12. A return of a portion of Federal revenues to States to be used as the States desire	27,263	14,457	53.0	9,641	35.3	3,165	11.7
13. Enactment of a law to provide for full disclosure by public officials of all their financial interests in any corporation, business enterprise, or institution through an annual financial statement	27,413	22,723	82.9	3,241	11.8	1,448	5.3
14. The establishment of a strict code of ethics to include rigorous conflict of interest provisions	26,969	22,966	85.1	2,083	7.7	1,921	7.2
15. Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967 to provide matching Federal funds to States and municipalities to improve their police departments, courts, and correctional institutions	27,570	21,287	77.2	4,121	14.9	2,162	7.9
16. Federal matching funds for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts and users	27,256	17,364	63.7	7,010	25.7	2,882	10.6
17. President Johnson's efforts to build bridges to Eastern Europe through increased trade and cultural exchange	27,457	14,803	53.9	9,646	35.1	3,008	11.0
18. In general, do you approve of the antipoverty programs (Headstart, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, VISTA)	27,534	12,609	45.8	12,284	44.6	2,641	9.6
19. Legislation restricting the sale and possession of concealable firearms	27,533	21,010	76.3	5,681	20.6	842	3.1
20. The outlawing of wiretapping, both public and private, except where the national security is at stake	27,163	15,882	58.4	9,123	33.5	2,153	8.1
21. Antistrike legislation for public service employees	27,691	17,961	64.8	7,307	26.4	2,423	8.8
22. Income tax deductions for parents of children attending college	27,649	19,806	71.6	6,451	23.4	1,362	5.0

Economic Development Administration Marks Second Anniversary With Record of Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Economic Development Administration celebrated its second birthday. I have been actively interested in this program since it first was envisioned during hearings held before the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member. As we mark the second anniversary of this Federal agency, designed to stimulate economic growth and development of our communities, I think the record of achievement speaks for itself. I would like to single out for special mention, two projects in California which have benefited from the Economic Development Administration program which, in turn, will result in long-term employment for hundreds of people.

First of all, I would like to call to your attention the Box Canyon Dam. On the 20th of July of this year, a construction contract, totaling $7,818,054, was awarded to Vinnell Corp. for the construction of this dam and reservoir in Siskiyou County near Mount Shasta.

The award of the contract culminates negotiations and application consideration extending over a period of approximately 2 years. The future dam has the enthusiastic support of the citizens of all northern California, and the project will result in a solid underpinning for the economy of a part of California which has been distressed for many years and plagued with a high rate of unemployment and low-median income.

The dam is expected to create employment for approximately 400 persons, and will be the nucleus for a recreation-tourist complex in addition to the control and conservation of water streams in the area.

A significant and unique facet of the project is the recognition it has generated of the importance of orderly economic growth through elimination of slum areas and the creation of employment opportunities for all segments of the population. As an immediate outgrowth of the project, the board of supervisors of Siskiyou County and chairman of Siskiyou County Flood Control

and Water Conservation District have agreed to implement a broad range of urgently needed and forward looking projects. Included will be an employment plan to assure employment of low income and minority group individuals during the construction phase of the project and during the life of the project itself; to institute training programs for persons heretofore unable to find employment for lack of training; and to initiate a program of countywide housing to assist low-income and minority groups.

This all has been achieved through the combined efforts of the Federal Government, State of California, and local government. The Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce provided a total grant in the amount of $4,618,500. The State, through its Davis-Grunsky program, put up $4,532,000.

Officials of all three levels of government are pleased with the cooperative attitude and constructive approach in facing a problem and finding a solution. I believe that here is an outstanding example of what can be done through cooperative action.

Similar cooperation between the Federal Government, represented by the Economic Development Administration, the State of California, and local government can be found in the other project which I would like to mention to you today, that is the South Tahoe Public Utility District sewer export works which is a major step in preserving the purity and beauty of Lake Tahoe.

Lake Tahoe, one of the clearest and most pure lakes in the world, has been threatened because of the ever-increasing presence of man. In 1962, the summertime peak population at this most popular resort was about 132,000 people. In just 4 years this increased to about 180,000 people and it is estimated that by the end of the century it will approach the 600,000 mark.

To meet this influx of people, steps must be taken to provide adequate sewer facilities if we are to prevent pollution of this beautiful body of water. Through the cooperative efforts of Federal, State, and local government we have achieved a major step forward.

The South Tahoe Public Utility District is the agency which is responsible for sewer collection and disposal of sewage. Like all other districts, South Tahoe's chief difficulty in maintaining adequate facilities to ensure the purity of the lake has been financial. The assessed valuation, from which the bonding limit is derived, does not reflect the increasing volumes of people who use the district's facilities. From 1961 to 1965 assessed valuation increased almost 75 percent, but sewage volume increased more than 200 percent.

The cost of expanding the facilities to export the sewer effluent out of the Tahoe basin—the only reasonable solution to the problem—amounted to about $8,680,000. Bonding itself to the maximum, the district still was $5,360,000 short. The deficiency had to come from State and Federal sources. More than 60 percent of the funds were provided under the Economic Development Administration program. An EDA grant of $3,253,000 to South Tahoe Public Utility District was the largest single grant ever made by any Federal agency for a water pollution control project and it was one of the largest made by EDA for any purpose during 1966.

It is my pleasure to report that the grant has made it possible for us to achieve major successes in halting the threat of pollution at the south end of Lake Tahoe.

At the same time, this grant will mean hundreds of new, permanent jobs for the people of El Dorado County and the city of South Lake Tahoe.

I cite these two projects to show that the goals for which Congress enacted the legislation in 1965 are being achieved.

Address of Senator Frank Moss, Before the Western States Democratic Conference in Los Angeles, August 26, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues a most timely and appropriate speech by Senator FRANK MOSS, of Utah, before the Western States Democratic conference in Los Angeles on August 26, 1967.

The address follows:

We meet tonight at a time of national pain and crisis. On all sides, our beloved country is beset with problems—with war, taxes, strikes, riots, population explosions, drugs, campus unrest, conflict between generations, invasion of privacy, and crime.

And we Democrats are getting blamed for all of them—for all of them, and the hippies too.

In fact, if we were living in China today, and were following the old Chinese custom of labeling the years, we probably would be calling 1967 "The year of our great agony."

There are few men of good will who do not feel shaken. What is happening challenges the basic Democratic processes upon which American civilization is built.

It questions the effectiveness of our institutions—public and private, spiritual and secular, labor and business—to rise to the needs of the people.

It calls up for scrutiny the human and social value of the economic progress the country has made in the last ten years.

It makes it very clear that all Americans—black or white, rich or poor—must reaffirm their willingness to be responsible citizens.

And it indicates that whatever we have done to banish hopelessness and open the doors of opportunity and improve life for the poorest of us—it is not enough—not nearly enough.

Events of 1967 constitute a clear call to all of us—to those who hold public trust, to those in business, to labor, to individual, dedicated citizens everywhere—to pitch in and help make democracy work for all so that the great American dream of equality and fraternity will not go down the drain, but will be preserved and strengthened.

TRIAL IN AMERICA

But if you think that this time of firey trial in America has brought forth any real suggestions for solutions from our Republican friends, you are pipe dreaming. It has only swelled the eternal Republican Chorus of "We can do it better." When it comes to the question of "how" the chorus is as silent as it has ever been.

It is easy to stand here and say that violence and rioting are wrong, and that we must enforce order and make our streets safe and bring to swift justice all who shatter the law.

Being *against* violence is like being against sin. To a public official, it is worth a thousand votes any day, and the Republicans know it.

But it is something else to try to *demolish* sin. You can't do this unless you know what causes it. And after you know what causes it you must provide alternatives to the conditions which drive men to evil.

The Democratic administration and the majority of the Democrats in Congress have been trying for sometime to get at the causes of some of our troubles. It would be cruel deception to stand here and tell you we have all of the answers. Part of the agony of our times is that the solutions to our problems are tough to find, and hard to put into operation. But we are aware that our cities are rotting at the core, and that our urban ghettos are fertile ground for violence and crime. And we have proposed some remedies—some minimal remedies.

What help have we had from our Republican friends who are talking so long and so loud? We have found that they are just as much against sin—after it is discovered—as anybody else, but when it comes to doing anything to prevent it, they shuffle into that Republican sidestep which they do so well.

VOTES IN THE HOUSE

Consider the votes of Republicans in the House of Representatives on the minimal first steps we Democrats proposed to remove some of the blight which has settled on the nation's cities.

84 percent of the House Republicans voted against the Model Cities Program.

90 percent voted to recommit the Urban Mass Transit Act.

94 percent voted against passage of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

85 percent of House Republicans voted to delay the effective date of the Minimum Wage Law for one year.

98 percent of the Republicans voted to recommit relocation assistance to the urban poor.

93 percent of the Republicans voted against rent supplements.

84 percent voted against the Civil Rights Act of 1966 and 85 percent against the Civil Rights Act of 1965.

And, finally, 87 percent voted against the Rat Extermination Act of 1967.

If I wanted to be unkind—and I certainly would never want to be unkind to a Republican—I might suggest that our Republican friends are trying very hard to make this the "Year of the Rat."

Gerald Ford, the Republican's Minority Leader, told us not long ago, with a straight face, that the Republicans voted against the Rat Extermination Bill because it could "at best serve only 2½ percent of the people, and only a little better than one-half of one percent of the nation's 18,000 communities."

By his own calculation, this means that the Rat Control Program would have served only five million people.

Does Mr. Ford mean that the Republicans only vote for programs which serve more than 5 million?

Only 300,000 people died from cancer last year. Does this mean that we should stop spending federal money to find the causes and cure of cancer?

Only 53,000 Americans died in highway accidents in 1966. Does this mean that we should not put into operation our new highway safety regulations?

COLD-BLOODED NONSENSE

Mr. Ford was talking nonsense and he knew it—cold-blooded nonsense which helped perpetuate a mini-riot in the House of Representatives a few days later.

There have been other brands of nonsense this summer from the Republican side. Surely they have been spawned by this long, hot summer—this "summer of our discontent" as the news media like to label it. I was amazed to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day that:

"Betty Furness terrifies us."

Now, I know President Johnson's new special assistant for Consumer Affairs quite well. She conducted a most successful audience participation show for me during my campaign in 1964, and she recently married Les Midgley, who is a native of Utah and the brother of my Administrative Assistant.

So I read further about Betty. It seems that Congressman Robert H. Michel, a Republican of Illinois, is "terrified" of her because she admits that some of the information made available to her since she took her new job has made her more careful about getting an automobile loan.

Congressman Michel asks darkly:

"Would you borrow money from Betty Furness?" Pretty, charming, intelligent Betty Furness. It must be the summer heat, Congressman.

If the Republicans have been floundering on riots and rats—and Betty Furness—consider their plight on Vietnam.

For months, they have generally supported President Johnson, taking the hard military line. About once a week, Gerald Ford, the House Republican leader, rises up to say:

"Let's rain more bombs on North Vietnam."

Now along comes Governor George Romney, one of their leading candidates for the Presidential nomination, with a plan to make the Republican the "Peace Party of 1968."

THE RIGHT COURSE

But since Governor Romney has said several times in the past that he felt President Johnson was pursuing the right course, he is having some difficulties in making his case for peace stick.

First of all, he doesn't say whether the Republican Party would achieve peace through military conquest, or whether the party has found some way out, which they haven't revealed yet.

Next, he declares that he thinks it is unrealistic to think that bombing North Vietnam will ever bring negotiations, but then hurries to say that he is not recommending that the bombing be stopped. And that he agrees with Gerald Ford anyway.

Furthermore, Governor Romney advises that the only way to end the war is to "demonstrate" that we can "destroy the military infrastructure of North Vietnam," that is destroy the guerrilla infrastructure. But he doesn't say how we should "demonstrate" this, or even better, how we should do it. I am sure our military leaders in the field would like to know.

But finally, Governor Romney does say something with which I think perhaps President Johnson, and many others here in the audience would fully agree—and that is that it is a "tragedy that we ever got into Vietnam."

I am telling no secrets when I say that no one is happy with the situation in Vietnam today. It is draining 2 billion dollars each month from our resources—resources we need to rebuild our bleeding cities and wipe out poverty here at home and is killing hundreds of young American men a month and wounding many more. I am sure that President Johnson and Defense Secretary McNamara and Secretary of State Rusk want, far more fervently than either you or I, to bring the war to an end. But they insist that we do it with honor—that we keep our commitment to the South Vietnamese—that we assure the people of this small, underdeveloped nation the opportunity to choose the type of government under which they will live. The President and his advisors are trying hard to bring North Vietnam to the conference table by bombing. If bombing will not work, they must find some other means of persuasion. But find it they will. You and I know that—you and I know that this agony will pass.

THE 1968 PLATFORM?

Some of the Republicans may think they are going to succeed in making the American people believe that they—and they alone—can bring peace to Vietnam and end our riots here at home. But if I should be asked to suggest a Republican platform for 1968 it would run something like this:

End the war in Vietnam—but don't ask us how.

Bring peace to the world—but we haven't even a twig for the dove.

Make our streets safe—but where do you start?

Stop the riots—but don't depend on us to do it.

And, if by chance the Republicans should tell you that a Democrat can't even be elected rat catcher in 1968—don't believe it.

I am reminded of the story of the politician who woke up one morning to find a large obituary in the newspaper announcing his death.

He was nonplussed, to put it mildly, and immediately got the local editor on the phone.

"Bill," he said, "Your story is in error, I'm right here on the phone."

The editor didn't say anything for a moment, and then came back hesitantly with:

"Where are you calling from?"

Well, I want to tell all the editors, and all the Republicans, and all of the people, that the Democratic party is very much here—and it is working in the here and now.

We have a program for the future of America and we have the resources—human and material—to match our problems and match them we will.

We have brought the United States to the greatest peak of prosperity in its history—Democratic prosperity. Our gross national product will run at the rate of $805 billion in the fourth quarter of this year. Any sag which was apparent in the economy the first of this year has gone. And unemployment is again down below the four percent point.

AMERICA WILL DO IT

So America has the money to do the things which must be done to meet the crises which face us. We can take the strain out of the fabric of American life—and we will do it.

But the federal government cannot—and should not—be asked to do it alone.

Whose fault is it when thirteen people are crowded into two rooms of a slum ghetto?

Whose fault is it when a willing and able-bodied man cannot find work, simply because his skin is the wrong color?

Whose fault is it when a young man drops out of school to join a gang of juvenile delinquents?

Whose fault is it when small children go to school in clothes that are not warm enough and with a breakfast that is too scant?

The answer is that it is the fault of each and every one of us—of America as a whole.

Whose fault is it when an infectious wave of mindless violence sweeps a city?

Whose fault is it when looters and snipers roam our streets at night?

Whose fault is it when our police departments are understaffed and our policemen ill-trained?

Whose fault is it when justice is not meted out swiftly and surely to those who break the law?

It is the fault of all of us—and it will require the efforts of all of us to do something about it—the efforts of every one of the fifty states, of each of our counties and cities and towns, of private enterprise, of labor, of our churches and our schools, of our police departments and our courts, of our civic groups and our philanthropic groups, of our mothers and fathers at our family hearths, and of men and women of good will everywhere.

YEAR OF OPPORTUNITY

I say that 1967 is not "the year of our great agony," but "the year of our great opportunity."

Over 100 years ago men like Washington and Franklin and Adams and Jefferson founded a new nation. The times were dangerous. The stakes were high. It took men with courage and heart. But the spirit of '76 prevailed, and the dream of a free and independent nation, in which all men were equal, became a reality.

Today, America faces a new test in a new time. The American dream has been challenged. There is a question as to whether free and equal people can live together in happiness and harmony. I think we can. I call upon America to produce the spirit of '67—a spirit akin to that which founded our country almost 200 years ago. I call upon all our people to show that courage and heart and wisdom and will are not dead in America, and that the American dream is still the hope of the world. And I call upon our great Democratic party to continue its leadership in seeking political and human solutions to the problems of our time. As we have done before, we will again prove our right to lead!

Remarks of Vice President Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, last week, under the very trying circumstances of a critical illness in his family, Vice President HUMPHREY made a telephone address to those assembled at the Western States Democratic Conference in Los Angeles.

It is not altogether a partisan message. For the Vice President, who is doing an outstanding job for his country, knows full well that the goals of peace, equality, and opportunity transcend party lines.

It is for this reason that I include the Vice President's remarks in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

I want to put my message in the terminology of four words—Confidence—Communication—Coordination and Commitment. Now let me say a few words first of all about confidence.

You can't win if you don't believe you can win. You can talk yourself into defeat and you can in a sense really lift yourself into victory. It just depends upon what you want to do.

Now I have been accused many times in Washington and elsewhere of being a perenial and congenital optimist and I plead guilty. One of the reasons that I try to be an optimist is that there are so many pessimists around, particularly in Washington. They're specialists in that field and most of them are Republicans. And I have never believed that we ought to crowd over into their jurisdiction. I believe in people honoring professional competence. And Republicans are absolutely the most professionaly competent pessimists in the world. They can make a young man feel old over night and as Adlai Stevenson said, "Democrats can make an old man feel young." So that is the difference.

Now, we ought to know that the attack is on. Republicans do not wait for a campaign to start about a month before the election. They started this campaign of 1968 when they convened in Washington after the election of 1966. They tasted a little of the wine of victory in 1966 and they would like to have a lost weekend with it. So I suggest that we recognize what we are facing and what we are called upon to deal with. The opening guns of the 1968 campaign are on and it is almost like guerrilla action. They shoot from behind the bushes, they lay in ambush for you and they wait to see what mistakes we make, if any. But more importantly, they wait for defection. And I repeat, for the defectors.

Now, my fellow Democrats, I want to tell you right now you can really convince the Republicans that they can win if we talk enough about their victories and if we talk enough about what they are saying. I think what we ought to do is to have confidence in our leadership; confidence, above all, in our program, and get on with the job of knowing that we have been doing the right thing.

I have an abiding faith in the American people. I think they're going to make the right decision in 1968. The American people know that government is serious business. They know that and they want people who have the intellectual integrity, the character and stamina to take a position and stand by it. They are not nearly as concerned with images as they are with reality. They are not nearly as concerned, may I say, with whether or not you look like the all-American boy or whether or not you really are thinking about all the Americans all the time and working for all of the Americans all of the time. So I call upon you to have the confidence in our Party, confidence in our leadership.

That brings me to the second part of my message.—Communication.

Communication is absolutely essential these days and, of course, with modern media you ought to be able to communicate.

We have the most creative and effective record of political accomplishment in our history these past seven years. Starting out in 1961 with John Kennedy, and continuing on with Lyndon Johnson, we Democrats have been busy passing progressive programs, initiating policies, breaking new grounds in terms of our social and economic betterment. We have been able to achieve the greatest legislative record in the history of this country. And I think it's time we Democrats got out and talked about it. Communicate—people forget. There is a lot of noise these days and people forget your message. Medicare, aid to elementary, secondary and higher education, civil rights and voting rights, War on Poverty—all of these matters . . . they did not come by accident. They came by hard work. Model cities, urban renewal, everything that you can think of in terms of the improvement of our programs of social welfare . . . we had to fight for these things. What are we talking about here? This administration is committed to the proposition that every American is entitled to have a chance in life. President Johnson and Vice President Hubert Humphrey are committed to the proposition that American freedom should carry with it opportunity . . . the opportunity to be somebody, the opportunity to make something of your life, the opportunity to make the best of your life, and that's why we have poured ourselves into the programs of health, education, and resource development. This is why this government of yours has done more in the field of education in the last five years than the government of the United States has been able to do since the beginning of this republic. Now, that is a program of accomplishment and I think we have to communicate.

The Republicans oppose these programs. You know, a real news flash today would be for some Democrat just to stand up and say that on most of the programs that have been adopted, 90% of the Republicans in Congress have voted no and 90% of the Demcrats have voted yes. So, when you see an old person that has benefitted from Medicare, you might not only ask them how the Medicare program is working, but you might even ask them, "Who do you think passed it?" "And who do you think was opposed to it?" They may not know because we haven't told them. And now's the time to tell them.

This record does not, in other words, speak for itself. We have to speak up for it and we have to do a better job of communicating not only the record of accomplishments but, also, the goals and objectives of the Democratic Party as we move into the 1970's.

People are not so much interested in what you have done as in what you plan on doing.

What's the philosophy of this Party?

Well, Franklin Roosevelt, bless his memory, in those final departing words of his, said, "Let us move forward with a strong and an active faith."

That ought to be the message of inspiration for every Democrat and every good citizen of this country. This whole concept of moving forward has been characteristic of our Party. John Kennedy said, "Let's get this country moving again. Let's begin." And Lyndon Johnson said, "Let's keep this country moving. Let's continue." This is a forward looking, outward reaching party and we are unafraid of the issues of tomorrow. We don't see problems and difficulties, we see opportunities and challenges and that's the faith that motivates us.

The third message that I have for you is, beside confidence and communication, is coordination. And that's why you're having this conference.

You simply must coordinate the enormous energies of our political structure. Coordination also means subordinating personal differences and personal ambitions to the common cause and good of the country and the goal of progressive and effective government. Coordination means forgoing the luxury of personal hatreds and revenge. It also means that you work together. It means cooperation for the common interest. Ben Franklin put it right on the line about 200 years ago when he said, "We must all hang together or we'll assuredly all hang separately."

And, my fellow Democrats, I have some other words for you.

Next year there is going to be a national ticket and President Johnson will be at the head of that ticket and on every Democratic ballot and every precinct in America. The Democratic family is going to win together or it's not going to win at all. We're going to have a joint victory or we're going to have separate political funerals without too many flowers. In other words, don't poison the soup that you're going to have to eat, don't put poison in the well from whence you're going to dip your cup. If you, if Democrats can, if Democrats feel they must be critical in order to prove they're independent, I suggest that they be critical of the opposition. There's plenty, plenty to work on.

Coordination also means intelligent analysis, planning and operations which are designed to harness the various strengths and abilities that are everywhere waiting to be put to work. Your meeting is a splendid early step to ensure that kind of communication and coordination.

I'm pleased, also, that you are spending some time on the nitty-gritty, the nuts and bolts of politics, the practicalities of it. We're all issue oriented and we ought to be. We're deeply concerned with the whys and the objectives and the goals of progressive government and we must be. But, my dear friends, to carry forward progressive government you have to be in power. We must win and that's what we're discussing. And if you really want social progress in this country, you better take a good look at the list of candidates' potentials that offer you that opportunity. I think when you do, you'll find you have a good going team right now. This isn't the time just for going separate paths. This is the time to work together.

My fourth and final message to you is commitment. Commitment. National commitment, personal commitment, party commitment, commitment to build a better America, commitment to our cities, commitment to our needy and our deprived, and commitment to the world. This world needs the American commitment as never before and the needy of this country of ours need our national commitment as never before.

I travel up and down this country. I've been in 46 States since I've been Vice President and I will be in all of them in a very few months. And I go not only to the luxury hotels, but I go to the back alleys of the slums as I was only yesterday in Washington, D.C., where I went out with the young boys who were on a special project of rat extermination and the filth in the garbage and the dirt of the back alleys of our slums.

I happen to be one that believes that you must have a strong and active faith. I believe that you must have commitments. This is no time for that summer soldier and sunshine patriot. This is a time for Democrats to stand up and be counted and to rally around the President and the leader of their Party. When the going gets tough and the opposition senses the possibility of an upset, this is the time to stand up and to be counted and to fight back. This is the difference between a great people and a weak people; a great Party and a weak Party.

Your President is bearing unbelievable burdens these days and responsibilities. I hear a great deal of criticism about our President in many areas of life. I hear criticism—foreign policy, domestic policy.

Let me just say a word about foreign policy. We signed more forward looking agreements that blend themselves to the ultimate cause of peace since Lyndon Johnson has been President than for many, many decades. With our relationships with the Soviet Union alone, only recently we put on the table for consideration the new Non-Proliferation Treaty on Nuclear Weapons in cooperation with the Soviet Union. The Consular Treaty which stood untouched and no one dared to even move it for years is a fact now. Civil air agreement is a fact. The Cultural Agreement is a fact. The Space Treaty is a fact. So when I hear that we seem to do not too well in foreign relations, I say the record says to the contrary.

The Alliance for Progress is working. Your President has just expanded that Alliance by a new commitment made at Punta Del Este. The Dominican Republic is free—elections were held. Latin America is moving ahead economically and politically. Europe is strong, independent and the United States of America still is the shield of protection. This hasn't been done by accident—it has taken careful, personal, effective diplomacy. And I do not think we ought to let our Pres-

ident stand alone to bear these awful burdens without the united support of his own Party and of his own people. He deserves that.

Let me just say something about Southeast Asia. I know this is the most sorrowful part of our national life.

I spoke the other day to the Democratic State Legislative leaders. I want to say to you what I said to them. I could not support the policy if I thought it were wrong. I could not go out talking to people, mothers and fathers, supporting a national position, doing it openly, actively, a position that required the lives of our sons if I thought it were wrong. Every man has his weaknesses but one of mine, I trust, is not to be a hypocrite. And I am not so politically ambitious that I would want to see my country do something that is wrong and knowingly wrong and yet to speak up for it.

To put it in the affirmative, we are in Southeast Asia not just because of South Vietnam, we are there for the cause of world peace and order. We're there for our own purposes as well and I have travelled in that area, much more than many of the critics, and I have been to all of the countries of free Asia and I have talked with their leaders. And isn't it interesting that not one of them, not one, suggested that we withdraw. No one. Some have a different point of view of certain tactics but not one suggests that we withdraw.

To the contrary, they tell us that our presence there is their hope for freedom. It is their hope for independence. And there have been some great victories. Indonesia today stands proud and free and independent. The sixth largest nation in the world. The leaders of that country know full well that our presence in Southeast Asia has given them that chance. They have delivered on their chance.

The leader of Singapore, the Prime Minister who surely has been no particularly outspoken friend of the United States, said that "America's presence in Asia buys time for Asians to be free." The Southeast Asian Association of Free Nations is a fact. War between Malaysia and Indonesia is over. Korea is beginning to come into its own and have a tremendous economic breakthrough. Things are happening that are good and it is because this Nation, even though it's been costly and painful, and it's required great sacrifice, kept its commitment. We have been tested once again, in Asia this time, as we used to be in Europe, and we have met that test.

Our commitment is the very keystone of the arch of world peace and world security and the credibility of the American commitment is the shield of protection not only for the American people but for people all over the world—in Asia, in Europe, in Latin America.

We are trying to build a world of peace. And that's why we have committed ourselves to the United Nations and that's why today we are trying to find a way to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This is why today your Government stands committed and ready for disarmament to save the peoples of the world from this terrible costs of weaponry. This is why your government today is ready to go to the conference table immediately to bring peace to Southeast Asia. Until that day comes, though, Americans owe it to themselves, owe it to their honor and owe it to the cause of peace and justice in this world to keep the faith and to keep the commitments. To do less would be to prove us unworthy of trust and confidence.

I have spoken of this many, many times and I ask you to think about it, to remember that leadership gives you no privilege. Leadership is not a luxury, it is a burden. Leadership is not a cloak of comfort, it is a robe of responsibility. And remember that a great nation must prove its greatness by trial and sacrifice. It must prove it at home and abroad.

Fellow Democrats, I want you to be the idealists that you have always been. The ideal of America—one nation. The ideal of an America with one citizenship, opportunity for all. I long for the day when we will never again speak of Ghettos, when we will never again speak of Americans as Negro or White but just speak of them as Americans. I long for the day when every boy and girl of Mexican ancestry can have a chance like everyone else. And believe me, we're working for it.

This is the liberal program—this is the progressive program. This is the program of the future. We're thinking about the tomorrows. The best way to do something about the tomorrows is to be proud of your work, to look at your record. And might I ask you to be proud of your President, speak up for your Party, stand up and be counted for what you believe in, to really submerge your little personal and private ambitions and feelings and to remember that this is a great country that has a great destiny.

We have a message to tell the American people and I am waiting to tell that message from the political platform. I welcome the opportunity of Republican opposition. I long to see them stand up in what I call a free and open debate. We'll take care of them.

The American people are not going to turn their backs on responsible leadership. They didn't do it in 1948 when Harry Truman was under much more criticism than Lyndon Johnson. So let's spend our efforts out here in the West to give the kind of get up and go that this part of the country is known for.

Thank you very much.

Summer Opportunity Centers—Address by Vice President Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the remarks of Vice President HUMPHREY before the American Federation of Teachers on August 24.

The Vice President called for the establishment of summer opportunity centers in our schools during the summer months to provide slum children the chance to become real participating members of our society. He emphasized that we must make social and economic opportunity a reality for all.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the Vice President's speech.

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

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, AUGUST 24, 1967

Thank you, President Cogen, and my good friend, your Legislative Representative, Carl Megel. I should pay a special note of tribute to the fine delegation from Minnesota—the MFT. And particularly Ed Bolstad, the President of our Minnesota Federation of Teachers.

And I don't want to leave out my friend here, Herrick Roth, and the others from Colorado.

First I want to congratulate the AFT, on its remarkable progress—not only progress in terms of membership—I think there were 103 new Locals this past year; but particularly on your progress as outlined in the remarkable and inspiring address of your President Charles Cogen.

I not only read the address, but one of my very capable staff assistants, whose brother works closely with the Minnesota Federation of Teachers, brother of Roger Peterson, my staff assistant, Neal Peterson, took the time to go through that speech.

It is more than a speech. It is a paper. It is a remarkable document that outlined for me what I considered to be the philosophy of education needed for America, and it tells, in good rhetoric and solid substance, the achievement and the accomplishments as well as the long term goals of the American Federation of Teachers and the goals for educators in the United States of America.

The point is not that every line is one with which you must agree but more importantly that here is a thinker, a man of ideas; a man deeply concerned with the educational process in our nation, and much more concerned, may I say with the substance as well as the process and the purpose of education.

I want you, President Cogen, to know that I have looked upon your remarks and your dissertation on the educational philosophy and the educational program as a standard by which we will measure our conduct in government, and, indeed, in the educational system.

I come to discuss with you some thoughts of mine on educational matters.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS SHOULD BE TEACHERS

I come to you today not only as your Vice President but I come to you, also as a teacher. You see, I happen to believe that a man in public life ought to be a teacher all of his life. When I served in the Senate for some 16 years, I tried in my way to teach, to think ahead, and all too often for the happiness of some, to think out loud. That way you get a chance for other people to tell you how wrong you are.

If you just think silently you are apt to convince yourself and no one really gets a chance to tell you that you are on the wrong course. But I do believe that every public officeholder should be and ought in a sense be required to be a teacher, speaking to the public; working with his associates; hopefully coming forth with some creative thought.

Today I am going to stand in the role of a teacher, and I'm going to prevail on you as a teacher to give you some candid thoughts about the expanding responsibility of American educators in a rapidly changing American society.

And I would also like to mention a word or two about the responsibility of American society to the American educator, and both to our clients, so to speak, the youth of the land.

WE SHOULD BE SELF-CRITICAL

We are prone, as Americans, to always be self-critical. That is a good sign. The famous Swedish sociologist, Gunnar Myrdal, an old friend of mine once said, "If you really want to find out what is wrong with America you don't have to spend too many years in research. Just ask somebody. They will tell you." And we are very good at that. And if he won't tell you, why somebody will tell you. They will hire people to tell you.

And that is a sign of health. Only the strong can be self-analytical self-critical. It is the weak; the uncertain; the fearful that are always right who never admit—at least publicly—that there could be any doubt at all.

It is the person of maturity; it is the person of responsibility and of strength that can admit that possibly he is in error, or that his judgment may have not been what it should be. Therefore, we look upon ourselves, in a sense of self-criticism, and from that criticism seek remedies to build.

Let's see where we are today in education.

AMERICAN EDUCATION TODAY

It has given motivation to some, and alienation to others. The educational opportunities open to Americans today, through your efforts, and through the efforts of the American Labor Movement that has been a champion of education throughout history, are literally unprecedented. Ninety-three per cent of the teenagers have had secondary education, compared to *seven* per cent at the turn of the century.

In just the last twenty years, the percentage of American high school graduates who go on to college and to the professional schools has doubled, from twenty-five to fifty per cent. Last year there were six million of your high school graduates that were in college, and a million of them were there because of federal scholarships or loans.

HIGH LEVEL OF EDUCATION IS IMPORTANT

A high level of education, because of your steadfast position, and others like you, has become an integral, inseparable feature of American society today. It reflects, and is reflected in our unprecedented prosperity.

I do not think our country could possibly be what it is on the economic front today without our school system and without the dedication, and many times the sacrifice, of teachers.

This dedication is reflected in our position of world leadership in the sciences and in our national power. It enables us both to integrate and to cope with rapid technological development.

EDUCATION NECESSARY TO MODERN SOCIETY

From the individual American's point of view, education in addition to the cultural environment that it affords, has become the credential which enables him to participate fully in our society. A high school diploma or a college diploma is the ticket which entitles a young American to opportunity. It is the coupon which makes him eligible to earn a decent living.

Now, our society insists on that credential, and it should. Therefore, it is not surprising to me, or to you, that in those same slums and ghettoes where frustration and hopelessness and joblessness and despair and bitterness have recently contributed to riots and violence, two-thirds of the unemployed ghetto residents have never finished high school. Even those who have completed a few years of school test much lower than their grade levels.

And this is only to say, in polite language, that separate but equal was only separate.

The average Job Corps recruit, most of them school dropouts as you know, has completed nine grades of school. But he reads at a fifth grade level, *if* he reads at all.

EDUCATION IS NOT REACHING SOME

I noted just yesterday the average earned wage of the Job Corps recruit before he came in—only five per cent ever had a job by the way—and those that had a job, their average hourly wage was 71 cents.

After they left the Job Corps, and 90,000 have now graduated, 70 percent of them received jobs in private industry, 20 percent went back to school; 10 percent into the military service, the average rate of pay is $1.91 per hour.

JOB CORP PAYS FOR ITSELF

So, when I hear people complain that it costs a great deal of money to have the Job Corps. I like to remind them that if a man earns a minimum of $1.91 on the average to start, the Government of the United States, and the state and local governments will be able to take enough from each one of those hourly paychecks so that in due time the cost of that educational or training experience will be amortized.

The result of educational deficiencies, and there are educational deficiencies, the result is unemployment, at least this is one result, and underemployment at a rate in our American slums and ghettoes up to 35 per cent.

JOBLESSNESS DUE TO UNEMPLOYMENT

Complex economic and social factors, of course, contribute to this grim situation. But I am certain that there is one factor more than any other which dooms a man to joblessness today, and that is insufficient education and training.

Now we are not just giving young people, nor should we have as our purpose transmitting just information. You can buy that in a world almanac. But what we are trying to do is to transmit to people an existence in living. We are trying to make life more meaningful. That is the ultimate purpose of education.

America today has reached an acute crisis in the historic progress towards economic and social democracy. One-seventh of our population, and I had originally in my remarks here one-sixth, but I am happy to tell you that the povery group in the American society in the last few years has somewhat diminished, live below the poverty line, and are excluded.

EDUCATION REDUCES GAP BETWEEN RICH AND POOR

That one-seventh do not want to be excluded. They want to be included. And they want to be sure that their children will be included.

I think one of the most remarkable addresses delivered by the President of the United States was at Howard University some two years ago, when he asked the American people whether or not we were going to have one America and one citizenship or whether we were going to have two Americas; whether we were going to have the America of the majority, the affluent majority, and the America of the poor; or whether we were going to have an America in which all Americans could feel that they were a part of this great community, that they were included in, and that hope could come to reality.

Now this nation has to make an historic choice, either make social and economic opportunity for all a reality, or watch the gap between the rich and the poor, between the employed and the unemployed, between the sheltered and the unsheltered, between the educated and the uneducated, grow ever wider, until it threatens our national growth, health, and well-being.

And if that gap does continue to expand, America will be at war with itself, and be in such a state of crisis that all of our hopes and aspirations will be lost.

Many of today's participants in this great American society are already too old to acquire what you would term a full educational credential. They are not going to go back to high school or grade school. They are of another generation. Therefore, they need temporary passes, so to speak, new skills; job training—and that is a very, very difficult assignment.

NEED FOR MOTIVATION, TRAINING, AND SKILL

They need, in other words, the kind of a program that offers them an opportunity for a diploma—not a diploma from your high school or your college, but in a sense a program of motivation; of training; of skill that gives them the key to opportunity to make something out of their lives.

There are a large number of these people, and we would not have to be talking about them today if our system thus far had been successful. There are twelve and a half million who have been passed by in America. That is a large number. And over fifty per cent of that twelve and a half million are under eighteen years of age. Many of them will be amongst the almost one million school dropouts this year.

We have to ask ourselves, and we ought to ask the school board, are the students dropping out, or has the school left them? There is possibly an interplay here. And there will be, if we continue at the rate of school dropouts in this decade, eight million who will fall by the wayside in our school system. Eight million who ought to have a rich educational experience.

Now it is these poor children who present the great challenge to the entire nation, and, indeed, to the American educational establishment today. These are the ones that we need to concentrate our attention upon.

PROVIDING FOR THOSE WHO HAVE TOO LITTLE

You know, Franklin Roosevelt said one time what I believe to be the guiding philosophy for this country in its present effort, and I can only paraphrase here, but he said, "It is not the purpose of government to help those more who already have too much. It is the duty of government to help provide enough for those people who already have too little."

In other words, our efforts need to be, in a sense, targeted on those who have been left by the side of the road, that are not fully involved in what you and I are seeking to do in our life.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MEANS AVAILABILITY OF JOBS

Can we bring this group into the large, prosperous American society with full educational credentials?—which is just another way of saying, can we bring them into the pattern of opportunity?

If there is one word that I feel that ought to characterize our efforts these days; it is the word "opportunity."

I spent a long time in public life fighting for what we call equal opportunity, I have spent a great deal of time in the field of civil rights, trying to get a fair employment practices law. But I ask you, what good does it do to have non-discrimination in employment, number one, if there are no jobs? And what good does it do to have non-discrimination in employment if you are not employable?

The legal rights are not enough.

And this is where the educator comes in. Here is where we come in. We have to help equip the individual so that he can have these legal rights mean something in his life—not just a theory of law, but a way of life itself. This is the challenge which requires the maximum use of every educational resource that we can bring to bear on the whole spectrum of educational needs.

Training—training—training in everything from personal hygiene and basic skills to highly specialized research on social problems.

REACHING OUT FOR DISADVANTAGED

And it also means something else. It means reaching out. It is not good enough just to open up the schools. It is not good enough just to say you are going to have job training. Ladies and gentlemen, I can tell you from this platform today that we have job training positions open in America today fully funded by the federal government, unused—unfilled.

I spend almost every hour of my life working on these matters. Let me put it this way: In a community in which there may be two thousand job training positions, where we seek to open up job training for two thousand hard core unemployed, half of them go empty.

Why?

Because we have opened up job training but that is not enough. People that have been rejected for a century—some of them,

or their families, are not going to believe that the gates of opportunity are open, just because you say they are. You have to reach out and find them, and I have said to government officials and private individuals, if we are half as ingenious in finding ways to extend the hand of friendship and fellowship and hopefulness to others as we were in denying them that hand of fellowship, we will make a lot of progress.

WE MUST BEGIN AT 18 MONTHS

Yes, what I am talking about means reaching out to children's children whose backgrounds of cultural degradation and economic poverty provide no motivation for them. It means reaching them young enough to counteract the lifelong mental stigma of poverty and rejection, of prejudice and discrimination, which begins to be acquired at about eighteen months of age, not eighteen years but eighteen months.

It means making education more than initiation rite to fraternity, or a lodge—an initiation rite required for entrance into the prosperous society of the majority.

EDUCATION A BRIDGE FROM POVERTY TO PROSPERITY

It means making education a bridge with one end that is firmly planted in the culture of prosperity, and it means making that bridge strong enough to be worth crossing; and it means helping people to cross that bridge, and to find a new life.

I think it is fair to say that we have made a remarkable start towards building that bridge, and here are some of its parts.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS HELP BUILD THE BRIDGE

Project Headstart—Project Headstart has already prepared two million pre-schoolers for what we hope will be a successful contribution to the educational experience. I think it needs to be a year-around, continuing program; and you know it.

Through Project Headstart, we cannot only help the lives of little ones; help make their lives better, but we find the parent; we reach back into the community; we follow the child back to the source of the trouble; and if we have any sense of decency at all we will do something about the conditions that exist in that area of trouble.

ACHIEVING FEDERAL AID A LONG STRUGGLE

Now the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is designed specifically to enable children from deprived backgrounds to benefit fully from regular schools. It is already operating in 17,500 school districts. It is already effective in the lives of eight and a half million people.

You know, we take all this for granted. It did not come easy. The first bill I voted on when I came to Washington in 1949, was to aid education.

We passed it in the Senate, and they killed it in the House. Two years later we passed it in the House, and they killed it in the Senate. It was a sort of suicide tennis game—homicide, I suppose I should say. Each year you had to determine who was going to kill it. You killed it either on the basis of race, religion, or region.

Whatever you may think about some of the things that may have been done, or should be done, I think that one of the greatest contributions to the welfare of this nation accomplished in the last four years under the leadership of the man who is President of the United States, is the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—no small accomplishment.

And two billion dollars goes into that program this year.

Oh, I heard somebody say, "That is not very much." But it is two billion dollars more than you had four years ago.

This is a very hard generation to satisfy—for sixteen years I stood side by side with people on this platform and fought for Federal Aid to Education; introduced the Federal Aid to Education bill.

PROJECT UPWARD BOUND

Let's take a look at another project, Project Upward Bound, a Headstart Program for prospective college students.

I have been visiting these young people. The program does not make many headlines. These are the young folks that have potential for something great, and something bad. These are the kinds that could go wrong, or could go to higher achievement.

I have been in college after college across this country and I want to tell you something—unless somebody stands up you would never know they were there; and I always hope somebody will, because then at least they know you are in town.

We have today thousands, 32,000 young Americans in Project Upward Bound, in over 200 colleges across this land—32,000 young people that are being found; 32,000 that are going on to college; 32,000 whose lives are going to mean something.

I wish it were three hundred thousand, but it is 32,000 more than you had two and a half or three years ago.

BUILDING AFT TOOK TIME

You did not get your good collective bargaining agreement all at once. You did not build the AFT that way. I was around building the AFT 27 years ago, and it wasn't anything like this, I'll tell you that. It takes a lot of doing, and it takes more than just dues paid.

And there is the President's Council on Youth Opportunity. I happen to be Chairman of that. I like my work. That program has sponsored summer enrichment programs in cities throughout the country; and we have the finest program that we have ever had. It is not good enough, but it is better than it was last year; three times better than it was the year before; and the year before that there was not any. So I have been in this from the beginning.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

We have a massive summer employment program this year. We found jobs under this program for a million, two hundred thousand needy youth. For the first time, we have cut into the teenage unemployment. Despite the fact that there were five hundred thousand more teenagers in the labor market, we have reduced the number of teenage unemployed. For the first time!

I know we have not done it well enough, but we have done it a whole lot better than our critics, because they did not do anything.

We are now embarking on what we call a nationwide back-to-school-stay-in-school campaign, designed to combat the dropout problem.

These are unprecedented programs, and you have cooperated with them. We work with your people.

The program is designed to catch as many of the disadvantaged young people as possible right now, wherever they are in their education; and to enable them to gain as much as possible from their remaining years of school. We just refuse to sign off anyone. We think that there is hope in every one of these young people, and it is our job to reach out to them.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS SUPPLEMENT LOCAL PROGRAMS

These programs are designed to supplement creative programs undertaken at the local level. They are over and above the regular education program. They are the sort of thing that this document, this remarkable address that I spoke of, incorporated in its thinking. And they are designed to give you, the dedicated professional teacher, the tools that you need to extend the challenge, the excitement, the pleasure, and the benefits of a good education to every American child.

AFT—FOR GOOD EDUCATION FOR ALL

I want the public to know that is what the American Federation of Teachers stands for—a good, wholesome, enriched education for every American child regardless of what it may cost the American public.

Various teachers federations have been prominent in the news lately because of your organizing and collective bargaining efforts. Well, let me just say a word about that.

First of all, there is nothing wrong with it. It is part of the American scene.

AFT COLLECTIVE BARGAINING TO IMPROVE EDUCATION

Collective bargaining, is, after all a process to achieve more than just higher salaries for teachers, even though higher salaries are needed if you are going to have teachers.

Teachers in this great organization are bargaining for the improvement not only of salaries, but the quality of education. I know what the teachers from my state are fighting for. I have been with some of them for years.

What you ought to do is what you ought to do whether people like it or not. They may come around a little bit later and like it. You cannot tell.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING TO DO AN EFFECTIVE JOB

In reference to your work, teachers are really bargaining for the rights and the tools to do effectively what is the overall job of public education, to transmit history to our youth, and to inspire creative thinking about the future, of our society, so that society and civilization can continue.

You can find a lot of this kind of philosophy in what John Dewey used to write, but you do not even need to read John Dewey. You know that you cannot really motivate young people with teachers that are not motivated.

You know you cannot really bring an enriched educational experience to young people today unless you have the facilities; the tools; the books—all of the teaching methods and machines and apparatus that is required to make education what it ought to be in the last third of the 20th Century. That is what you are fighting for. And I regret that this story does not seem to get to the people.

Every time I read about my friends of the AFT, it appears to the public that you seem to be fighting is just for yourselves.

Well, let the Vice-President of the United States, put it on the record that had not some of our teachers stood up and fought for what they believed was right, the educational system of this country would not be half what it is today. (Applause)

TEACHER POWER

I read a great deal these days about student power. There has never been any lack of it as long as I remember. I can remember it back a few years. I am not sure that it always holds in one direction, but there is plenty of power.

What you really need is a little teacher power.

Who knows better—who knows better what ought to go on in a classroom?

Who knows better about young people than those who work with them and live with them?

Who knows better about the kind of teaching tools that work?

Who knows better what the purpose of education is than a trained teacher?

Well, what I am talking about is what the Federal Government is trying to help you do in some of these programs; trying to make these all-important educational credentials available to the poor youngster.

AFT'S MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM

And these federal programs are and must be supported by a vast number of local and private interests. I think the AFT's Effective Schools Plan is outstanding amongst these

splendid local and private efforts that can help our educational system.

Mark my words, this massive effort we are speaking of will pay dividends long before many other investments. But even if you have to wait a few years, it is too long when it is counted in lives wasted because of inadequate education.

At this time of acute crisis—and it is a crisis—we have to ask ourselves, are we doing as much as we can right now with what we have, to concentrate our existing educational resources on the needs of the poor child in America?

The answer is, "No"—we can do much more.

I believe that the obvious place to start is in extending our educational programs right through the summer months.

SUMMER PROGRAM IN SCHOOLS

I do not mean for you to work for nothing.

Well, teachers are entitled to be paid for the services they perform. So, when I speak of a full year's school program I do not mean that you are paid for nine months and you contribute three to the Community Chest; and I do not mean that the 12-month program was exactly the same as it was when you started in September.

You have programs that are related to needs and seasons. The 12-month school year has been adopted tentatively in some communities under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and it works; and in the context of our present needs the nine-month school year is an unacceptable anachronism. It is as out-of-date as a kerosene lamp in a public utility.

It was related to the harvest season. Only six percent of the population is rural now, living on farms. A century ago the school year lasted 78 days. Now it averages 162 days. I think it is time to add another ninety days. At least in those neighborhoods where the school offers the only wholesome, positive influence in the bleak and poverty-ridden lives of thousands of American youngsters.

What right do you have to padlock a school playground; to close a swimming pool; to close off the auditorium when it is owned and paid for by the public?

I could give you another tip. There is more school vandalism on closed schools than there is on open schools. Disadvantaged children, you know, are disadvantaged all year; not just for nine months. They don't have a rich daddy and mama, or even a semi-prosperous one that can send them off to summer camp or make it nice and pleasant out at the country club, or in a comfortable suburban area. They need your help all year, and not all year except during the worst months, the hot, explosive summer months.

SUMMER OPPORTUNITY CENTERS

Now don't misunderstand me. I am not talking about correctional summer schools, designed to punish and prod those who did not do their homework during the year. And I am not talking about merely an extension of the regular classroom activities. I am talking about something much more than simply an extension of the regular classroom activities.

I am talking about turning our schools into summer enrichment centers; opportunity centers for the development of human resources.

Summer is a time of growth. It is a time when plants and flowers and shrubbery grow. It is the period of life, and it should be a time of experimentation for expanding the experiences of the individual child.

It should provide special opportunities in art; in music; in drama; opportunities for exploration; for reading; for developing individual capacities. It should be a time for camping; for trips; for new horizons.

It should be a time for learning, to even swim; for games and playing.

Does this sound like the summers that you remember from your childhood?

I think some of us remember that. This is close to what I mean.

If people say, "What is your target?"—something like you have experienced.

But keep in mind that the slum child of today does not look forward to this kind of a summer, and he does not remember it, nor do his parents, because they never had it. He looks forward to three months of days on the hot pavement; three months of standing around on the corner; three months of nights in a stifling rat-infested apartment or tenement. Three months of idleness; impatience, and frustration.

AMERICANS SHOULD VISIT SLUMS

And if the people of this country do not know it, let them go and see their own country. If you want to do something in your town that will help it, when you go back, go to the mayor or one of the city officials and say, "Let's us organize a little tour through the slums, and let's get everybody in this town to go take a look at it."

I don't think the American people are calloused and sinful. They just don't know. We have people talking all the time about China, and Asia, and Africa, and they haven't even been across the tracks in their own home town.

And some of my friends here from Minnesota, you know I used to say that very thing when I was Mayor of Minneapolis. I'd go down in the south of Minneapolis and speak to a young people's group, and they would want to talk about China.

I'd say, "That's good; let's talk about China." I did not know very much about it, so I could talk a great deal about it. We'd talk about China. I'd say, "How many of you have been on the other side of Holecombe Boulevard?"—which was in the other direction, about a mile and a half; mighty few had. I'd have a group of a hundred youngsters, and one hand would go up.

I would say, "You are trying to talk about China, which is 8000 miles away, and you haven't even been visiting a part of your city which is a mile and a half away. Why don't you go up and find out what they are doing?"

OUR BEST SCHOOLS SHOULD BE IN THE SLUMS

Isn't it a fact, that the best schools, with the highest paid teachers, with the most up-to-date audio-visual machines, finest equipment, are generally to be found in the newest areas of the city, where the well-to-do people live? Where they have the extra-curricular activities; the orchestra; and where they have all sorts of student activities; and where they buy the band instruments; and where they have school concerts?

And where are the worst schools?

The best schools in America ought to be where the people need them the most. That is the way you make progress. That is the way you get on top of this.

SLUM CHILDREN NEED NEW EXPERIENCE

This boy or girl's experience that I talked about, this slum child, his opportunities for experimentation and explorations, they are not happy. They are not art and music. They are limited to the vices of the street. They are not camping.

His experiences, too, remember, may well include a run-in with the law.

Summer Opportunity Centers—that is what I want to call our schools. I think after that nine months period is over of regular schooling, we ought to change the sign and say Youth Opportunity Center; put it right up there. Let the kids know that we care.

They should provide a comprehensive package of experiences, especially designed to meet the needs of these disadvantaged children; to bring them up; to help them see the other part of the life that this nation lives.

Let me give you some ideas of what is available in this great Summer Opportunity Program. I have been into more slum areas in America in the last year than I think almost any public official in this country because I travel around this country. I have been in forty-two of the fifty states; and I go into the backwash areas.

I have been out to see and not just hear about these.

SUMMER OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Here is what these young people could have in these Enrichment or Opportunity Centers—remedial courses for those who need them in English and other fields, the mastery of which is a prerequisite for success in regular schooling in other subjects.

They could have cultural programs; museums tours; and trips designed to broaden cultural horizons. There could be emphasis on jobs preparation which would include visits to factories; talks with union leaders; business leaders; and other contacts designed to present realistic but interesting employment horizons.

I know of one program where they have taken hard core kids and put them out on this big earthmoving equipment, and the first thing that a kid asks when he sees these great machines is, "How much do you make?"

LEARNING FOR HIGHER PAY

And when the driver says he gets six dollars an hour, or eight dollars an hour, or five dollars an hour, or whatever the pay is, the kid says, "Gee, I sure like that!"

And if you have your program worked out right, the fellow that is driving that piece of equipment says "Well, I'll tell you what; if you get back to school they can get you in a program; we can put you on one of these machines, and we can teach you how to operate one of these machines. And if you can get a good reference from your teacher, we can get you a job on one of these machines."

The teacher is the enemy at that point. That kid needs that teacher like he needs his mother. He knows the only way he is going to get the six dollars an hour, five, or four, or whatever the wage is, if the teacher says the boy has done well. So the teacher becomes an ally instead of an enemy. This works; I have seen it work.

But you have got to bring this child in contact with reality, not just talk theory. He most likely is not going on to Harvard. He possibly is going to try to get enough experience and training, and hopefully a high school diploma, because he has been told he needs it in order to get some place, and he wants to come in contact with the life that is going to be his.

These Opportunity Centers should permit contact with local civic leaders; political leaders; welfare administrative and indeed police authorities, designed to give participants a sense of how their communities operate.

And they can have science discovery centers; shop courses; home economics work; work study programs for adults, which enable them to earn a living while gaining experience. And some camping for every child; special camps for those in need of special attention.

The organized sports program: Do you know what I am talking about?

What we are trying to do is this; this is not theory. We are working at it. I worked on it yesterday. I worked at it last night. I have contacted across this country over a hundred of the top mayors of the hundred largest cities, working with business, labor, and church leaders and teachers to get this Youth Opportunity Program going.

Oh, we've had some wonderful experiences. In Chicago, last year, a group of Chicago

students participated in a work study program designed to raise the level of their opportunities and initiative. They manufactured and marketed their own handicraft, products; aid their own way, with advice and assistance from the local business community and schools.

Some 200 New Orleans' children from Spanish-speaking background underwent an intensive six-week course in English, using everything from puppets to modern electronic equipment. And they improved their language capability immeasurably. They also studied American political institutions, and their Spanish cultural heritage.

NEED TO TEACH NEGRO HISTORY

You know, I read in the paper the other day that some of the advocates of Black Power said that we ought to teach Negro history in the schools. You ought to teach that; that is a part of the history of America. We ought to know about it. You do not need to get that kind of advice from so-called power movements. That is not necessary. We ought to be teaching labor history in our schools.

Most people are wage earners. They ought to know what the labor movement has meant too. Frankly, a lot of the young people joining the labor movement do not know what it means. All they know is it means the initiation fee and dues. They do not know how this labor movement was built. They do not know the sacrifices of the early leaders, of the trouble they had to go through, and indeed may I say of the brutal beatings that many of them had to take.

They need to know this history.

Well now, these are just a couple of examples. So there are lots of things we can do.

One of the reasons that the summer is so desirable for all of this—space is more available; the weather is better for field trips; there is a warm and informal relationship between the teacher and pupil; and what's more important is you're trying to fail somebody. You are trying to edge them along.

Then I know the inevitable question—what will it cost?

Well, there are two ways of analyzing. What will it cost if you do not do it? That is one way.

And what will it cost?

WE CAN USE SCHOOLS IN SUMMER

Well, it is not prohibitive. The estimates I have seen, and we are making full evaluation of that, and will be able to report to you more accurately by this December, is about $40.00 per child.

I have been around, and I want to say that I used to tell some of my friends back home when they were a little angry because we had to raise the tax a little bit to get our school system a little better I'd say, "Now look, my dear friends, you spend enough up at the club drinking those martinis, protesting what I am trying to do, to pay for your share of that plan."

I don't like to be misunderstood. Many of you know I often speak of my father. He was my best teacher. My daddy never ever told me what time to go to bed. He never lectured me on that. He just was the best getterupper in the county. I never told the folks that they shouldn't be up to the club. I just said, "Fellows, if you can spend all that time grousing, griping, and planning how you're going to kill it off, go ahead and have your martinis, but get ready to back the kids because we're going to put the program through. You're going to have to pay for it."

That is what you have to tell the people.

The cost of such programs are modest. The equipment does not need to be large. The schools are there. The school buses are there, and if they're not ask your local bus company to help. Ask and it shall be given. Seek and ye shall find.

I go around the City of Washington. When we asked to put in playgrounds. They did not have any lights in these playgrounds a year ago. We had 132, and 18 were illuminated. We have 137 now, and 122 are illuminated. We did it.

And if you need some extra buses call the National Guard. They can provide buses, too. I've got it cleared with them.

The libraries are there. The laboratories are there. The museums are there. The gymnasiums are there. And we are opening up National Guard armories for young people today for use as gymnasiums; we use their equipment.

The Fire Department in Chicago opened the Navy Pier facility, and they had 7,000 kids a year into the Navy Pier gymnasium. It was sitting there idle. There is a lot of equipment around.

We have camps, one right out here at Camp Roosevelt.

Camp Roosevelt, the oldest Boy Scout Camp in this area. They were going to close it up. We kept it open. We raised the ninety thousand dollars it took to rehabilitate that Camp. We raised it, and we are putting into that Camp 1700 kids that have never been to camp in their life.

Right now as I speak to you one of the great big camps out near Watts, Camp Roberts, is being opened for thousands of kids from the Watts Area.

It can be done if you want to do it. But you can roll over and die, too. I tell you I let other people talk about dying conditions; I am for living conditions. (Applause.)

LET THE PUBLIC KNOW WHAT AFT STANDS FOR

I appeal to you to go home to your respective communities and let people know what this organization stands for, because what you stand for is what your country stands for.

You stand for opportunity. You stand for the enrichment of our society. You stand for helping those who need help. You stand for giving people the opportunity to gain self-respect, human dignity.

That is what educators are all about. That is what the AFT is about. That is what the Labor Movement is about.

I have been proud to be associated with the Labor Movement.

When I look back over the history of the United States, who was the first to champion the cost of public education—American Labor. (Applause)

AMERICAN LABOR FOR BETTER EDUCATION

Who was the first to come to the Congress of the United States and back aid to education—American Labor.

Who was the first that said if you want to have good teachers, you are going to have to treat them as professionals and pay them as professionals—American Labor.

Who was the first to say that if you really want a good educational system you have to provide a good educational environment, meaning the total facilities—American Labor.

So we're on the same ball team. Occasionally, once in awhile, we may have somebody in the bleachers that doesn't think so; but we are.

And I want to congratulate this illustrious President of yours. I want to thank each and every one of you for your work in behalf of a better America.

I want to thank you for what you are trying to do to give every person a chance.

As Thomas Wolff, that old depression poet put it, give every man his chance; his right to live; his right to work; his right to be himself.

To every man, his chance to become whatever his manhood or his vision can make of him.

To every man his chance—this is the promise of America.

Thank you very much.