regrettably wide. But I take pride in saying that, in our case, the reforms were implemented with considerable success almost from the start, sweeping the small power-elite from domination and speeding Iran on the road to membership with the more advanced industrial nations.

Along with success in social reforms, there have been phenomental gains in the implementation of our development programs. In 1965, the Gross National Product in Iran rose by 11.9%, and, in 1966, by 9.5%—in both cases one of the highest in the world. Last year industrial investment rose by 16%. Whereas, in 1953, our total imports amounted to only $115-million, in 1966 it reached almost one billion.

The prosperity and stability thus gained, coupled with fantastic potentials, have gone a long way to attracting a great inflow of tourists and of foreign capital to Iran.

For all this the Iranian nation owes a debt of gratitude to the initiative and farsightedness of its dynamic leader. His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran, who declared a long time ago that to reign over a land beset with poverty and illiteracy is no source of pride or satisfaction. The Shahanshah set the revolutionary goals before the nation in the national referendum of January 26, 1963. Said he, and I quote:

"We set ourselves to accomplish far-reaching social reforms, economic reconstruction commensurate with democratic ideals, development of education, international cooperation and respect for moral beliefs, as well as individual and social freedom."

The revolution can now be examined not simply for the goals promised in the first flush of enthusiasm, but for what has actually been accomplished. The present Exhibit is thus brought to you not only to illustrate seventy centuries of Iran's history, rich heritage and culture, but also to portray her achievements of the past decade. The work ahead is still vast, allowing for no complacency; but what has been accomplished is most encouraging and, to all of us, highly rewarding.

Before concluding, I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Regents and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, as well as to the distinguished President and members of the Board of Directors of the Iran-American Society, for their kindness in arranging the Exhibit and for their wholehearted support and invaluable contribution toward better understanding and closer cultural ties between Iran and the United States.

I now take pleasure in inviting you all to view the Exhibit.

Mr. Speaker, His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran is respected and admired not only by his countrymen, but the entire world and is a beacon of light in the Middle East.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength.—Isaiah 40: 31.

Our Father in heaven and on earth, we, the representatives of the people of our land, bow before Thee humbly praying for strength, for guidance, and for good will from Thee. Make this a sacred moment in which we become aware of Thy presence, a moment when strength is given, guidance provided, and good will arises anew within us.

We need Thee, every hour we need Thee. We hurry too much, we eat too fast, we sleep too little, and then wonder why we are weary and worried and worn out. As we wait upon Thee renew our strength, restore our spirits, reinvigorate our minds, that this day we may think good thoughts, make wise decisions, and do it all free from tension and filled with faith. Trusting in Thee, may we sing even in the rain. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana the program for the remainder of this week and the agenda for next.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. In response to the request of the distinguished minority leader, the program for today has previously been announced, as the Members know, as the bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921.

Upon conclusion of the consideration of that legislation the House will adjourn until Monday next, permission having been granted on yesterday, upon the request of the majority leader.

On Monday we have a very heavy calendar and, I might say, we have had very heavy legislative business on Mondays for the past month or so. On Monday we will have the Consent Calendar.

There are seven suspensions scheduled:

H.R. 4903, to provide for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands;

S. 223, to authorize the disposal of Government-owned long-lines communications facilities in the State of Alaska;

H.R. 5943, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 9796, to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence;

H.R. 4772, to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct initiation of allotments of pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 11767, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust legislative jurisdiction of the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.; and

H.R. 12910, to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy.

On Tuesday and Wednesday: Tuesday is Private Calendar day; to be followed by House Joint Resolution 853, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968; S. 676, obstruction of criminal investigations, to be considered under open rule, with 1 hour of debate; and H.R. 1411, false representations by mail, also with an open rule and 1 hour to debate.

On Thursday and Friday of next week there are Jewish holidays, and we have not scheduled any business for those 2 days.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman from Louisiana, the acting majority leader, think we will get the conference report on the public works bill next week?

Mr. BOGGS. I think so. I think the conference report has been agreed to. Of course, that is the military construction conference report. I do not know about the public works bill generally. As the gentleman knows, however, conference reports are always in order.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

L. T. "TEX" EASLEY RETIRING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, after 30 years of service with the Associated Press, L. T. "Tex" Easley is retiring. During my years here in Washington, I have come to know Tex and his lovely wife, Bonita, as neighbors and friends, as well as by my association with him here on Capitol Hill.

Tex embodies the very highest moral and ethical standards and is an outstanding example of a responsible reporter.

While I am aware that his "retirement" will consist of hard work, I wish him every success in his new endeavor and look forward to many more years of pleasant association with him.

GOV. FARRIS BRYANT LEAVING OEP

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES, Mr. Speaker, Farris Bryant, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, is going home to Florida. For 18 months he has rendered distinguished service as one of the strong forces in the Executive Office of the President. Those of us who have known Farris through the years, and watched his dedicated work in the Florida Legislature, followed by his outstanding services as Governor of our State, expected no less than an equally outstanding performance in Washington.

Governor Bryant is a man who has a deep faith in the vitality of America's legislative processes and a dedication to the principles of constitutional government. He leaves Washington to return to his professional and business interests with increased stature and with a wider circle of friends who admire his qualities and contributions.

SUPPORTING THE MARINES IN CONTHIEN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today over a battalion of our Marines are under attack on three sides on the Conthien Salient. I strongly urge that the strength of the United States be placed behind these men who for days have undergone heavy, unrelenting, incessant bombardment and vicious attacks.

Such action as is necessary to save every life possible must be taken. While I do not support the policy which placed our men there, I do and will continue to support them.

The seriousness of the situation in the I Corps area is such as to require immediate action and our fervent, heartfelt prayers.

M-16 RIFLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I received direct firsthand confirmation of some additional sorry facts about the M-16 rifle mess in Vietnam.

First, hard-pressed marines in the thick of fighting still did not have guns retrofitted with the new buffer assembly as of September 16.

Early in August the Congress was told by Defense officials that a sufficient supply of the new parts had been produced to equip all guns in combat service. Manufacture of the buffer assemblies had begun last December, when it was clear that ball-type ammunition still used in the M-16's causes such an increase in rate of fire as to result in frequent gun failure.

In my view, failure of the Defense Department to retrofit all M-16 rifles in combat service long ago is absolutely scandalous. Because of this failure marines in Vietnam go into combat duty without dependable rifles.

Second, these same hard-pressed marines, then serving on Hill 52 in Vietnam, were ordered to lie about the performance of the M-16 rifle when an official inspection team believed to have included several Congressmen, visited the area in early June of this year.

All of them felt compelled to follow orders and did actually lie, telling the inspectors the gun worked fine even after it had been fired for several thousand rounds. Actually, in at least one case, a marine had been able to get less than 300 rounds through the gun and the experience of others had been even worse.

Congress should probe deeply enough to fix precisely the blame for the orders to lie, and for the failure to get all combat weapons retrofitted promptly.

This is an unconscionable outrage, and some heads should roll.

WHAT IS SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE IS SAUCE FOR THE GANDER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I read in the press that the University of Virginia had asked the Prime Minister of Rhodesia to come there to make a speech, and it was suggested that he would not be granted a visa. I have taken this matter up with the State Department. I do not necessarily agree with the Prime Minister of Rhodesia on his position, but I do think he has a right to express his opinion. I have told the State Department that if they do not give him a visa, I would like to have them come before my subcommittee and explain why they would give a passport to Stokely Carmichael but not a visa to Ian Smith.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 286]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Belcher
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Brademas
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Fla.
Bush
Button
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Corman
Cowger
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dulski
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Eshleman
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fino
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gilbert
Goodell
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gurney
Hagan
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hammer-schmidt
Hanna
Harrison
Harvey
Hathaway
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Holland
Hosmer
Ichord
Jacobs
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kazen
Keith
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Lennon
Long, La.
McCarthy
McCulloch
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mathias, Md.
Meskill
Michel
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Ottinger
Pike
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pucinski
Quillen
Rarick
Rees
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Sandman
St Germain
Schadeberg
Scherle
Selden
Shriver
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Utt
Waggonner
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Zion
Zwach

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 247 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ATTENDANCE IN THE HOUSE ON FRIDAYS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that several days ago 28 Members of the House of Representatives addressed a letter to the Speaker complaining about the fact that we do not have business on Fridays. I think today's rollcall will indicate that almost one-half the men who signed this letter addressed to the Speaker are not present today. I think something ought to be done about it.

Of the 28 signers of this letter urging Friday and Saturday sessions, the following 12 are absent today: Hon. WILLIAM O. COWGER, Hon. DAN KUYKENDALL, Hon. GEORGE BUSH, Hon. EDWARD BIESTER, Hon. JOHN ZWACH, Hon. BOB PRICE, Hon. CHARLES SANDMAN, Hon. ROGER ZION, Hon.

MARGARET HECKLER, Hon. CHARLES WHALEN, Hon. SAM STEIGER, and Hon. CHALMERS WYLIE.

If the House of Representatives' records are further checked, they will reveal that several of the signers of this letter have among the worst attendance records in the Congress.

AMENDMENT OF PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 921 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 921

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10673) to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 921 provides for a 1 hour open rule, making in order consideration of H.R. 10673, to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended.

To the best of my knowledge there is no opposition whatsoever to the rule and very little, if any, to the legislation itself.

I therefore reserve the remainder of of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Missouri.

This resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of debate. The purposes of the bill are: First, to make clear that a stockyard owner has the responsibility and right to manage his stockyard in a just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory manner; second, to require persons operating at the stockyard to conduct their operations in a manner which will foster, preserve, and insure an efficient, competitive public market. The bill expressly provides that no person can engage in business at the stockyard as a market agency or a dealer unless the stockyard owner has determined that his services will be beneficial to the business and welfare of the stockyard and its patrons and customers. It would relieve the stockyard owner or market agency of a duty to furnish stockyard services to all persons upon reasonable request without discrimination, but would provide that all stockyard services furnished pursuant to reasonable request at a stockyard must be reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

The Packers and Stockyards Act was encated in 1921 in response to flagrant and deceptive practices in the livestock and meat industries, including the monopolistic control of livestock marketing facilities through ownership and control of the facilities by several large packing firms. The Congress passed the act, setting up a system of regulation, based on the principle that the major terminal stockyards were monopolies and should be treated as "great national public utilities" whose existence and function was essential to the flow of commerce.

However, major changes have taken place in the livestock industry since the enactment of the Packers and Stockyards Act: First, the terminal markets—where livestock is sold after negotiations between commission sellers and buyers, and the stockyard owner provides the facilities and certain services, and the actual selling is done by the commission sellers—are no longer in a monopolistic position because they are surrounded by 2,200 auction markets and thousands of packer and dealer buying stations; second, today most of the packing plants are located throughout the country areas away from the terminal markets. In these circumstances, it is necessary that stockyard owners exercise such management and control over their stockyards and the persons operating thereon that they are able to preserve and maintain an efficient, competitive market.

This bill applies to terminal stockyards and auction markets. The question of stockyard owners' rights, however, has arisen primarily at terminal markets. At an auction market there is no question about the right of the auction operator to manage and regulate the market.

The need for the terminal stockyard owner to have clearcut authority to manage the stockyard arises from the fact that the stockyard owner provides the facilities, while the actual selling is done by the commission firms. Some stockyard owners have investments exceeding $15 million. The commission firms at a terminal market are, in effect, the selling arm of the stockyard. The stockyard company's existence is dependent upon the ability of the commission firms at the stockyards to obtain consignments to the market. If the firms at the stockyard do not support the market, and the stockyard owner has no control over this matter, the stockyard owner can be forced to close his business.

Most market agencies selling livestock at terminal stockyards conduct their activities in a manner which will foster, preserve, and insure an efficient, competitive public market. Others, however, engage in practices which are not in the best interests of the market or patrons of the market.

Also, some commission firms engaged in business at terminal stockyards exert more effort in getting shippers and buyers to bypass the stockyards than they exert in getting business to be handled at the stockyards.

The Department of Agriculture believes that the enactment of the proposed legislation with the amendments proposed will clarify and extend the authority of stockyard owners in a manner which will be beneficial to the livestock industry, while preserving the right of the Secretary to prevent an abuse of such authority.

The enactment of this proposed bill would not require any additional funds for its enforcement.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10673) to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10673, with Mr. BROOKS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, if there are any questions with respect to this measure, I am sure that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], or I or any one of the members of the committee present, will be glad to answer them.

Mr. Chairman, the primary purpose of this bill is to make clear that a stockyard owner has the responsibility and right to manage his stockyard in a just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory manner, and to require persons operating at the stockyard to conduct their operation in a manner which will foster, preserve, and insure an efficient and competitive market. It preserves to the Secretary of Agriculture the right to prevent any abuse of authority by the stockyard with respect to the exercise of any of the rights that this bill gives.

This bill relieves the stockyard owner or market agency of a duty to furnish stockyard services to all persons merely because they request such services. This is a change to the present law, and is necessitated as part of the attempt here to get away from the outdated concept that these terminal stockyards are "great national public utilities." This bill provides that no person can engage in business at a stockyard as a market agency or a dealer unless first, the stockyard owner has determined that his services will be beneficial to the business and welfare of the stockyard and its patrons and customers, and second, that this de-

termination is not unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory.

Mr. Chairman, the purposes of this bill, and the necessity for its passage, can best be understood in terms of the effect of the changing times on this vital industry.

Fifty years ago, the great terminal markets existed in an attitude of near monopoly. There were abuses of power by several large packing firms. The abuses included the monopolistic control of livestock marketing facilities. In response to these and other flagrant and deceptive practices, Congress passed the present Packers and Stockyards Act, which declared that the major terminal stockyards were monopolies and should be treated as "great national public utilities."

A terminal market sells livestock by negotiation between commission sellers and buyers. The stockyards owner provides the facilities and certain services, and the actual selling is done by the commission sellers. This type of operation is different from auction stockyards, where one person or firm operates the facilities selling livestock at public auction to the highest bidder, although today many terminal markets also sell a considerable volume of livestock at auction on certain days of the week.

The passage of time has not treated these institutions kindly. From their former powerful position, the terminal markets have fallen far. Today these markets are surrounded by approximately 2,200 auction markets and thousands of packers and dealer buying stations. Today, packers buy substantially more livestock directly from producers or others than from terminal markets. The percentage of federally inspected slaughter cattle bought at terminal markets has declined from 91 percent in 1925 to 34 percent in 1965. During the same period, sales of slaughter hogs have dropped from 82 to 26 percent.

Mr. Chairman, successful operation of a terminal stockyard comes about from a blending of the facilities and certain services provided by a stockyard owner, and the actual selling of livestock, which is handled by commission firms. Customarily, the stockyard owner will provide free space to commission firms, and his income is dependent upon yardage charges collected upon the livestock sold by these commission firms. The commission firms are, in effect, the selling arm of the stockyard. The continued existence of the stockyard is dependent on the ability of the commission firms at the stockyards to obtain consignments to the market.

It is readily obvious, then, that the little business remaining to the terminal markets is seriously jeopardized by any unscrupulous practices in which commission firms might be engaged.

While the great majority of commission merchants are honest and reliable, testimony before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains of the House Committee on Agriculture revealed that some commission firms are actually exerting more effort to convince shippers and buyers to do business away from the stockyard than in getting business to be handled there.

In addition, some commission men do not properly represent the best interests of the shippers. They may have another occupation, which prevents them from giving their fullest effort toward sales in the stockyard. Firms such as these are often disinterested and/or inefficient, and these attitudes result in a poor reputation for the stockyard, as well as for other commission firms which deal there.

To prevent recurrence of the abuses I have mentioned, commission men at a stockyard have sometimes attempted to form themselves into livestock exchanges, which are organizations of commission men at a terminal market. In addition to the other values and benefits which accrue to such an organization, often enough the exchange will attempt to provide a source of regulations designed to foster better and more scrupulous practices at the market. However, because the membership in the exchange is only voluntary, control is gained only over those commission firms and individuals who choose to belong. The common interpretation of the present law is that the commission firm which chooses not to belong to the exchange is free to continue in any harmful practices it may choose without fear of regulation. Thus, these associations are virtually powerless to relieve this most obvious problem in the terminal markets, this situation is serious, indeed.

The logical answer to the problems would be to specifically alter the present Packers and Stockyards Act to give the terminal market owner the power to enforce reasonable restrictions designed to provide for more efficient marketing at his place of business, and to give a more binding effect upon any regulations adopted by the organizations of commission men who work at the stockyard.

This is the purpose of this legislation. This bill would provide the necessary power to the stockyard owner to regulate the matters I have been discussing. The stockyard owner would be authorized to regulate or refuse to furnish facilities and services to a firm which is not furthering the interests of the market, subject to the Secretary of Agriculture's supervision. The owner would also be authorized by the bill to regulate any other matter at the stockyard which is appropriate to foster, preserve, or insure an efficient, competitive public market, practices, for example, such as a centralized computerized bookkeeping and paying system would be allowed under this legislation. This could replace many separate accounting systems, thereby leading to reduced marketing cost.

Presently, stockyard owners are afraid to put such practices into operation, because the ability of the stockyard owner to regulate even these normal activities is open to question. There is a great degree of uncertainty as to whether or not these owners can take many actions that might normally appear appropriate to a businessman, without laying themselves open to money damages for exceeding their authority. The bill would provide reasonable guidelines which owner and commission agent alike could rely on in the conduct of their business.

There is broad general support for this bill. The Committee on Agriculture realized that the present law creates a hardship, not only for the stockyard owner and commission agent, but for the buyers and the livestock industry as a whole. Both my learned colleagues, the gracious gentlewoman from Washington, and myself were members of the National Commission on Food Marketing which unanimously recommended the enactment of clarifying legislation in this murky area. The Department of Agriculture also strongly favors the enactment of this bill.

Initially, there was some question as to whether or not this bill conflicted with the holding of the Supreme Court in *Denver Union Stockyard Company* v. *Producers Livestock Marketing Association* (356 U.S. 282), where the Court held that the present Packers and Stockyards Act does not permit a stockyard owner to prevent a commission man, engaged in his stockyard, from also engaging in business at another regulated stockyard. This is not the intent of the bill, but neither is there here any intent to broaden the scope of the Denver case beyond the limited scope set forth in the committee report.

Mr. Chairman, the stockyards of today are sad reflections of the thriving institution of half a century ago. The small percentage of livestock business that the terminal markets are now receiving has placed them in an economically vulnerable situation. Since 1921, the percentage of slaughter livestock being processed through these markets has been steadily declining, and the trend is expected to continue unless, and perhaps even if, we act favorably on this bill. There is no longer a need for regulation of the stockyards as monopolies and only Congress can provide the necessary surgery to give stockyard owners the reasonable right to mind their own businesses, commission merchants the right to seek compliance with reasonable regulations made by them for better conduct of their business, and the livestock industry the right to except reasonably efficient marketing practices which can achieve the best price to the buyer for his product.

Presently, should the owner of the stockyard attempt to make his stockyards more efficient in operation through regulation of the matters I have mentioned, he is treading in an area where liability and monetary damages can spring up against him at any moment. Serious questions of interpretation have not only "muddied the water" in this area, but have also rendered many stockyard owners simply afraid to act.

The Denver Stockyards case, which I mentioned previously, the Court said:

> We are told, however, that the economics of the business has changed, that while at the passage of the act most livestock purchases were at these stockyards, now a substantial portion, about 40 percent, it is said, takes place at private livestock markets such as feed yards and country points. * * * If the Packers and Stockyards Act does not fit the present economics of the business, a problem is presented for the Congress (p. 289).

Mr. Chairman, the present situation facing these terminal stockyards, as stated by the Supreme Court, represents a mandate on us to act. We must act now to avoid further hardship to this industry. The present Packers and Stockyards Act does not fit the present economics of the business.

In summation, then, passage of this bill is vitally needed. Its enactment would cost nothing. It has broad support. It is good legislation and was thoroughly examined. I urge its favorable consideration here.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10673, a bill to strengthen and clarify stockyard owners' rights and responsibilities with respect to the management of their stockyards.

The Packers and Stockyards Act, passed by Congress and enacted in 1921, set up a system of regulation of terminal livestock markets based on the principle that they were monopolies and should be treated as "great national public utilities." At that time, most of the livestock sold passed through these terminal markets, but today they are no longer in a monopolistic position. Auction markets and packer and dealer buying stations now receive most of the livestock sold.

For example, in 1925, nine out of 10 federally inspected slaughter cattle were bought at terminal markets, but, in 1965, the number had dropped to a little over three out of 10. The comparable decline in slaughter hogs has been from three out of four in 1925 to less than one out of four in 1965. For sheep, the decline has been from eight out of 10 in 1925 to about one out of four in 1965.

At these 50-some terminal markets, the stockyard owner provides the facilities, while the actual selling is done by commission firms. The stockyard owner furnishes free pen space to the commission firms, and the stockyard owner's revenue is dependent upon the yardage charges collected upon the livestock sold by these firms.

Testimony developed in hearings held before our Livestock and Grains Subcommittee in June revealed that some commission firms are actually using the free pen space and facilities provided to solicit business away from the stockyards. Sometimes it seems they work harder at getting business away from the stockyards than to them.

Not only is this practice unfair, but it decreases business at the stockyards and increases operating costs, making it more expensive to handle livestock there. This, in turn, is reflected in higher costs of livestock to the buyers and eventually to the consumers—while at the same time tending to lower the prices received by the producers.

The basic and fundamental thrust of the legislation before us today is to permit owners of these terminal market stockyards to issue regulations that would prohibit agencies using their free facilities from soliciting business for their competitors.

Mr. Chairman, this change seems altogether fair and reasonable. One of the witnesses testifying before our subcommittee made what seems to me an especially appropriate analogy. He said:

> We feel that frequently we are in the same position, let us say, as a depot, a train station down here where the airline puts a man in the lobby who contacts every potential customer who comes in to buy a railroad ticket and they say "We can fly you faster and cheaper and more comfortably—come out and do business with us." I do not think that the railroads would put up with that very long. I do not think that we should have to put with a comparable situation.

It is important to keep in mind that while the bill would make these needed changes with respect to the stockyard owners' right to manage his facility, it would also preserve to the Secretary of Agriculture the right under the Packers and Stockyards Act to prevent the abuse of authority by the owner. The basic regulatory authority under the Packers and Stockyards Act would remain unchanged.

Last year the National Commission on Food Marketing, of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] and I were members, filed its comprehensive report on the structure and performance of the Nation's food marketing system with the President and the Congress. In that report, we pointed out, and I am quoting:

> Generally, the stockyards section of the act is considered to be a valuable service to producers and the industry. However, changes in marketing methods for livestock have raised some questions about the restrictions the act puts upon the competitive strength of terminal markets.
>
> In the past few years, direct buying and auction markets have diverted substantial amounts of livestock from the terminal markets. Attempts by terminal owners to meet declining volumes by reducing the number of market agencies on the terminal have been met with the claim that the act requires the terminal to accept all who wish to stay. Although the question is unresolved, it seems clear that such a requirement would make it difficult for the terminal owner to adjust to economic change. The terminal markets' loss of almost complete control of livestock marketing may warrant a new look at regulations of terminal markets not imposed on other marketing channels.

On the basis of our investigation in this area, the Commission made this unanimous recommendation, and again I quote:

> Terminal markets for livestock are still the focal points of livestock trading in many areas, play an important role in all pricing, and are especially important sales outlets for smaller producers. In order that these markets have every opportunity to serve the changing needs of the livestock industry, and in view of increased competition from other marketing methods, the Packers and Stockyards Act should be administered, and if necessary amended, to give stockyard owners and marketing agencies the greatest flexibility and control over their operations consistent with protecting the interests of buyers and sellers.

I might just add that this was one of the few noncontroversial recommendations made by the Commission.

Our 18 months of study clearly demonstrated to the members of the Commission that legislation of the type before us today is necessary and justified by the major changes which have taken place in the livestock marketing industry, and especially in the terminal markets, since the passage of the original Packers and Stockyards Act 46 years ago in 1921.

I think it is also interesting to note that in one sense, the National Food Marketing Commission's recommendation is quite unique. This group was created by Congress, and established as an official governmental factfinding body—yet it has proposed in this instance a movement away from greater Federal control and toward allowing private enterprise more flexibility in management and decisionmaking. I hope this will be a contagious move.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this legislation is both necessary and desirable, and will have a beneficial effect upon the industry. I was one of those who originally introduced this bill, and it has strong bipartisan support in the Agriculture Committee, as evidenced by the final vote of approval—21 to 3.

I hope my colleagues here this afternoon will also give it their approval.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE] such time as he may consume.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the intent of this legislation and to ask certain questions of the distinguished gentleman from Texas who is the author of the bill and who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, which considered the bill and which conducted hearings thereon, and who is handling the bill today and, also, I would like to address this question to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee and who is handling the bill today for the minority.

I would ask the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington if she agrees that the testimony at the hearings by Deputy Assistant Secretary Rodney E. Leonard, of the Department of Agriculture, by Acting Administrator Donald A. Campbell of the Packers and Stockyards Administration, and also the testimony by President Bennett of the Union Stock Yards Corp. and President Jennings of the American Stockyards Association, and by all other witnesses, all established the fact that the Sioux City Livestock Exchange is a strong and vigorous association of commission men doing business at the Sioux City stockyards and who do a good job of policing their own members?

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAYNE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE] that this was certainly made clear by all witnesses. They testified to the effect that the Sioux City market is working well and that it is not experiencing any trouble. I think we might point out for the record that members of the Committee can find testimony to that effect in the hearings at page 17,

lines 4 and 5, which in my opinion is a very good quote. They also testified to the effect that as far as they were concerned they do not need this legislation in Sioux City. I further recall the fact that the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Mr. Leonard, testified that the relationships between the owner of the stockyards and the commission men at Sioux City have been good and that he did not believe this legislation would change that relationship significantly.

I might say that is on page 12, the last 10 lines of our hearing testimony.

Then President Jennings of the American Stockyards Association also testified to the very good job the commission firms are doing in the Sioux City Livestock Exchange, and also testified to the fact that they would not be affected at all by this bill.

Mr. MAYNE. I would like to inquire of the gentlewoman if it is also her intention, and the intention of the committee, that this bill should not change this present existing relationship at Sioux City, and should not affect the situation there?

Mrs. MAY. That is certainly my intention, and I believe it is the intention of the committee.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, if I might direct this question to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Judge PURCELL, who is the author of the bill, and floor manager of the bill, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill. I will ask the gentleman from Texas if he believes that this bill is aimed at the situation in Sioux City, and the other river markets?

Mr. PURCELL. I will say to the gentleman that the bill definitely is not aimed toward the situation in Sioux City, and I will assure the gentleman from Iowa that it is not the intention of the committee that the situation at Sioux City be changed by this bill in any way.

Mr. MAYNE. Does the gentleman agree with me, and also with the gentlewoman from Washington, that the testimony at the hearing was that the Sioux City Livestock Exchange is doing a good job of policing its own members, that the Sioux City market is working well, and that the bill is unnecessary as far as Sioux City is concerned?

Mr. PURCELL. I do so agree. I would say that the Sioux City market and other markets in the river areas in the general area of Sioux City really are more or less a model for permanent marketing problems, and it is more in the other areas of the country that this bill is really needed.

Mr. MAYNE. I wonder if the gentleman could give us some specific examples of situations in which it would be reasonable for stockyards to take action to deny commission firms the use of the yards under the intention of this bill?

Mr. PURCELL. I will be glad to. We had testimony describing a firm which consisted of one man who was really a painter, as I remember, and who spent most of his time painting. There was another example given of a tollkeeper on a bridge, and this man seemed to spend most of his time keeping the bridge, and not being available for duty as a commission man. The major problem is that this type of individual hurts the stockyards because they are not really interested in fostering a good livestock market. It is only when a firm degenerates to the point where they are hurting the reputation of the stockyard itself in selling livestock that there would be any reason for the owner not to want a commission firm or a selling firm to continue on that yard.

Mr. MAYNE. Are these the types of situations which the bill is intended to affect which the gentleman has just related to the Committee?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes. Those examples that we have given, and other similar ones, are the reasons that this bill is thought to be necessary.

Mr. MAYNE. I would further ask the gentleman is it intended by the Agriculture Committee that this bill should give a stockyard owner complete control over market agencies on the yard with absolute and complete discretion as to who can operate on that yard?

Mr. PURCELL. That is not the intent of the committee or of this legislation. It is intended that the owner shall be required to furnish stockyard services on a fair, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory basis. If a commission firm feels that it has been treated unreasonably, it can bring a complaint to the Secretary of Agriculture, who will investigate the complaint and take appropriate action if he finds a basis for the complaint.

Mr. MAYNE. Referring to the testimony of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Rodney E. Leonard, who appeared before the subcommittee, I will ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if he recalls Mr. Leonard's testimony that where there is an association of commission firms which is actually functioning and policing its own members, such as the Sioux City Livestock Exchange, then the Department would consider that the stockyards owner should consult with the association or exchange before revoking the authorization of any firm to operate on that particular market?

And I believe that testimony appears at page 23, lines 34 to 45 of the hearing transcript.

Does the gentleman recall that testimony?

Mr. PURCELL. I do distinctly remember that testimony, and this is my understanding of the intent of this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. MAYNE. And I believe Mr. Leonard further stated that he would have no objection to having a safeguard actually written into this law providing that the stockyards owner would be required to consult with the livestock exchange or association at a market before revoking the authorization of any firm to operate on that market?

Mr. PURCELL. That is correct.

Mr. MAYNE. In order to further clarify the congressional intent in passing this bill, I would ask the gentleman if it is his intention and the intention of the committee that if this bill is passed, it would be considered unreasonable within the meaning of the act for a stockyards company to take any action against any market agency as defined in the act without first consulting with the livestock exchange or association at the market where such agency was doing business?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes, such is my intention and I believe it to be the intention of the committee.

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Texas and to the chairman that I have received the following letter dated September 28, 1967, from Deputy Assistant Secretary Leonard which further clarifies the position of the Department of Agriculture with reference to this bill and which reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1967.

Hon. WILEY MAYNE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MAYNE: During the hearing before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grain relating to H.R. 6231, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, there was a discussion relating to stockyard owners consulting with the livestock exchange before taking action affecting a particular commission firm.

To amplify our views, we have frequently urged stockyard owners to consult with the livestock exchange and other groups engaged in business at a terminal stockyard before promulgating regulations or taking significant action which affects the persons engaged in business at the stockyard. We have stated to stockyard owners that, irrespective of their authority to take unilateral action, the success of the stockyard is dependent upon cooperation and harmonious relations between the stockyard owner and the persons engaged in business at the stockyard. Frequent exchange of views is, therefore, vital to a successful stockyard.

The stockyard owners have expressed an agreement with our views, in this respect. They have assured us that they would obtain the views of the livestock exchange and other persons engaged in business on the stockyard before taking significant action affecting such persons.

In determining whether a stockyard owner acted reasonable, in a particular instance involving one or more commission firms, we believe that one of the relevant considerations would be whether the stockyard owner had obtained the views of the livestock exchange with respect to the matter at issue.

Sincerely yours,

RODNEY E. LEONARD,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] and the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] for their cooperation in clarifying the congressional intent in passing this bill.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE].

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and concur in the opening remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mr. Chairman, after extensive hearings, the House Committee on Agriculture approved H.R. 10673 which revises the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921. The overwhelming support for this bill reflects, I believe, a strong consensus within the committee that this act should

be updated to make it clear that stockyard owners have the right and the responsibility to manage and regulate their own facilities in a reasonable and nondiscriminatory manner.

In essence, the bill provides that no person may engage in business at a stockyard as a market agency or a dealer unless the stockyard owner has determined that such services will be beneficial to the business of the stockyard and its customers. Certainly it is not unreasonable to give the stockyard owner this measure of control over operations taking place on his own property.

The proposed legislation, at the same time, requires stockyard operators to maintain efficient, competitive markets and preserves the right of the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent abuses of authority by the stockyard owners. It provides that stockyard services shall not be refused on any basis that is unreasonable or discriminatory.

When the Packers and Stockyards Act was adopted in 1921, marketing conditions were in many respects much different from those prevailing today. The terminal markets held what amounted to a monopolistic position. The volume percentage of livestock moving through terminal markets has substantially declined. While the stockyard owner today still provides the facilities, the actual selling is done through commission firms and individuals. Owners have little power to determine who shall operate in their own yards. H.R. 10673 is designed to remedy this. I urge support for this bill.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, perhaps coming from New Jersey, I should not participate in this debate because probably I am not fully aware, even after a reading of the report, of the real purposes of this legislation or the implications therein. But as I read it, I have come to the conclusion that this legislation in effect is a private bill for the owners of stockyards whose business has been reduced perhaps 50 or 75 percent in the last several years due to changes in practices regarding the purchase and sale of livestock.

In reading the report, I also note that:

> The Department of Agriculture presently contends that terminal stockyard owners have broad authority under existing law to manage and regulate their stockyard and the persons engaged in business thereon.

The views of the Department are set forth in the report. I have to believe therefore that this act will increase prices for the consumer. Under present law, as I read the report, there is nothing to prevent a stockyard owner from converting his operations or prohibiting anyone he wants from doing business with the yard on a reasonable basis. And this law will not change that. What the law will do, in my judgment at least, is to give the stockyard owners the right to demand that commission agents if they wish to face the realities deal exclusively with the stockyard owners.

In effect, this, in my judgment, will raise the price of meat to the consumer.

Another point interested me. That is the fact that one of the reasons alleged for this bill is that the shippers are not receiving as much money under the present system from the commission agents as they would if the cattle were sold at the stockyards. I would think that if the shippers were dissatisfied, we would be hearing from shippers.

Here is the key sentence as far as I am concerned. It appears on page 3 of the report. It states:

> In addition, the testimony shows that some commission men do not properly represent the best interests of their shippers. They may have another occupation which takes most of their time, resulting in their failure to obtain the best price for their livestock shippers. This not only injures such shippers but may also serve to generally weaken prices at the market.

It seems to me that we are giving stockyard owners the right to say to commission agents, "Unless you deal exclusively with us, we will not handle your individual transactions."

This, in my judgment, could place such economic pressure on commission agents that they would be compelled and constrained to do just that. It seems to me—and I think we ought to understand it—that this legislation will increase the business of the stockyard owners. This seems to me to be the main purpose of the legislation. Today the stockyards can, by the exercise of any reasonable regulations that they wish, keep out any disreputable or unconscientious trader that they want so that I fail to see the real necessity for this legislation aside from the beneficial results to the stockyard owners.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas for some clarification.

Mr. PURCELL. The assumption that the gentleman just made about the owner of a stockyard being able to limit a commission agent to operating only in that yard is not a correct assumption.

In the Supreme Court decision commonly referred to as the Denver case, the Court held that a selling agent, a commission firm, could not be limited to one location. A commission firm, under that holding, may have commission business at various terminal markets.

Mr. CAHILL. I understand. May I ask the gentleman this question. In the gentleman's opinion, if this bill is enacted into law, will it increase the business of the stockyards?

Mr. PURCELL. Our hope is that it will, but it should not increase the price of cattle going through that stockyard.

Mr. CAHILL. Could this not prevent some independent commission merchants from making individual transactions with individual cattle raisers who would be in competition with the stockyard owners? And would this not involve possible additional costs?

Mr. PURCELL. The only manner in which an example such as the gentleman is referring to could occur would be as the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] made very clear a few moments ago.

Let me clear up this point. The owners of the stockyards do not sell anything.

Mr. CAHILL. I realize that. They have facilities available for the commission agents.

Mr. PURCELL. That is correct.

If a commission agent is operating on a terminal stockyard and has violently opposed reasonable rules and is deliberately going to the terminal stockyard in question, and doing nothing but seeking business for himself away from the terminal stockyard, there could be times when the stockyard owner would have under this bill, the power to refuse to allow him to continue this practice, by denying the commission agent the right to sell at the stockyard.

Mr. CAHILL. Will the gentleman explain to me the statement on page 9 of the report, the last sentence, the third paragraph, which says:

> Consequently, many stockyard owners fear to exercise authority which they probably now have.

Mr. PURCELL. Because the law is unclear. Courts have held that some actions of stockyard owners were prohibitive, resulting in civil liability. This effort is to clear the air and make specific what the stockyard owner's authority is.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, was the gentleman on the floor when I made my statement?

Mr. CAHILL. No. I regret that I was not.

Mrs. MAY. In this statement I tried to point out very clearly the benefit to the consumer of this legislation. In the first place, I was a member of the National Commission on Food Marketing, which was definitely consumer oriented. This was one of the very few completely unanimous recommendations that was made by the Commission. I will not read it again at this point—it is in my statement and the report. But the gentleman should notice that this change will protect the interests of both buyers and sellers. When there is an inefficiently operated terminal market—in other words, where an owner cannot refuse his services to people that are not working efficiently on his behalf and the producer's behalf—it is going to be a costly procedure for him. That makes it more expensive to handle livestock there. This, in turn is reflected in higher costs of livestock to buyers and eventually to consumers. Anytime any marketing process is unnecessarily costly and inefficient the consumer pays.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I must say to the Committee I have not been dissuaded from my original point of view upon examination of this report, that this legislation, it seems to me, must increase the business of the stockyard owners by giving them authority to deprive many individual entrepreneurs of the use of stockyards and, second, therefore, it must follow that prices will probably be increased to the ultimate consumer.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. Will the gentleman note that we have kept every original protection in here, that was already in the Packers and Stockyards Act, against injurious discrimination.

Mr. CAHILL. That is why I do not understand the purpose of this bill.

Mrs. MAY. But present law does not make it clear that owner selectivity is not unfair discrimination. On this point I refer you to the Denver Stockyard case. The Supreme Court decision in this case implied that Congress should enact some legislation to clarify this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended (7 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(a) Section 302(a) (7 U.S.C. 202(a)) is amended to read:

"(a) When used in this title the term 'stockyard' means any place, establishment, or facility commonly known as stockyards, conducted, operated, or managed for profit or nonprofit as a public market for livestock producers, feeders, and buyers, consisting of pens, or other inclosures, and their appurtenances, in which live cattle, sheep, swine, horses, mules, or goats are received, held, or kept for sale or shipment in commerce."

(b) Section 303 (7 U.S.C. 203) is amended to read:

"After the expiration of thirty days after the Secretary has given public notice that any stockyard is within the definition of section 302 by posting copies of such notice in the stockyard, no person shall carry on the business of a market agency or dealer at such stockyard unless (1) the stockyard owner has determined that his services will be beneficial to the business and welfare of said stockyard, its patrons, and customers, which determination shall be made on a basis which is not unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory, and has given written authorization to such person, and (2) he has registered with the Secretary, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, his name and address, the character of business in which he is engaged, and the kinds of stockyards services, if any, which he furnishes at such stockyard. Every other person operating as a market agency or dealer as defined in section 301 of the Act may be required to register in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe. Whoever violates the provisions of this section shall be liable to a penalty of not more than $500 for each such offense and not more than $25 for each day it continues, which shall accrue to the United States and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States."

(c) Section 304 (7 U.S.C. 205) is amended to read:

"All stockyard services furnished pursuant to reasonable request made to a stockyard owner or market agency at such stockyard shall be reasonable and nondiscriminatory and stockyard services which are furnished shall not be refused on any basis that is unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory: *Provided,* That in any State where the weighing of livestock at a stockyard is conducted by a duly authorized department or agency of the State, the Secretary, upon application of such department or agency, may register it as a market agency for the weighing of livestock received in such stockyard, and upon such registration such department or agency and the members thereof shall be amenable to all the requirements of this Act, and upon failure of such department or agency or the members thereof to comply with the orders of the Secretary under this Act he is authorized to revoke the registration of such department or agency and to enforce such revocation as provided in section 315 of this Act."

(d) Section 307 (7 U.S.C. 208) is amended to redesignate the first sentence as paragraph "(a)" and to add a new paragraph (b) as follows:

"(b) It shall be the responsibility and right of every stockyard owner to manage and regulate his stockyard in a just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory manner, to prescribe rules and regulations and to require those persons engaging in or attempting to engage in the purchase, sale, or solicitation of livestock at such stockyard to conduct their operations in a manner which will foster, preserve, or insure an efficient, competitive public market."

(e) Section 312(a) (7 U.S.C. 213(a)) is amended by inserting after the words "in connection with" the phrase "determining whether persons should be authorized to operate at the stockyards, or with".

Mr. PURCELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PURCELL

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PURCELL: On page 1, line 3 after the word "Act" strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the typographical symbol ".".

On page 2, line 5, insert "SEC. 303." before the words "After the".

On page 3, line 4, insert "SEC. 304." before the words "All stockyard".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10673) to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 921, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amend was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 6, not voting 192, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

YEAS—234

Adair	Gathings	Mosher
Andrews, N. Dak.	Giaimo	Murphy, Ill.
Ashbrook	Gibbons	Myers
Ashmore	Gonzalez	Natcher
Ayres	Goodling	O'Hara, Ill.
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Olsen
Bates	Gross	O'Neal, Ga.
Battin	Grover	O'Neill, Mass.
Bell	Gubser	Passman
Bennett	Gude	Patman
Berry	Haley	Patten
Betts	Hamilton	Pelly
Blackburn	Hanley	Pepper
Boggs	Hansen, Idaho	Perkins
Boland	Hansen, Wash.	Pettis
Bolling	Hardy	Philbin
Bolton	Harsha	Pickle
Bow	Hawkins	Pirnie
Brasco	Hays	Poage
Bray	Hébert	Pollock
Brinkley	Hechler, W. Va.	Pool
Brooks	Hicks	Price, Ill.
Broomfield	Holifield	Pryor
Brotzman	Horton	Purcell
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Quie
Brown, Mich.	Hull	Railsback
Broyhill, N.C.	Hungate	Randall
Broyhill, Va.	Hunt	Reid, Ill.
Burke, Mass.	Hutchinson	Reid, N.Y.
Burleson	Irwin	Reinecke
Burton, Calif.	Jarman	Rhodes, Ariz.
Burton, Utah	Joelson	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts
Cabell	Johnson, Pa.	Robison
Carter	Jones, Mo.	Rodino
Cederberg	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Chamberlain	Kastenmeier	Rogers, Fla.
Clark	Kee	Rooney, N.Y.
Clawson, Del	King, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Cohelan	Kleppe	Roth
Conable	Kyros	Roybal
Conte	Laird	Rumsfeld
Conyers	Langen	Ruppe
Corbett	Latta	Ryan
Cramer	Leggett	Satterfield
Culver	Lipscomb	St. Onge
Daddario	Lloyd	Saylor
Daniels	Long, La.	Scheuer
Davis, Ga.	Long, Md.	Schneebeli
Dellenback	Lukens	Schweiker
Dickinson	McClory	Schwengel
Dingell	McClure	Scott
Dole	McDade	Shipley
Donohue	McDonald, Mich.	Sisk
Dorn	McEwen	Skubitz
Dow	McFall	Smith, N.Y.
Dowdy	McMillan	Smith, Okla.
Downing	MacGregor	Snyder
Duncan	Machen	Springer
Dwyer	Mahon	Stanton
Edmondson	Marsh	Steiger, Wis.
Edwards, Calif.	Martin	Stephens
Erlenborn	Mathias, Calif.	Stuckey
Esch	Matsunaga	Talcott
Evans, Colo.	May	Teague, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.	Meeds	Teague, Tex.
Fascell	Miller, Calif.	Tenzer
Findley	Miller, Ohio	Thompson, Ga.
Fisher	Mills	Tuck
Flood	Minish	Tunney
Foley	Monagan	Udall
Ford, Gerald R.	Moore	Ullman
Fraser	Morris, N. Mex.	Van Deerlin
Friedel	Morton	Vander Jagt
		Vanik

Vigorito	White	Winn
Waldie	Whitener	Wright
Walker	Wilson, Charles H.	Young
Watts		Zablocki

NAYS—6

Cahill	Cunningham	Fulton, Pa.
Carey	Denney	Mayne

NOT VOTING—192

Abbitt	Gallagher	Nix
Abernethy	Gardner	O'Hara, Mich.
Adams	Garmatz	O'Konski
Addabbo	Gettys	Ottinger
Albert	Gilbert	Pike
Anderson, Ill.	Goodell	Poff
Anderson, Tenn.	Gray	Price, Tex.
Andrews, Ala.	Green, Pa.	Pucinski
Annunzio	Griffiths	Quillen
Arends	Gurney	Rarick
Ashley	Hagan	Rees
Aspinall	Hall	Reifel
Barrett	Halleck	Resnick
Belcher	Halpern	Reuss
Bevill	Hammer-schmidt	Riegle
Biester	Hanna	Rivers
Bingham	Harrison	Ronan
Blanton	Harvey	Rooney, Pa.
Blatnik	Hathaway	Rosenthal
Brademas	Heckler, Mass.	Roudebush
Brock	Helstoski	Roush
Brown, Ohio	Henderson	Sandman
Buchanan	Herlong	St Germain
Burke, Fla.	Holland	Schadeberg
Bush	Hosmer	Scherle
Button	Ichord	Selden
Byrnes, Wis.	Jacobs	Shriver
Casey	Jonas	Sikes
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Slack
Clancy	Jones, N.C.	Smith, Calif.
Clausen, Don H.	Karth	Smith, Iowa
Cleveland	Kazen	Stafford
Collier	Keith	Staggers
Colmer	Kelly	Steed
Corman	King, N.Y.	Steiger, Ariz.
Cowger	Kirwan	Stratton
Curtis	Kluczynski	Stubblefield
Davis, Wis.	Kornegay	Sullivan
Dawson	Kupferman	Taft
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Taylor
Delaney	Kyl	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Landrum	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	Lennon	Tiernan
Devine	McCarthy	Utt
Diggs	McCulloch	Waggonner
Dulski	Macdonald, Mass.	Wampler
Eckhardt	Madden	Watkins
Edwards, Ala.	Mailliard	Watson
Edwards, La.	Mathias, Md.	Whalen
Eilberg	Meskill	Whalley
Eshleman	Michel	Whitten
Everett	Mink	Widnall
Fallon	Minshall	Wiggins
Farbstein	Mize	Williams, Miss.
Feighan	Montgomery	Williams, Pa.
Fino	Moorhead	Willis
Flynt	Morgan	Wilson, Bob
Ford, William D.	Morse, Mass.	Wolff
Fountain	Moss	Wyatt
Frelinghuysen	Multer	Wydler
Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.	Wylie
Fuqua	Nedzi	Wyman
Galifianakis	Nelsen	Yates
	Nichols	Zion
		Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Biester.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Bush.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Wylie.
Mr. Lennon with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Scherle with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Pike with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Poff.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Minshall.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Hall.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Taft.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Button.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Steed.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Dawson.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Gray.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Pucinski.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Yates.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. de la Garza.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Hathaway.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. CONTE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended so as to read: "To amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 10673, and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON THE CONGO

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, the recent appearance before the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs by Robert O. Blake, just returned from his post as counselor and chargé d'affaires from November 1966 to July 1967 at our Embassy in Kinshasa, prompts me to make some remarks about the Congo based on the intelligent observations of an experienced foreign service officer.

Last spring we had many reasons to be optimistic about the immediate future of the Congo. It had had its difficult and tragic moments but seemed to be on the path to economic and political stability. Hard work by the Congolese, by their Western friends, and, in no small measure, by the United States has paid off. The Congolese educational system expanded remarkably and a new generation of educated Congolese was moving into positions of responsibility. Thanks to its subsoil wealth, the Congo was expanding its mineral production. Assisted by the International Monetary Fund, the Congo revalued its currency and established a sound stabilization program which promised to stimulate further its economic development, especially in the agricultural field. The United States was playing an important role. It had extended about $45 million in aid. Much of this, in the form of Public Law 480 foodstuffs, has generated counterpart funds for the construction of roads, bridges, and schools.

Unfortunately, on July 5 of this year a small group of European mercenaries mutinied. These mercenaries are still in Bukavu in the eastern Congo. Their revolt threatened the stability and progress of the Congo. It also menaced the important and fruitful relationship between the Congolese people and the foreign community. Most recently the Organization of African Unity met in Kinshasa, the Congo's capital, and adopted a resolution calling for the immediate departure of these mercenaries with the help of competent international bodies.

It is my sincere hope that this effort

will succeed. Thereafter, we can expect a rededication of the Congolese Government and its peoples to the essential tasks of nation building and economic development. In these efforts, I am sure, the American Government will continue to help, thus carrying out its policy of consistent support for the central government of the Congo.

Mr. Speaker, I placed such importance on the recent summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity that I caused to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 27, 1967, on pages 26999 and 27000 the full text of the resolutions adopted, including that relating to the mercenaries.

DAVID T. PETERSON—FLIGHT TO VIETNAM

Mr. BLACKBURN. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleagues might find it heartwarming, as I did, to know of a letter written by one of my young constituents to a member of his church describing his feelings during his flight to Vietnam this summer.

David T. Peterson, from Decatur, Ga., is a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army Intelligence Division. The son of missionary parents and himself born in São Paulo, Brazil, David put himself through Georgia State College, where he received a BA degree in English and drama. An aspiring actor, David performed at the Oakhurst Baptist Church, at Georgia State College, and the Pocket Theater in Atlanta before he joined the service.

The letter which David wrote to a friend, Billy Densmore, music director at Oakhurst Baptist Church, sets forth his impressions and thoughts during his 20-hour flight from San Francisco to Vietnam. Because of my own recent trip to Vietnam, and because I feel an even greater appreciation of our fighting men there, I bring to your attention, with deep gratitude for the thoughts expressed, what I like to think may be a typically American letter, complete with comments on the personalities of the stewardesses on the airplane.

The letter of David Peterson, as reprinted in the Decatur-DeKalb News, follows:

It was 0600 on the morning of August 13, and our Braniff 707 was circling in a zig-zag pattern over Bien Hoa Air Base, which is just 20 miles north of Saigon. We were in a group of more than 100 officers on our first tour of duty in Vietnam.

As we approached Bien Hoa it was dark, all the lights in the big jet were out, cigarettes were extinguished and seat belts were fastened. As I looked out my window, I carefully scanned the darkness and noticed the lights blinking faintly in the distance. I was lucky to have a seat by the window, because everyone aboard was anxious to get a first glimpse of Vietnam.

The trip, which had lasted about 20 hours, included stops in Hawaii, Guam and the Philippines. Throughout the flight, there was an air of joviality. David Sharp, sitting next to me, asked Dixie, the nice little red-headed stewardess, if red heads were more fun. Marni, another stewardess who had made her debut at 18 years old, spoke excellent Brazilian Portuguese, so, of course, I got her address.

But now, we were landing in Vietnam, and everyone was silent. Were we a little bit scared? Yes, I guess we were. We were wondering where we would go from here and what we would be doing. Would we go 20 miles away to Saigon to enjoy its music and gaiety for a few days? No, probably not. We would probably join our units which were scattered throughout South Vietnam from Con Tho to the northern limit, the DMZ.

The big jet landed gracefully and came to a halt. We waited a few minutes for the health inspector to come aboard. In silence we stood and looked in each other's faces and then off in the distance. I looked out the window and noticed that the sun had risen, over in the east, in the east from where we had flown, from that grand city, San Francisco.

Dixie and all the girls said goodbye to us as we stepped off the plane, down the stairway, and onto Vietnamese soil. The air had a clean scent and the sunrise was beautiful and full of color. I was aware of the noise and the power of the big Skyraider jets as they rose rapidly and fearlessly into the skies, but I was in awe of the silence and beauty of this hour. My eyes drifted to the multitudes of men who ahead of me and behind me were walking away from our plane towards the massive bungalow-style terminal building.

We were all apprehensive and every heart beat a little faster. Was it fear? No, I don't think so. It was a feeling which was hard to explain. I guess it was pride. I was proud to be here and proud of my fellow officers. I glanced back at the big jet we had just deboarded.

I took in the deep blue of the plane's fuselage and its towering size. The largeness seemed to represent the great country we had watched disappear in the distance 20 hours before. But my gaze stopped as I saw our American flag imprinted on the side of the airliner. A tear rolled down my cheek.

I'm proud of that flag and I'm proud of our commitment in Vietnam.

POLITICS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF OUR POSTAL SYSTEM

Mr. MYERS. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about politics in the management of our postal system. I am shocked over a clear case of both politics and mismanagement this last week regarding the proposed merger of rural routes in Putnam County, Ind.

On September 13, I began receiving telephone calls and letters from the patrons of the Roachdale, Ind., post office stating their objections to a Post Office Department decision to consolidate rural delivery service involving four routes at Roachdale, Bainbridge, and Russellville.

Subsequently, I received a petition signed by 439 patrons which, along with my request, was forwarded to the Post Office Department.

On September 21, 1967, I received a two-page letter signed by Mr. Howard R. Barker, Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, which I make a part of this RECORD. Mr. Barker expressed regret that the Post Office Department was unable to approve my request.

The letter, in detail, explains that a savings of $4,343 annually would result from the consolidation. The letter further states, and I quote:

The Department would be derelict in its duties to continue four such routes when good delivery service could continue to be provided by three carriers none of which would be employed as much as 40 hours per week.

Upon receipt of this notice I notified, by letter, the people of Roachdale of the Department's decision against a review of the case. Yesterday, September 28, 1967, I read in the Daily Banner, a Greencastle, Ind., publication, dated Monday, September 25, 1967, that the senior Senator from Indiana, who just happens to be a Democrat, had the pleasure of notifying the people of Roachdale he had been successful in retaining their mail service.

A call to the Post Office Department yesterday confirmed that the Senator's report was accurate.

I want to emphasize I am happy for the fine folks of Roachdale who will keep their rural routes as they wanted. However, I regret, by the Post Office Department's own admission, that we have a "derelict" Post Office Department.

Webster's dictionary defines derelict as "neglectful of obligation, unfaithful, careless, deserted, and abandoned."

Is it not a shame that the people of this country may soon be asked to pay much more in the form of increased postal rates to finance a careless, neglectful, and abandoned postal system?

A Republican Representative has been told "No" while simultaneously a Democrat is told "Yes." The fine, dedicated carriers and employees of the postal system deserve better and the tax-burdened public is entitled to better than such politically oriented decisions.

This is a clear case of politics being played by the Post Office Department. I would like to see some integrity and honesty someplace in the executive branch of this expensive Federal Government.

As long as the Post Office Department places such a high premium on political decisions we will continue to have a second-class postal system.

I include at this point the material I have previously referred to:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., September 21, 1967.

Hon. JOHN T. MYERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your letters of September 14, 1967, and September 18, 1967, transmitting a petition signed by Mr. Kenneth A. Miller, and others, patrons at Roachdale, Indiana, protesting the proposed consolidation of the rural delivery service at Roachdale, Bainbridge and Russellville, Indiana, incident to a vacancy at Greencastle.

When a rural vacancy occurs, it is the practice of the Department to have a survey made

to determine the feasibility of consolidating existing service prior to taking any action toward filling the position on a permanent basis. Such a survey was made in this instance.

The survey disclosed that it would be very practicable to consolidate Route No. 1 at Bainbridge, routes Nos. 1 and 2 at Roachdale and route No. 1 at Russellville into three routes so as to provide a surplus carrier at Roachdale for reassignment to fill the vacancy at Greencastle. There would be a saving of approximately $4343 per annum in operating costs of the rural delivery service.

The four routes involved are not long and serve only 212, 199, 204 and 121 families. The present carrier schedules are evaluated at 31, 29½, 32 and 20 hours per week which is far below the normal workweek of 40 hours. All mail is delivered by 12:30 p.m.

The three consolidated routes would be 76, 71 and 74 pay miles in length and would serve 254, 269 and 213 families. The number of families to be served is well below the national average of 321 families. The proposed schedules would be evaluated at 38, 37 and 32½ hours per week and all mail would be delivered by 1:15 p.m.

The carriers would be routed over all weather roads and mail collected on the routes would be dispatched on the same day.

While it would be necessary for 156 families to change their mailing address, we consider this to be a temporary inconvenience only until such time as they can notify their correspondents of the new address.

The Department would be derelict in its duties to continue four such routes when good delivery service could continue to be provided by three carriers none of which would be employed as much as 40 hours per week.

Therefore, in view of the substantial savings involved, and the fact that excellent delivery service would be provided, the Department feels that it has no alternative, but to place the consolidation of service, as outlined above, into effect on October 1, 1967 as contemplated.

In view of your personal interest, it is regretted that we are unable to reply more favorably in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD R. BARKER,
Deputy Assistant Postmaster General.

NO INTERRUPTION IN ROACHDALE SERVICE

U.S. Senator Vance Hartke, a member of the Senate Post Office Committee, announced today in Washington that there will be no interruption in the present Roachdale Post Office rural route service.

The Post Office Department had recommended earlier the Roachdale routes be consolidated with service from Bainbridge and Russellville.

Petitions and letters substantiating Sen. Hartke's position had been received from some 450 postal patrons at Roachdale.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

Mr. FINDLEY. 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. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the chief sponsor of the House resolution calling on Congress to undertake a fundamental view of Vietnam policies, I was gratified to see the following editorial comment which appeared in the September 27 San Francisco Chronicle:

CONGRESSMEN ASK LOOK AT VIETNAM

The move by an unusual coalition of 52 Congressmen to re-examine deepening American involvement in Vietnam is heartening to anyone who believes in constitutional government. The coalition includes both Republicans and Democrats, hawks and doves.

Representative Paul Findley (Rep.-Ill.) is the spokesman for these 52 Representatives who are calling on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to pass formal judgment on whether the Administration is really authorized to do what it is doing in southeast Asia.

President Johnson has repeatedly cited the Gulf of Tonkin resolution as Congressional authority for committing Americans to combat in Vietnam. This resolution was passed three years ago. Requested by Johnson after a reported naval clash in the Gulf, it contained the stereotyped wording calling for "all necessary measures to prevent further aggression."

It was not, as Senator Clifford Case (Rep.-N.J.) expressed it so well this week, a continuing letter of credit to the President to draw on indefinitely. In fact, a parallel movement toward reassertion of Congressional prerogatives in foreign policy is under way in the Senate. There the Foreign Relations Committee is expected to approve a resolution limiting the authority of the executive branch to enter into military commitments without legislative approval.

Three years, as all Americans are aware, have brought drastic changes in the war in Vietnam and our commitment there. Congressman Findley senses "a great uneasiness" over this situation among members of Congress, including many who had voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

In his careful, restrained approach, Findley rightly points out that placing the Vietnam issue "squarely on the Congressional anvil" should ultimately have a unifying influence in clarifying America's will and purpose and "removing the feeling of uneasiness so prevalent today."

More evidence of general concern is shown by the dramatic change in the latest California Poll of persons representing all shades of political opinion and walks of life. Compared with a year ago, there has been a definite shift among both Democrats and Republicans against the Johnson Administration's policy of escalation and increased emphasis on military measures in Vietnam.

The stirring in Congress to tackle head on its constitutional responsibilities is a healthy development for the country.

POLICIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mrs. DWYER. 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 gentlewoman of New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the more than 50 Members of the House who this week cosponsored companion resolutions directing the appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report on the desirability of further congressional action with respect to our policies in Southeast Asia, I should like to outline very briefly the reasons which led me to join in sponsoring the resolution and to suggest what I believe are some of the benefits which can be realized from approval of the resolution.

Never before in our history, to the best of my knowledge, has the United States ever fought a major war in which congressional participation in the determination of policy has been so strictly limited. Aside from the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in August 1964—which did not even begin to contemplate the huge expansion of the war which followed—the role of the Congress has, for all practical purposes, been limited to the more or less routine approval of military authorizations and appropriations.

It is worth noting, too, that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which was passed without a dissenting vote in the House, was considered in the midst of a presidential campaign in which the principal issue was the President's strong opposition to a major expansion of the war.

To a considerable extent, therefore, neither the people nor their representatives in the Congress have been consulted about decisions which have involved the United States, step by step, in one of the costliest, most destructive and most dangerous wars in history. Whatever our individual views may be about this war and the administration's conduct of it, there is no reason to doubt that Congress has important constitutional, political and moral responsibilities concerning the Vietnam conflict. This is especially true in the absence of a formal declaration of war. Our resolution, Mr. Speaker, would provide a means for Congress to accept and carry out these responsibilities.

The lack of real deliberation with respect to our policy in Southeast Asia on the part of the Nation's chief deliberative body has contributed, I believe, to the restlessness, the questioning, the unease in the country which have been noted by several of our colleagues. Without the leadership of Congress, the national debate on this major aspect of our foreign policy has inevitably been inadequate. It has lacked direction and focus. Our people have been deprived of reliable information on which to form a meaningful public opinion about our national purpose and the means we are using to achieve it. And the administration has been deprived of the benefits of accountability, the searching scrutiny which would require it to do a better job of informing the people and justifying its policy.

In my own experience as a Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, I have found it impossible to justify to my constituents the failure of Congress to conduct a thorough debate on our Vietnam policy. In no other area of major national policy—foreign or domestic—have we failed to do this. In most areas, in fact, such debate or deliberation is carried on periodically as Congress considers legislation to establish, amend, or appropriate for such programs as foreign aid, the war on poverty, housing, urban development, agriculture, public works, and so forth. The war in Vietnam, inexplicably, is the only exception, and this is the single most crucial issue confronting the country.

Approval of our resolution will bring the issue of U.S. policy in Vietnam before the Congress for the very first time in all its fullness and complexity. It will provide the first real opportunity for Congress—the direct representatives of

the people—to consider all aspects of our policy in that beleaguered land, to determine whether and to what extent we approve of the policies being followed by the administration, and to recommend whatever changes, if any, we may want to urge upon the administration. I am sure I speak for all the cosponsors of our resolution when I say that we have no desire or intention to usurp or limit in any way the constitutional authority of the Chief Executive for the conduct of our foreign relations or the command of our Armed Forces. Our sole purpose is to assure the people, through their Congress, their right to participate in the determination of their own destiny.

If our resolution is approved, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we can anticipate many benefits, including the following:

First, the provision of more and better information about our Vietnam policies by the administration;

Second, greater understanding of the nature and extent and legal basis of our commitment in Vietnam;

Third, a more accurate estimate of our present military position and future prospects in Vietnam;

Fourth, greater awareness of the international political implications of our present course;

Fifth, the opportunity for congressional consideration of such critical and complex issues as the significance of the bombing of North Vietnam, the adequacy of U.S. efforts to bring the war to the negotiating table, and the character of the pacification program, together with consideration of the several important alternatives to present policies in each of these areas which have been proposed by a number of our colleagues and which have received less than forthright responses from the administration; and, finally,

Sixth, the opportunity for a formal expression of Congress views on the war in general and on the more significant specific issues raised by the war.

During the years of our involvement in the fighting in Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, our commitment has grown to the point where it now extends to nearly half a million young Americans and tens of billions of American dollars. Is it too much to ask, I wonder, for Congress to stop long enough to consider in depth what we are doing, and why, and where we are going? We owe it to our people and to our own self-respect as a great legislative institution.

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS TO NEW CITY COUNCIL

Mr. TALCOTT. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was astounded and embarrassed by the President's appointment yesterday to the new City Council.

Can anyone in this body imagine a draft dodger, a conscientious objector, being chairman of a city council or chairman of a board of supervisors in any other city or county of the United States during a war?

Can you imagine any other city or county tolerating a city councilman who was a rabblerouser, a promoter of demonstrations who condones civil disobedience, during a time when our cities are trying so desperately to maintain and enhance respect for law and order?

Can you imagine the appointment of a Bobby Baker crony, a bank manipulator, a lobbyist, as the chairman of the city council of a city straining for a semblance of prestige and respectability?

Perhaps we should sympathize with the President. Admittedly, his choices were drastically limited. Washington may be a classic example of a fundamental failing of our cities. Long ago the competent and concerned citizens moved to the suburbs. They were no longer willing to carry the burden of city management and of citizen participation required to make a city pleasant and progressive for those who were unwilling to carry their share of the load. The incompetent and unconcerned have stayed behind. They cannot manage themselves, their homes, their streets, or neighborhoods. How could they manage their city? Into the inner core of the big cities have moved many people who have absolutely no experience, training, or ability in city management or city citizenship. Little wonder our cities have deteriorated.

Like other cities, too many people have moved to Washington for what they can get or take from the city—not what they can contribute. Until the citizens contribute more than they consume, their neighborhood and their city will deteriorate.

It is obvious now why the President had to go out of Washington to find a city manager and an assistant city manager. There was no one in Washington competent to fill the requirements.

We should study these appointments to the new City Council carefully. The obvious implications are a tragic commentary on the competency and level of citizenship of the Nation's Capital. If these nominees are the best Washington, D.C., can offer, the District is a long way from effective or competent home rule, and there are many problems ahead which cannot be solved by spending more and more Federal money and some serious ills that can be cured only by raising the competency level of the citizenry.

A FANTASTIC PLOT—PART II

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted into the RECORD reports from UPI and the Philadelphia Inquirer detailing the fantastic plot against various leading political figures in Philadelphia. The Philadelphia Inquirer of today details the latest developments of members of the Chinese Communist oriented Revolutionary Action Movement who are behind it all. Today's revelations indicate intentions of murdering the President of the United States and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigations.

The extreme nature of RAM has been known for some time, but to help fill in the details of their tactics and goals, I insert into the RECORD excerpts of the Inquirer's article, "Death of President, Tate, Rizzo, Plotted by Ring, Convict Says," by George J. Murray and E. J. Hussie:

DEATH OF PRESIDENT, TATE, RIZZO PLOTTED BY RING, CONVICT SAYS HOOVER, SPECTER ALSO ON LIST

(By George J. Murray and E. J. Hussie)

A conspiracy to murder high Government and city officials and destroy with dynamite Federal and municipal buildings has been exposed by an escaped Georgia convict now being held for extradition, it was disclosed Thursday.

According to the informer, the assassination list included President Johnson, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, Mayor James H. J. Tate, District Attorney Arlen Specter and Police Commissioner Frank L. Rizzo.

DYNAMITE CHARGE

Tate, according to the informer, was to be killed with dynamite charged to detonate when he started his car. Rizzo was to be shot by the informer himself, who boasted he asked only five days to "set Rizzo up."

There were indications late Thursday the informer would be arrested on charges of threatening to kill the officials named in the list he claimed was supplied by members of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), an anarchist, Black Power group sympathetically allied with Red China.

The man was identified as Herman Bailey, alias Robert Earl Bailey, 22, of Atlanta, who now is being held at Holmesburg Prison. Bailey was arrested last November and held for extradition proceedings to Georgia. He was transferred to Holmesburg last August as a troublemaker after attempting to start a riot in the House of Detention.

POLITICAL ISSUE

The plot disclosed by Bailey immediately was made a political issue by Tate who charged Specter—his opponent in November's mayoralty election—left the Mayor and his family defenseless by failing to warn him of the danger of assassination.

Specter replied that Rizzo was kept abreast of the investigation from the beginning as a result of a system of "instant coordination between the District Attorney's office, the Police Department and the FBI."

Bailey, who is being held without bail for Georgia authorities and faces a detainer filed by the U.S. District Court, where he recently was sentenced to nine months' imprisonment, said the RAM members promised to help obtain his freedom so that he could shoot Rizzo.

EXPERT RIFLE SHOT

Bailey claimed to be an expert shot with a rifle.

The alleged multiple assassination plot came to light just one day after another youth, who said he was a member of RAM, turned over a half-pound of potassium cyanide to the FBI and said it was intended for use to kill policemen and other citizens in the wake of an artificially instigated riot.

The FBI laboratory in Washington studied the cyanide and reported it in "pure" state. Experts said its quantity was sufficient to kill 1000 to 4500 persons.

The poison plot was exposed by Hilton Louis Jones, 22, of Wilt st. near 31st. He is

a neighbor of Maxwell Stanford, 33, of Fontaine st. near 31st and Diamond sts., who has been identified as national leader of RAM.

Last summer, Stanford and 15 New York RAM members were arrested on charge of plotting the murders of moderate Negro leaders Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Whitney M. Young, executive director of the National Urban League.

It was not disclosed whether Bailey identified other members of the multiple assassination plot—which included plans to dynamite City Hall, the Police Administration Building at 8th and Race sts., and the Federal Courthouses at 9th and Market sts.

NAMES THREE IN PLOT

However, Jones—who was reported as cooperating with the FBI for weeks during an investigation—identified three men by name and one by description as fellow conspirators.

One of those named, William James Lyles, 26, of Cumberland st. near Front, was found already in custody at the Philadelphia detention center.

Reginald Grantham, 21, was arrested in a house on Spring Garden st. near 36th on Thursday afternoon by members of the police civil disobedience unit, which received a tip he was hiding out there.

CHICAGO STUDENT

Grantham was taken immediately to the Administration Building, where he asked that he be interrogated without delay. He was joined there by his attorney, Arthur Early.

The third man named by Jones was picked up Wednesday night in Chicago near the University of Chicago campus, where he is enrolled as a political science graduate student.

He is Anthony B. Monteiro, 22, who said he was a graduate of Lincoln University. The fourth man, identified only as Sakeeb, still is being sought.

WAIVES EXTRADITION

Monteiro was arraigned before a Chicago magistrate early Thursday and refused to waive extradition. However, later, he appeared in Cook County Court accompanied by two lawyers and waived extradition before Judge Joseph A. Power.

Monteiro denied in Chicago he was connected with any Black Power groups and stated he would "get all this straightened out" upon his return to Philadelphia.

He was hurried to an airliner and was due to arrive at International Airport here at 11:36 p.m. Thursday.

Specter said Lyles, Grantham and Monteiro would be arraigned Friday morning in City Hall before Judge Leo Weinrott.

TRAINING CAMP

Bailey said he was told that RAM operated a large "training headquarters" somewhere in Virginia and that he would be taken there after he assassinated Rizzo.

Bailey and Jones reportedly both submitted voluntarily to lie-detector tests, which indicated they were telling the truth.

The investigation of the Bailey revelations dates back a month or more—no one would say exactly how far. It was so secret that Edward J. Hendrick, superintendent of Philadelphia prisons, was unaware it was going on.

Hendrick told The Inquirer on Thursday he was so irked over repeated delays in Bailey's extradition proceedings he prodded the District Attorney's office "to move this thing."

"He was being taken downtown to court once every three weeks," Hendrick said. "Each time he would be returned to prison with a card marked 'case continued.' He was down there (City Hall) last Tuesday."

It was learned that on Tuesday, Bailey's statement was prepared formally, signed and sworn to.

Hendrick said Bailey was one of the "ringleaders" in the Detention Center whenever there was trouble.

TROUBLEMAKER

"A number of our ringleaders are coming up in other things," he said. "We feel good we were able to spot them."

He said Lyles was spotted as a troublemaker when he arrived at the Detention Center last August on charges of inciting to riot.

"We put him straight into the House of Correction to keep him separated from the others," Hendrick said.

PLANNING ORDERLY RURAL DEVELOPMENT CAN CHECK THE OVERCROWDING OF URBAN CENTERS

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the problems of our overcrowded cities have erupted into violence in so many areas this summer that we must take action on many different fronts. The possibility of intelligently planning the orderly development of rural areas has not been examined as thoroughly as I believe it should be.

Some cogent analysis of these problems and their solution is contained in a series of editorials in the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser, September 25 to 28, which follows:

DIFFICULTIES OF BIG CITIES TIED TO ILLS OF SMALL TOWNS

The baffling problems of the big cities, particularly those of the ghettos, have resulted to a considerable extent from the troubles of the rest of the country.

The drift of people from rural areas and small communities to the cities has been under way for many years. In the last decade it has been greatly increased by three factors:

1. The inability of many tenant farmers and owners of small farms to make a decent living.

2. The elimination of jobs, particularly in coal mines, by the use of machinery.

3. The determination of more and more Negroes to gain their civil rights and better opportunities for themselves and their children.

Surveys have shown that the movement to the cities is beginning to slow down. But federal officials have reported that the number of migrants still reaches about 600,000 a year.

Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty said recently that about 1,000 newcomers arrive there each week. He estimated that at least a fourth of them come from the South.

Most of the migrants lack skills for any job that pays well. These usually drift into the ghettos and increase the crowding in the woefully substandard housing there.

Thousands that can't find work have to depend on welfare benefits. Some turn to crime.

But besides the disadvantaged newcomers who greatly complicate the problems of the big urban centers, many talented and educated young people who could benefit their smaller communities go to cities to take advantage of more promising opportunities for a career.

Men from Huntington have risen high in law, medicine and business in New York and other large cities. Several have done well in art, science, engineering and the entertainment field.

The hospital and research facilities of the big cities offer strong attractions especially to young doctors of exceptional ability.

The major cause of the acute shortage of doctors in this state is the tendency of graduates of the West Virginia Medical Center to leave for practice elsewhere.

The acquisition of independent retail and wholesale businesses and industries by large corporations also has tended to drain competent and ambitious young people away from towns and small cities.

The most capable employes of the corporations move up to better jobs and generally reach a big city.

The affiliation of the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Baltimore & Ohio railroads has already resulted in the transfer of more employes from Huntington than will come here.

The loss of community leaders through such transfers and the removal of young people who would become leaders tend to reduce the launching of new enterprises that would create jobs.

There are opportunities here for the development of profitable aluminum fabrication industries such as those operating near the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. works at Spokane, Wash.

Before the Kaiser plant opened at Ravenswood, the company took a number of newsmen and Chamber of Commerce representatives to Spokane. Company spokesmen pointed out that operations similar to those in that area could be developed along the Ohio and Kanawha Valleys for fabricating aluminum from the Ravenswood plant.

The possibilities were discussed in West Virginia newspapers at the time. But fabricating industries have not developed as they might have if there had been more enterprising men in the area.

Similarly there are opportunities here for the opening of plants to fabricate nickel, steel and plastics produced in and near Huntington. But there are few such operations even though the city is prospering from the payrolls of its big industries and from heavy shipments of coal.

The constant draining of people away from rural and small urban areas to the overcrowded cities is comparable to giving an overweight patient with high blood pressure one transfusion after another from an underweight victim of anemia.

The big patient has already suffered attacks similar to apoplectic strokes in the form of destructive riots. His well-being is further endangered by polluted air and water, increasing crime and the nerve strain of crowding, commuting and competing for advancement.

The rising costs of government and the increasing welfare load comparable to medical bills are forcing the patient to call for more and more aid.

The anemic patient, who represents the rural urban areas, lacks the means to provide the remedies for the symptoms or the basic causes of his trouble.

Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnittker said in an address at Columbus, Ohio, some time ago:

"Rural towns that once flourished with manufacturing or as railroad centers are now stagnant or deteriorating aggregations of grocery stores, taverns, feed stores, filling stations, garages and empty buildings. They have lost their place in our modern economy."

For several years The Advertiser has been urging legislation to deal with the twin problems of the deterioration of towns and the festering of overcrowded cities.

Now riots and other troubles of the cities have forced themselves upon the attention of high federal officials. At the same time

members of Congress and some members of the President's Cabinet have taken up the problems of rural America.

Remedies proposed to adjust the imbalance in which 70 per cent of the people live on one per cent of the land will be discussed in other editorials of this series.

EFFORTS UNDER WAY TO SLOW DRIFT OF PEOPLE TO CITIES

Several federal programs have been launched to help relieve poverty, create jobs, provide training for them, improve living conditions and in general offer a better life for both city and rural dwellers.

Such efforts should be continued, and some of them should be expanded to meet the needs of millions of disadvantaged people.

But while these remedies relieve some of the troubles, they do not sufficiently reduce the migration of people from the stagnant rural areas to the already crowded big cities. For that a more extensive effort is necessary.

The continuing flow of people from farms and rural towns to the congested big urban areas has been called by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman one of the most serious problems of our times.

For a penetrating study of possible solutions he has announced the sponsorship of a symposium by himself and five other Cabinet members in Washington next December. Eminent economists, sociologists, city planners and population specialists will attend.

Meanwhile, other officials have proposed attacks on the problem.

West Virginia's Democratic Sens. Jennings Randolph and Robert C. Byrd have joined in cosponsoring a rural development bill presented by Republican Sen. James B. Pearson of Kansas.

The measure proposes these tax incentives for attracting job-producing industries and commercial establishments to rural areas:

1. A 14 per cent credit on machinery instead of the normal 7 per cent.

2. A 7 per cent investment credit on the cost of the building.

3. An accelerated depreciation of two-thirds on machinery, equipment and building.

4. A 25 per cent tax deduction above the normal 100 per cent for wages paid low-income persons.

Credits and deductions can be carried backward three years and forward 10 years.

A number of conditions are provided for the benefits. The firm must locate in a county that does not have a city of more than 50,000 population.

At least 15 per cent of the families of the county must have incomes of under $3,000 a year, or employment must have declined at an annual rate of more than 5 per cent during the last five years.

Areas are included where the closing or curtailing of operations of a Defense Department installation is likely to cause a substantial removal of residents.

The secretary of agriculture may also certify the eligibility of Indian reservations after consulting with the secretary of the interior.

Another of the several additional requirements is that the employer must prove that he has not discontinued a similar enterprise and will not reduce the employment in any other area as a result of opening the new establishment.

Restrictions upon the areas in which the benefits would be effective would prevent the development of jobs that would attract many unemployed workers from the big cities.

But if it proved as effective as its sponsors hope, the measure would at least slow the removal of people from rural areas.

Possibly in time its provisions could be extended to encourage the opening of establishments offering work for which city dwellers could be trained and resettled.

Many depressed rural areas, such as those in much of Appalachia, however, are not suitable for extensive industrial development. The best hope of economic progress for the mountainous counties of eastern and southern West Virginia lies in the development of vacation and recreational facilities.

Dams, reservoirs, parks and forest reservations already existing or proposed in that region offer encouragement for building a great playground that would provide work for thousands.

Completion of the Interstate Highway system, Appalachian development roads and the Allegheny scenic highway proposed by Sen. Byrd would open those areas of rugged natural beauty for the enjoyment of millions from the steaming cities of the East and Middle West.

For full success of this development and others in the program of balanced economic growth of the nation, however, still faster transportation facilities will be necessary.

Business and industrial personnel will need jet plane service back and forth and rapid helicopter travel to and from regional airports. There will also be need for fast passenger trains that will carry automobiles.

The rural areas and small cities must have the means of providing theatres, libraries, playgrounds, better schools, regional colleges, swimming pools, golf courses, hospitals and other medical facilities.

There must be facilities to enable young people to develop their full potential for success and to enable them and their elders to travel quickly and frequently to the big cities for business or pleasure.

And these less populous areas must grant the full rights of citizenship and full opportunities for education, employment and advancement to all persons regardless of race or color.

The disadvantaged particularly should be urged to profit by their opportunities.

This should be done because it is right and just.

But besides that, encouraging the millions of low-income families throughout the country to qualify for a higher standard of living would bring a level of progress and prosperity never before approached.

The resultant wealth and harmony would give the nation a strength and respect in the world that it could never otherwise achieve.

STUDY PROPOSED AS BASIS FOR BALANCED U.S. GROWTH

A plan for an extensive study of means of achieving a better balance in the economic growth of the United States has been offered in a proposed joint resolution of Congress.

The measure was introduced in the Senate by Sen. Karl E. Mundt, R-S. D., for himself and 18 others, including Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va.

To carry out the study the resolution authorizes the President to appoint a commission of 20 members.

Four of the appointees would come from United States cities having a population of at least a million. Four would be from cities of between a million and 100 thousand population, four from those of between 100 and 10 thousand, and four from communities of less than 10 thousand.

The final four would be appointed for special qualifications to help carry out the work of the commission without regard to place of residence or political affiliation.

Not more than half of those chosen from cities or towns could be from the same political party.

The commission would make an analysis and evaluation of:

1. The social, political and economic factors that affect the geographical location of industry;

2. The social, political and economic factors necessary to enable industries to operate efficiently outside large urban centers or to operate and expand within large urban centers without the creation of new economic and social problems;

3. The limits imposed upon population density to enable municipalities or other political subdivisions to provide public services in the most efficient and effective manner;

4. The effect on government efficiency generally of differing patterns and intensities of population concentration;

5. The extent to which a better geographic balance in the economic development of the nation serves the public interest;

6. The role that state and local government can and should play in promoting geographic balance in the economic development of a state or region; and

7. Practical ways in which federal expenditures can and should be managed to encourage a greater geographic balance in the economic development of the nation.

The study would also cover various ways by which the federal government might effectively encourage a more balanced economic growth.

The resolution requires that the study be completed and a report of findings and recommendations be submitted to the President and to Congress within two years after its effective date.

The commission and its authorized subcommittees and members are empowered to hold hearings. Departments and agencies of the executive branch of the government are directed to furnish any information the commission requests to help in carrying out its work.

The study would not be limited to the subjects specifically assigned. Experience gained as the work progressed would doubtless open new avenues of investigation.

The major purpose of the resolution seems to be to open the way for planning national economic growth to obtain a better balance.

The imbalance now existing between the troubled, overcrowded cities and the deteriorating rural areas gives abundant evidence of the need of such a program.

The possible benefits of national planning have been demonstrated also by the improvements brought about by city and area planning.

If a planning program had been in effect for the nation a generation ago, it could have prevented or alleviated many of the social and economic ills that challenge city, state and federal governments today.

But besides providing the basis for a planning program, the study can encourage general economic development by:

1. Stimulating community agencies to greater effort in attracting business and industry to rural towns and areas.

2. Encouraging smaller cities to join in regional development programs, as The Advertiser has been urging the Huntington and Charleston areas to do in providing a new airport midway between them.

3. Pointing out to progressive companies opportunities for locating branch operations in certain areas and supplying ideas for expanding various lines of production.

The commission might perform a distinct service by studying the benefits of locating railway operating offices at the most advantageous points along their lines.

This Tri-State Area is near the center of the origin of much of the coal hauled by the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. It would thus seem to be a superior location for many of the company's offices.

Bringing more people here and providing faster service would tend to attract diversified industries to the area already highly favored by an abundance of fresh water and other resources such as coal, salt brines and natural gas.

Merger of the Norfolk & Western with the Chesapeake & Ohio-Baltimore & Ohio affilia-

tion could open the way for the development of a great railway center here that would provide the stimulus for the growth of a much bigger metropolitan area.

Through such benefits of planned and speeded economic growth the sponsors of the resolution and the commission it established could become the architects for rebuilding the nation into a balanced new pattern that would assure all its people a fairer share of its great riches, and would stand as a shining example of justice and wise management throughout the world.

NATIONAL PLANNING NEEDED TO BALANCE FUTURE GROWTH

The federal government itself could set an example to private business and industry for bringing about a better balance in the nation's economic and population growth.

For several years The Advertiser has been advocating the creation of a national planning agency to make studies and recommendations for the location of new federal bases and installations and for the award of new space and defense contracts.

A short time ago the Republican party's National Coordinating Committee proposed in a five-point program that more government contracts and installations go to poor rural areas.

The five points were outlined in a New York Times News Service story to The Advertiser as follows:

1. Economic incentives for factories to locate in poor rural areas; channeling more government defense and supply contracts and building more installations in such areas.

2. Increased aid for schools, including more vocational-technical schools, in rural areas.

3. Enactment of the rural community action section of the opportunity crusade, the Republican alternative to the administration's antipoverty program.

4. Providing rural areas with the kind of employment service available to urban workers.

5. Stepping up the work of the economic development administration in poor rural areas to attract new industries.

Not only slowing but eventually reversing the migration from rural areas to big cities, as previous editorials in this series have pointed out, is necessary as an attack upon growing social and economic ills.

The need will become even more urgent as the population of the big cities increases. In recent years about four-fifths of the rapid population growth has been in the already congested cities, and much of that has been in the crowded, impoverished slums.

How this crowding can increase, with consequent complication of problems, is illustrated by predictions of future population gains.

The number of people in the nation reached 100,000,000 between the census of 1910 and that of 1920. The total in 1920 was 105,710,620. Within a few weeks the population is expected to reach 200,000,000.

The increase from 100,000,000 to 200,000,000 will thus require about 50 years. But forecasters say only about 30 years will be necessary to reach 300,000,000.

If the proportionate rate of growth in the big cities continues as it has in the last few years, the problem of financing an adequate war on poverty, pollution and congestion could become too great for solution.

But as great as this problem would be, the danger of cataclysmic destruction from a possible nuclear attack upon the major cities would be much more awesome.

These populous centers would be the first targets of enemy missiles. The fact that some of them are on the coasts would make them still easier to hit with missiles from submarines.

And the location of many of our defense facilities and essential production industries on the coasts would simplify the work of an enemy in destroying them.

The need of dispersing essential defense industries and installations was widely discussed during the destructive bombing of World War II.

Some European countries, notably Sweden, have built extensive underground facilities. We have concentrated even our defense research facilities on the coasts, the most vulnerable areas.

Locating new federal installations on the recommendations of a national planning agency could definitely strengthen national security.

In most cases it would probably also give the installations other advantages not available at spots chosen by congressional committee chairman influenced by their constituents.

The threatened serious national water problem is another vital reason for efforts to reverse the migration to the big cities. The seriousness of this threat has been demonstrated by the water shortage that existed in New York and other cities of the Northeast.

Conditions during the long drought there gave ominous emphasis to the 1966 report of a Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution headed by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine.

One paragraph of the report said:

"Our withdrawal of water was 40 billion gallons per day in 1900. It will reach 450 billion gallons in 1970 and 650 billion gallons per day in 1980. The current estimate of usable fresh water in lakes, streams, and reservoirs is 650 billion gallons a day. We will soon reach the limit of our water supply, and because water demands will continue to rise in accordance with population increases and per capita use, it is clear that water needs can be met only by an immediate large-scale expansion of our water resources development program and by continued reuse of the available water supply. Unless pollution is controlled, water cannot be reused."

Dispersing the population to make better use of the available supply of water is important not only because of the growing household consumption but because of the great quantities essential for some industries.

Once the federal government demonstrated the importance of dispersing its bases and installations, private business and industry would doubtless be inclined to follow its example, particularly if tax incentives were offered.

A policy of channeling government contracts into rural areas would also influence industries to locate there.

The factors cited in this series of editorials definitely seem to justify congressional approval of:

1. A bill providing tax incentives for the location of business and industry in rural areas;

2. A resolution for studies to provide the base for a better balance in economic growth;

3. A measure creating a national planning agency to make studies and recommendations for the location of government installations and contracts.

The serious conditions discussed call for prompt efforts to generate popular enthusiasm for planned progress that can bring such enormous benefits.

Serious troubles within the cities have already demonstrated that it may be much later than we think.

Allowing the influx of people from rural areas and towns to continue while middle-class residents leave the core of cities for the suburbs could make the problems impossible of solution.

That could bring on a hopeless era of violence and destruction even if fortune spared the jam-packed millions cremation in the flames of nuclear war.

ACTION COULD HAVE BEEN TAKEN ON A CONTINUING RESOLUTION ON APPROPRIATIONS TODAY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to observe that the House has been in session today. It has passed legislation.

I further observe that if the Rules Committee had met yesterday on the continuing resolution, it could have been brought up today and action taken on it.

MENTAL RETARDATION

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, many Americans today are concerned about the population explosion and about the problems of mentally retarded people. What many of us who share these concerns do not know is the close relationship there is between them.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Katherine Oettinger, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Family Planning and Population, made a timely speech last week at the dedication of the Child Development Center at Howard University.

The Child Development Center is one of about 140 mental retardation clinics now being supported in whole or in part by the Children's Bureau. These centers provide training and care for the mentally retarded where it is most needed—at the local level. As Mrs. Oettinger said of the Center at Howard University:

> Your Child Development Center . . . will be able to bring to . . . many families . . . the most recent advances in the field of mental retardation. And your work is of even greater significance because your facilities are right at the doorstep of the homes of so many people who otherwise might find no relief from their fears and their burdens.

Last week the House unanimously passed the Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967, a key element in President Johnson's recommendations to aid the welfare of our children. Its passage insures that many more of the 6 million mentally retarded Americans will receive proper care and training by making available funds to assist in the construction and staffing of mental retardation centers. This is indeed heartening.

But the pessimism expressed by several Members of this House during the debate on the bill as to the likelihood of any immediate or substantial reduction in the number of children born with this affliction was disheartening. This pessimism stands in contrast to the optimism expressed by Mrs. Oettinger that we can do something to reduce these rolls and we can do it now.

Two of the major ways in which we can reduce the incidence of mental retardation with the knowledge we now have is through better maternal and child care and by making family planning services more readily available to all mothers. As Mrs. Oettinger pointed out, premature births occur most frequently among four groups of women: teenage mothers—particularly among unwed teenage mothers—mothers over 40, mothers who have already borne three babies, and mothers who have children one right after the other with no adequate spacing between them.

Mrs. Oettinger offered some striking figures. She said:

> The baby who comes into life prematurely is 20 times as vulnerable to mental retardation . . . as the full-term infant—Everytime a woman delays pregnancy until she is in the optimum condition for both child bearing and child rearing, she increases the chance of her future children to live a life free from such handicapping defects as mental retardation.

Other presently possible means of lowering the incidence of mental retardation are through universal vaccination against measles, through the screening of all newborn infants for phenylketonuria, commonly known as PKU, and through widespread efforts to remove all lead paints from the interiors of old homes and to educate people as to the dangers inherent in lead poisoning. Programs to counter these possible causes of mental retardation are underway. The Public Health Service spearheaded the campaign to educate the public as to the dangers of measles and cooperates with State and local agencies to make measles vaccine readily available at a minimum cost to all children. By late 1966, 34 States had enacted laws pertaining to the screening of newborn infants for PKU. And the Children's Bureau will shortly issue a publication entitled, "Lead Poisoning in Children" in an effort to educate more physicians and parents to this syndrome. The Bureau is also working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development to chart a program whereby local public health authorities will make available to landlords, on a low-cost basis, the machinery needed to remove lead paint from the inside walls of dwellings.

Thus we can and are doing something for both sides of the coin of mental retardation. While we cannot eradicate it with the knowledge we now have, we can lower the percentage of people who must be afflicted. And we can help those unfortunates in our society who are affected by it through therapy and treatment provided in centers throughout the country.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: ACTION NOW

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article appearing in the July–August issue of Rally entitled "The Great Seniority Struggle: Can Congress Survive as a Co-Equal Branch?" by Donald Lambro.

On January 10 this year I introduced a bill, H.R. 96 to amend the rules of the House to provide for the election of committee chairmen by secret ballot of the members of each committee. My bill embodies the proposal put forward by the prestigious American Assembly of Columbia University, by my former colleague John Lindsay, who researched this subject for our Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform, and by others knowledgeable on this subject as perhaps the fairest and most workable alternative to the present method of selecting committee chairmen purely on the basis of longevity.

In matters of courtesy such as the assignment of room space, I think that reliance on seniority is probably as equitable and practical a system as could be devised. But on the question of choosing who shall be the chairman of each of the important standing and special committees of the U.S. Congress, it seems to me that we ought to be governed by a higher law of logic than that which says that the fellow who has been around the longest shall therefore exercise the greatest authority.

Obviously, I do not agree with Mr. Lambro's conclusion. But he is a hard-working scholar, and I commend his contribution to the literature on this subject. His article is well worth reading, and I hope that its appearance in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will help to advance the dialog on congressional reform.

As an immediate proposition, I urge the leadership to schedule S. 355, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, for action by the House of Representatives. This modest piece of reform legislation, passed by an overwhelming vote of the Senate, has been bottled up in the Rules Committee approaching 7 months. Although much will remain to be done, this bill contains many provisions for the modernization of our institutions that are critically overdue and should be promptly enacted.

THE GREAT SENIORITY STRUGGLE—CAN CONGRESS SURVIVE AS A CO-EQUAL BRANCH?

(By Donald Lambro)

Washington columnist William S. White likes to recall an incident that occurred at the platform committee proceeding of the 1956 Democratic convention. Nearly the entire day had been given over to complaints against the seniority system in Congress. But after the last witness had his say, Rep. John W. McCormack, who is now Speaker of the House, rose to make some concluding remarks. Warmly placing his arm around Negro Congressman William Dawson of Illinois, he told the delegates that he understood and sympathized with their positions. But, he added, there was inside the House an actuality of experience they did not understand.

"You see," he said, "if it were not for the seniority system in the House I am bound to tell you that I very much doubt that my friend Bill Dawson would today be the chairman of a House committee."

Each year various liberals suggest schemes to replace "The System" as the method of selecting committee chairmen. Ex-Senators Lehman, Humphrey and Douglas, and their colleagues, have repeatedly attempted to substitute almost anything for the present system of advancement through longevity.

In recent years the campaign has been intensified by "reformers" both in and out of Congress. Professor James MacGregor Burns is the foremost academician with blueprints for leveling "obstructionist" legislative hurdles. Senator Joseph Clark (*The Sapless Branch*) and Rep. Richard Bolling (*House Out of Order*) head the congressional opponents of the system.

Our purpose here is to examine the merits of the seniority system in the hope that its remarkable assets will be more fully recognized. According to Dr. George Galloway, House historian, seniority has been entrenched in the Senate for well over a century, but arose in the House only 56 years ago. Liberals have consequently assumed the system to be more tenuous in the House, but almost beyond removal in the Senate, and have concentrated their fire on the lower chamber. The resurgence of a Republican "sentiment" in the House as a result of the 1966 elections has dampened, but not extinguished, their ardor. Seniority is still at the top of the liberals' list.

The seniority system is merely a reflection of the customs and procedures of Congress. "States' rights, local elections, restricted franchise, minority rights, rural over-representation, checks and balances, congressional power, the danger of majority or 'mass' rule, judicial review (at least in the old days), powerful committees, the seniority system, the filibuster—in short, the Madisonian system in all its ramifications—arouse their [conservatives'] support," wrote Professor Burns.

In his "brilliantly wrong book," *Deadlock of Democracy*, written several years before the legendary 89th Congress enacted a flood of welfarist legislation, Burns complained of a deadlock in the political machinery of our national government. Nothing was happening in Washington, he said, and nothing happens out in the country unless something happens in Washington. Something, anything, must be done. The White House would ship bushels of bills to Captiol Hill, but Congress slowly and methodically sifted everything, permitting only a few to become law. This is what the Massachusetts professor called the "deadlock" and he reasoned that it was caused by "obstructionism" in Congress—i.e., committee chairmen, House rules, and off-year elections.

Burns then proposed a tidy scheme to permit the liberals, whom he calls the Presidential Democrats and Presidential Republicans, to seize the two parties. If both parties were liberal, he reasoned, the outcome in Congress would be as delightful (liberal) as the presidential elections which, he said, were always a race between leftward-thinking candidates. In each house, he continued, there would be the Presidential Party (Republicans and Democrats supporting the President's program) and the Congressional Party (Republicans and Democrats who oppose the White House program). The professor is obviously eager to expand the strength of the former and undermine the latter.

"What it takes," he wrote, "is majority support for changes in Congress, determination, parliamentary resourcefulness, and persistence. . . . [S]upported by a Johnson or a Nelson Rockefeller in the White House, the presidential party in Congress should pool its strength with the other presidential party to strengthen both Senate and House."

When the reformers talk of "strengthening" Congress, they do not mean it in the traditional check-and-balance sense of renewing legislative prerogatives vis-a-vis the executive. A "strengthened" Congress is one subservient to the presidency, a Congress

composed of liberals; a Congress whose committees are controlled by cooperative people.

Conservative Professor Willmoore Kendall underscores the Machiavellianism of Mr. Burns' proposal for a congressional *coup d'etat*. "Give Mr. Burns and his friends a free hand with our political machinery," he argued in their Pasadena debate, "let them do a little tinkering with it, and everything will come out all right! All of which is to say, Mr. Burns and his friends will then get their way in American politics: the White House program will be adopted and all good things will be added unto us."

It is apparent, on close examination, that the seniority system does govern the "procedures and organization as well as the selection of committee chairmen." "It is perhaps worth remarking," James Burnham wrote, "that this is also true of all other legislative bodies (state and municipal) in the United States, though it is only in connection with Congress that the issue has excited much public debate.

"Unquestionably, as a glance at any session's roster of committee chairmen proves, seniority upsets the plebiscitary relations in favor of age, of social stability in the constituencies, of southern and normally one-party states against more volatile regions, and of farming or small town districts against the big cities."

And it is through these key districts, these safe seats, that those congressmen establish their tenure and accumulate years of service and knowledge—an internship that frequently transforms freshmen into seniors, novices into experts, and congressmen into statesmen.

However, the facts do not altogether mesh with the myth that nearly all committee chairmen are conservative southern Democrats who hail from backward rural areas and seldom vote with their own party.

For example, of the twenty House standing committee chairmen in the 90th Congress only three have an Americans for Constitutional Action rating above 60%; Colmer, 80%; Burleson, 74%; and McMillan, 65%. Thirteen out of the 20 have an ACA rating of 30% or less. Americans for Democratic Action scores correspond inversely to these percentages. Committee chairmanships have hardly been usurped by conservatives.

Of the 20 standing committee chairmen, 6 come from the south, 5 from the north, 2 from border states, 2 from the west, and 5 from the southwest.

New York Times commentator Arthur Krock, writing in the Jan. 22 *Sunday Times Magazine*, vigorously defended the seniority system after a lifetime of observing it in action. Some of his observations, however, are not totally accurate. Rather, he seemed to reinforce the myth that committee chairmen almost overwhelmingly belong to a rural America of yesterday. A close look at the facts suggests that those who have arrived at this conclusion are in error.

Nine House committee chairmen can definitely be placed in the rural column: Mills, Teague, Willis, Colmer, Staggers, Aspinall, Burleson, McMillan and Rivers. However, 7 chairmen are solidly in the urban column: Miller, Fallon, Dulski, Garmatz, Celler, Dawson, and Morgan. More important, though, 4 of these standing committee chairmen come from what can accurately be described as semiurban areas which have through the years felt the impact of industrial expansion and the influx of large numbers of people. For instance, Rep. George H. Mahon (Appropriations) comes from Lubbock, Texas, with a population of over 181,000, and can hardly be called a rural congressman. Rep. W. R. Poage of Waco, Texas, comes from a rapidly expanding district. Waco's population exceeds 170,000. Another Texas chairman, Wright Patman, from industrially expanding Texarkana (pop. 99,000) obviously fails to qualify in the rural column. Rep. Carl D. Perkins of Kentucky has several rapidly growing metropolitan areas in his once-lethargic district. The point is, that population and industrial growth are rapidly urbanizing a number of rural districts. Thus only nine of twenty chairmen can be described as rurally-oriented, and some of these districts are changing rapidly.

The record of party support among House committee chairmen is, surprisingly, quite good. The notion that they are renegade mavericks who constantly bolt their party leadership is just so much mythology. Fully half of the standing committee chairmen of the present Congress supported their party during the 89th Congress more than 75% of the time. Of the remaining ten chairmen, four supported their party leadership more than 50% of the time. The remaining six supported their party an average of 27% of the time. All these statistics simply do not support the theory that seniority is a major factor in congressional resistance to White House proposals.

Committee chairmen wield considerable authority over the affairs of their committees and the subcommittees beneath them. But in most cases they are not the iron-fisted despots portrayed by various pundits and political scientists. They direct committee affairs in much the manner that executives in any complex organization oversee operations.

But just what is it that gives chairmen their power? Let's run down the list. They arrange the agenda; appoint subcommittees; designate chairmen; refer legislative matters to the subcommittees; decide when the committee is to meet; whether or not to hold hearing; approve the list of witnesses; hire the staff; decide what and when to investigate; manage legislation on the floor; decide when the committee is to vote; open and close committee debate; and decide whether hearings will be open or executive. They can, if they wish, pigeonhole legislation or speed up action on it, or amend it substantially with assistance from committee colleagues.

It is argued that these are extraordinary powers, inconsistent with modern democracy and efficiency. But this argument ignores the broad spectrum of checks on the chairman's power. A simple majority vote by the House can bring to the floor any bill being stalled in committee. A simple procedure known as Calendar Wednesday can also pry loose a bill from a reluctant committee chairman. And in almost every instance the Speaker (now that the 21-day rule has been repealed) can request the chairman to report a bill from committee. Several other maneuvers are also available. Often the chairman himself establishes clear rules of procedure and scheduling to protect the committee from arbitrary rules and dilatory maneuvers.

Seniority is not a rigid system that invariably elevates long-term incompetents to authority. It can at times be extremely flexible, often resolving problems and tie-ups with amazing speed and smoothness. No one was surprised, for instance, when the late Sen. Theodore Green (D-R.I.) relinquished his chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1959 even though he continued as that committee's highest ranking member. He was eminently qualified, but because of age he was no longer able to handle the enormous workload of committee business. The younger Mr. Fulbright automatically took command. There have been several instances where congressmen have switched committee positions to enable each man to work in a field in which he had greater competence and interest.

Often the House has carefully circumvented seniority to patch a break in the congressional machinery without disrupting the system itself. R. Ewing Thomason, who later became a federal judge in Texas, was the actual chairman during the early postwar period of the now-defunct House Committee on Military Affairs. The Chairman by seniority, however, was Andrew May of Kentucky, who later got into trouble with the government over influence peddling. The entire House knew about Thomason's *de facto* control of the committee, but not a word was uttered about it outside the caucus rooms. The seniority ranking, on the surface, was left untouched.

The removal of Rep. Adam Clayton Powell from his chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee is still another example of the power to override the system and punish members who flout House standards. The Powell case provides a modern example of the flexibility with which Congress operates.

Though the House and Senate have been reluctant to weaken the prerogatives of seniority, they have at times sternly punished those who have misused the system. Only a few years ago a liberal faction of the Democratic Party successfully purged Rep. Albert Watson (S.C.) and John Bell Williams (Miss.) of their seniority for supporting the candidacy of Barry M. Goldwater in 1964. During the 69th Congress, in 1925, Wisconsin Republicans John M. Nelson and Florian Lampert were purged of their seniority after campaigning as La Follette Progressives in the 1924 elections. Both were committee chairmen, and they and the entire Wisconsin delegation were quickly dropped to the bottom of the seniority ladder of their party.

Still earlier, Rep. John Randolph of Virginia lost his chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee in 1807 for what was described as "eccentric and arbitrary behavior." He apparently didn't learn his lesson, for several years later he was bodily evicted from the chamber by Speaker Henry Clay for bringing a pair of hunting dogs onto the House floor.

The point is, the orderly workings of the seniority system have not coerced the members into becoming its servants. Rather, the system's uniqueness is that it serves its members well, year in and year out.

Heinz Evlau, writing for the American Enterprise Institute, argues that "as a legislator comes to specialize, he tends to become an expert in his area of specialization. But this in turn presupposes that he has sufficient opportunity to become familiar with the often highly technical aspects of modern legislation. This he cannot do if his committee tenure is of short duration. From this vantage point at least, there is much to be said for retaining seniority as a criterion in guiding committee assignments."

Few defenders of the existing system argue that it is always beneficial. "There is rarely a time," writes William S. White, "when some dunderhead is not at the head of some committee by the mere inexorable workings of seniority." This, however, proves to be the exception in both chambers, where scores of committees and 535 men and women figure in a complicated hierarchical system. It is also true that on many committees legislators of extraordinary talent and wisdom are influential, even though they have achieved no specific hierarchical status.

Other ways have been suggested of selecting committee chairmen, but, as White observes, none of them is a viable alternative to seniority. The most frequently suggested reform—that committee members should elect their own chairmen—would plunge the system into a three-ring circus of logrolling and vote-trading: You give me a vote here and I will give you a vote on that bill of yours. Such infighting "would produce a lobbying chaos . . . in which 'outside' pressures, not all of the necessarily beneficent and forward-looking and disinterested, could simply tear the place apart."

"Nor could there possibly be any objective standard upon which objective men could rely," White adds.

When members are repeatedly returned to

their seats they begin to feel the fruits of seniority and their objections to it gradually lessen. Most members have more faith in committee chairmen than the reformers do—a conviction that these senior members know best how to run Congress.

Seniority survives because none of the proposed alternatives seems as likely to serve as well in selecting the right men. White points out that Congress "is no more able—even if it were willing, as it is not now and never will be—to repeal the claims of seniority than any human enterprise is able to repeal the claims of the synonyms of seniority: experience, capacity, earned prestige, personal influence through personal power."

Seniority is essentially the strength of Congress. It ensures that the personal power and prestige of the men who run the committees shall not fall aimlessly into inexperienced hands, into the laps of wild-eyed reformers eager to manufacture a new set of social reforms, or aid the progressive erosion of congressional power by becoming the adjutors of the "presidential party." And, too, seniority enhances the quality of legislation by requiring that congressional leaders absorb a long series of lessons about laws, men, and justice. And it further requires that such individuals merit the support and earn the approval of their constituents.

"What the defenders of the seniority rule are really saying," Burns admits, "is that given our present congressional party system, a seniority rule is inevitable. And in this they are correct. By the same token, an end of the rule depends on the end of the system."

To this William White replies that "any reform of the kind proposed by Burns and by a good many others would within five years of its acceptance be no reform at all. The realities of legislative life . . . will not accommodate themselves to theoretical designs resting upon such splendid abstractions as 'progressive . . . forward-looking'—designs formed far from the scene of daily action."

But the point is that the reformers are slowly gaining ground. Those who favor essentially the present system must gird themselves for a lengthy siege.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES TO COMMERCIAL BANKS

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point an interesting series of correspondence which I have had with a commercial banker on the subject of free services provided by commercial banks to the Government. Too often it is overlooked that banks are the ones who enjoy a bonanza at the expense of the American taxpayer, particularly with respect to the $2.5 billion of interest-free funds that banks hold in their Treasury tax and loan accounts, and I have urged for many years that this free ride be ended.

As I pointed out in my letter to Mr. Smith, member banks of the Federal Reserve System are examined free of charge. Commercial banks can build up a bad debt reserve of 2.4 percent of outstanding loans. Since 1956 this has enabled the commercial banks to write off about $2,442 million more against loan income than actual loan losses that amounted to $1,563 million. As you can see, this is quite a tax subsidy. Commercial banks during 1965 had net losses on loans of about $324 million but they wrote off roughly $781 million from taxable income. That writeoff reduced their Federal income taxes by more than $203 million in only 1 year; that is about 26 percent on $781 million. Of course, other businesses pay a rate of about 50 percent and some of your biggest banks pay on a rate as low as 14 or 15 percent. The prestigious Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.'s rate was less than 19 percent in 1966.

The common trust fund in a commercial bank's trust department is completely tax exempt, another huge subsidy that commercial banks enjoy. And, of course, interest paid on time deposits are tax free and the tax-exempt municipal bonds, of which commercial banks hold a huge bulk, are not taxable. Banks also enjoy long-term capital gains on securities at the favorable rate of 25 percent. Losses on securities are used to offset ordinary income which would otherwise be taxable at the 48-percent corporate income tax rate.

The greatest gift to the commercial banking industry by the Government is their ability to create money on the credit of the Federal Government free of all charge by the fractional reserve system. The interest charged on loans which result from the fractional reserve privilege is also part of a commercial bank's profit.

Mr. L. D. Smith, of the Marine Bank & Trust Co., of Tampa, Fla., has outlined his case in the following letter to which my letter of April 10 responds:

MARINE BANK & TRUST CO.,
Tampa, Fla., April 4, 1967.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Your reply of March 20 to my letter of March 14, 1967 is interesting but hardly reassuring.

You ask me to be specific, in extension of comments in my earlier letter referring somewhat critically to some of your positions and actions which have been held to be less statesmanlike than might have been expected from one with your long experience and rank in Congress.

I shall be specific, at this time, on only one subject.

From time to time, you have undertaken to have the Treasury Department require the payment of interest by banks on Treasury Tax and Loan deposits.

I feel, strongly that you are unaware of, or, perhaps, are not making due allowance for, the fact that the commercial banks render invaluable, extensive, continuous, and skilled service to the public and to the Treasury, the cost of which to the government, if paid for commensurably with going rates for professional service of such a high order, would be shocking to those now obtaining such service practically free. It would be surprising, to you probably, if it could be arrived at.

The number, extent, variety and exacting nature of such services is little understood or adequately appreciated, even by the Treasury Department, in my opinion.

I refer, particularly, to the services rendered to the Treasury Department in issuing, redeeming, and obtaining the reissuance of U.S. Savings bonds for the holders.

The only direct and tangible compensation banks receive for this continuous and exacting service is the small fee they are paid for *redeeming* (over the counter) savings bonds, Series E, and whatever small profit can be earned from their Treasury Tax and Loan accounts. These balances have to be secured with collateral, they are demand deposits, and are withdrawn at the Treasury's pleasure (which means that they are usually left for rather short periods). This seems to be especially true these days, in view of the heavy calls on the Treasury, due to the war effort and constantly expanding government on all other fronts. It also seems to me that the tempo of withdrawals very probably has been increased, either intentionally or unconsciously since you uttered your more recent criticisms and charges that the banks are being unduly enriched at the public's expense thru Tax and Loan deposits.

There is a basic law that banks may not pay interest on demand deposits, which you should bear in mind. Furthermore, the banks have the duty and responsibility of collecting the taxes and proceeds from the sale of government securities, and accounting for them according to rigid rules. This involves much service.

The service extended, in advising with existing and potential holders of government securities, particularly savings bonds, is surprising and its extent is largely unknown to any except those directly involved in dealing with the public. Redemptions, except the simplest, have to be forwarded to a Fiscal Agent, or to Chicago or to the Treasury, which involves considerable work and expense. Usually, there is delay, at which the bondholder fumes.

The unusual and varied nature of many of these transactions requires that someone with long experience handle them. This means considerable expense to the bank. No two transactions seem to be alike, and it is amazing how involved and troublesome some of them are.

Recently, it has occurred to me that I have been handling such matters ever since the first Liberty Loan bonds were issued, about the time of World War I, and I do not recall that the two banks with which I have been connected during all that time have ever received more than very scant thanks, nor can I recall that I, personally, have ever received the first word of thanks from anyone connected with the government. Of course, I expected none, wanting only to serve the government, too much of the time because it was at war, declared or otherwise, and to serve the public because somehow, the public looks to the banks (as the banks would have it) for financial guidance and assistance.

It does seem, however, that the banks might be compensated better, rather than worse, and that at least some sparse words of thanks might be in order now and then.

Yours very truly,

L. D. SMITH.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1967.

Mr. L. D. SMITH,
Marine Bank & Trust Co.,
Tampa, Fla.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Thank you for your letter of April 4 concerning the free use by commercial banks of public funds. I fully agree that commercial banks should be compensated for any and all services to the public. I further believe that interest should be paid on the approximately $5 billion annual average balance in the Treasury Tax and Loan accounts.

I should also remind you that the Marine Bank & Trust Company is examined by the Federal Reserve System free of charge to you. Also, the annual additions to your bad debt reserve of 2.4 percent are roughly 15 or 16 times the industry's actual loss experience. The difference represents a huge tax subsidy. Furthermore, your common trust fund in your trust department, if you have one, is completely tax-exempt. Also, you can deduct

the interest paid on time deposits and buy tax-exempt municipal bonds. Also, your long-term gains on securities are taxed at the favorable 25 percent rate, while any losses may be used to off-set ordinary income otherwise taxable at the 48 percent rate—another instance of tax favoritism toward banks.

Furthermore, you are permitted to create money on the credit of the government free of charge, by the fractional reserve privilege, and keep for yourself all the interest charged consumers, small businessmen, and other borrowers.

In conclusion, it would seem to me that any alleged subsidy the banking industry gives to the government is far outweighed by the subsidy the banking industry receives from the government as indicated above.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

TEXAS SCHOOL OFFICIAL BLAMES COLLEGES FOR SLOWDOWN IN STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the guaranteed student loan program, authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, has not been as successful as had been anticipated.

One of the reasons I have suggested for the slowdown is that commercial banks have been slow to go into this program. In recent weeks, the American Bankers Association has made it clear that it is demanding a $35 fee from the Government for each loan made before it will put its mark of stamp of approval.

Mr. L. E. Boze, assistant superintendent of the Grand Prairie Public Schools, has suggested a supplemental reason for the lag in college loans. While pointing out that the Grand Prairie State Bank has been extremely cooperative in making student loans, Mr. Boze suggests that the trouble lies with the colleges and universities. In a letter to me, Mr. Boze wrote:

> They (the colleges and universities) simply will not tell the students, public school people, (counselors and principals) the availability of such loans. We have found it next to impossible to even find that such a loan is possible for a college student to obtain.

I am including in my remarks a copy of Mr. Boze's letter so that when hearings on the student guarantee loan program are resumed by the House Education and Labor Committee, members will have the opportunity to consider Mr. Boze's feelings:

GRAND PRAIRIE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Grand Prairie, Tex., September 20, 1967.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I read with interest an article in the Dallas Morning News concerning, "United Student Aid Funds, Inc.". I am sure through the publication of this article more students, parents, administrators and counselors are better informed about this project. I think your remarks have merit, and may encourage more banks to make these funds available to college students. I would like to thank you for this.

I thought you would like to know that the Grand Prairie State Bank has made such loans available to our students. Mr. Durwood Sutton, President, has taken a personal interest in making these loans. I might suggest that if more bankers were better informed and that these forms be simplified to the extent that it would not be so difficult for the banks to meet the requirements to make these loans, it would help. Mr. Sutton, personally, spent many hours in studying these forms and requirements. He made several telephone calls to the numerous colleges and universities as well as to the fund headquarters in New York, in order to get all the information needed to complete the applications. It was most difficult to get all information necessary from the colleges and universities.

I feel the trouble lies with the colleges and universities, rather than the banks. They simply will not tell the students, public school people, (counselors and principals) the availability of such loans. We have found it next to impossible to even find that such a loan is possible for a college student to obtain.

If you could help us with the colleges and universities in getting this information to all public schools, it would be most helpful.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. BOZE,
Assistant Superintendent.

GRAND JURORS CHARGE CURBS IN CRIME FIGHT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a grateful feeling toward the recently adjourned grand jury for the District of Columbia that I read into the RECORD a news item from the Washington Post of September 28, 1967. It is on the third page of section B, but deserved a place on the front page of the first section.

It refers to the unanimous action of the grand jurors in writing a letter which should lay at rest the idea in the minds of some, if not most of officialdom, that the Negro population does not want the laws enforced. The composition of this grand jury was predominantly Negro, and its members unanimously soundly condemned the handcuffing of law enforcement in the District of Columbia. I commend them for their courageous action.

The article referred to follows:

GRAND JURORS CHARGE CURBS IN CRIME FIGHT

The outgoing Grand Jury No. 1 for the District of Columbia, in an unprecedented move, yesterday sent a letter to the editor of The Washington Post strongly attacking what it called the limitations imposed upon police, prosecutors and judges in their fight against crime.

The letter was signed by 19 of the 23 members of the jury with a notation that the remaining four, although unable to be present at its composition, gave their approval to its contents.

It stated in part that "we feel the pendulum has swung too far. After two months of duty we find ourselves amazed and shocked at the exaggerated consideration given those who roam our streets indulging themselves in acts of the most outrageous nature."

"If you happen to murder someone in the near future, feel free to confess to one or a hundred people. Unless you are informed of your rights in the most precise terminology, the odds are that the judiciary branch will see to your freedom."

Officials of the U.S. Attorney's office said that the letter had been drafted and sent without their knowledge or consent.

Strictly speaking, a grand jury is prohibited from taking such an action. Each juror is under oath not to discuss any phase of his activities or cases he hears inside the grand jury room.

The jury was dismissed Monday after sitting five days a week for eight weeks. It was predominantly Negro in composition.

A BILLION DOLLARS

Mr. BRINKLEY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's insurance industry has demonstrated its confidence in the efficacy of the rent supplemental program. Most of the initial portions of the $1 billion they have pledged to invest in rebuilding slum areas is slated to go into housing for tenants eligible to receive rent supplements. Surely, Congress will not turn its back on this industrywide project and the Nation's poor by rejecting funds to continue the recent supplement program.

As the Baltimore Sun noted in a recent editorial, the $1 billion will provide as many as 80,000 dwelling units. However, urban renewal and highway construction alone destroy more units than this each year. We need closer to 2 million new housing units per year, most of them for low-income families. The insurance industry has taken a promising first step. Congress must join in the battle too.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

A BILLION DOLLARS

Life insurance companies plan to invest $1 billion in housing mortgages in city slums. This will be a good start, but more will be needed. A billion dollars will provide maybe 80,000 dwelling units. Urban renewal and highway building destroy more units than that each year. A building association official says there is a need for two million new dwelling units a year, much of it for the poor, but there has never been a two million-unit year. This year only 1.2 million units will be built.

According to the 1960 census there were 10.6 million units of substandard housing, 4.3 million in urban places. The percentage of substandard housing in most cities had decreased by 1965, but that is for the city or metropolitan area as a whole. In the slums, if Watts is typical, the situation is worse than in 1960: dilapidated units up from 3 to 5 per cent in five years, deteriorating units up from 12 to 28 per cent, according to a special census.

The insurance companies, and the Johnson Administration, are to be applauded for the new plan. Money is the catalyst slums need. Private money is desperately needed. There could never be enough Government money. David Rockefeller estimates the need at five private dollars for every one public dollar. The importance of the insurance companies' announcement is that it signifies

faith that money can be profitably put to use in areas increasingly shunned by big investors. If the experiment works, other giant financial institutions could be expected to follow.

SUPPORT FOR S. 780

Mr. BRINKLEY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to draw the attention of the Members to the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has recently concluded hearings on air pollution control legislation and has reported a bill on this subject to the House, S. 780.

The public has—rightly so, in my opinion—become increasingly concerned about the steady deterioration of the quality of our atmosphere. The President gave voice to these feelings in his message to the Congress last January 30 when he said:

> This situation does not exist because it was inevitable, nor because it cannot be controlled. Air pollution is the inevitable consequence of neglect. It can be controlled when that neglect is no longer tolerated.

The people of this country are demanding an end to such neglect. The reasons for their attitude are numerous. The most important reason, in my view, is that air pollution is a menace to the health of our citizens in many parts of the Nation. The Surgeon General, Dr. William H. Stewart, in testimony to the committee, detailed some of the adverse medical consequences of breathing polluted air. He pointed out that air pollution is associated with many chronic respiratory diseases; including emphysema, bronchitis, and lung cancer. Air pollution also corrodes and destroys property, limits visibility, and depresses the human spirit.

The legislation reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee would provide a basis for bold new efforts to combat this problem. In line with the President's recommendations, it would afford new impetus to joint action by the Federal Government, States, localities, industry, and concerned citizens. Such a concerted attack on the problem is to be welcomed. I am particularly pleased by provisions which would place major responsibility upon the Governors of the States and at the same time expand the support and guidance to be furnished the States by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In my opinion, prompt approval of the new air pollution legislation by the House will be a major step to protect the interests of the American people and I urge all my colleagues to support S. 780.

STRONG MOVES FOR AIR SAFETY

Mr. BRINKLEY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 21 compliments the Federal Aviation Administration for stiffening air safety rules to hold down chances of fires aboard planes that make crash landings and to speed passenger exit from planes under these circumstances.

The Inquirer notes that this move complements President Johnson's call for a new program of air safety, and his own budget amendment, now before the Senate, for several hundred additional air traffic controllers on the FAA staff.

The Administration should be complimented for such timely action aimed at keeping pace with the unprecedented growth in air travel. By these moves, many lives have been saved.

I insert the Inquirer editorial in the RECORD at this point:

STRONG MOVES FOR AIR SAFETY

Everyone who uses the commercial airlines, or expects to use them, has a personal stake in the move by the Federal Aviation Administration to stiffen air safety rules aimed at reducing fire dangers and to speed up escape from planes forced to make crash landings.

The new regulations, scheduled to take effect between next October 24 and October 1, 1969, seem to be soundly calculated to save lives and reduce injuries, if not entirely eliminate them in many accidents. Clifford W. Walker, FAA's deputy associate administrator, sums up a great deal in pointing out that after years of development, airliners are being built that "will take a real battering" without serious harm to passengers.

Under such circumstances, it is a life-and-death matter to get passengers out of the aircraft "before fire, fumes or something else gets them." A major requirement is that new planes must have enough exits for a full load of passengers to get out in 90 seconds using exits on only one side. Furthermore, it is to be up to the manufacturers rather than the airline to demonstrate this capability. Present regulations put responsibility on the airline, and allow 120 seconds. Other rule changes facilitate this aim.

All of these requirements seem to make sense. They nicely complement President Johnson's call for a new program of air safety and aviation control in keeping with the increases in aviation activity which, this year alone, have been double the anticipated rate. The more stringent requirements will mean little, however, unless matched by adequate air traffic controls, airport safety equipment and safety personnel in the field.

DAY CARE PROGRAM

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I introduced H.R. 13194, a bill to provide day care for children from low-income families, and for other purposes. This bill would amend title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The language in my bill is the same as that now being considered by the Senate during its debate on proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. It is important, in my opinion, that this proposal be debated fully in the House as well.

There is no question that improved day care programs, particularly for the children of low-income families, are needed in the United States. As the report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare points out, one of the few poverty groups that have increased in size in recent years have been families headed by females. An effective day care program could become a real means for such women to achieve self-sufficiency. Following is the section of the Senate committee report on the program:

DAY CARE PROGRAM

A. FINDINGS

Poor families with female heads are one of the few poverty groups which have increased in size during the past 7 years. The number of children living in such families grew from 4 million in 1960 to 4.4 million in 1966. This increase occurred mostly among families with five or more children.

There are two means through which these families can escape poverty. One is through an income-maintenance program—by increasing payments under public assistance or by adopting an alternative program, such as a family allowance or negative income tax. The other is to provide training and employment opportunities so that the mothers are able to support their families, but to do this would require child-care services when the mother is at work.

The income maintenance approach has not been considered by the committee but the latter type of approach is within our current interest because the various training and job-creation programs contained in the committee bill will offer new opportunities to these women.

The committee believes that mothers should have a meaningful choice between adequate income support and employment, including combinations of the two. They should be neither forced to work nor denied the opportunity to gain employment. But if they choose to work, they should be assured that their children will receive proper care.

Throughout the country the committee has heard statements about the insufficiency of day-care programs. This testimony has come from civic leaders, professional social workers, and poor persons who would utilize such services if available. A modest program for Federal assistance for day care is contained in the Social Security Act, and Congress is considering amendments to expand this activity. However, this program is administered solely by Departments of Welfare and is aimed primarily at families which receive public assistance, and therefore excludes hundreds of thousands of poor families which could utilize a day-care program as a means of achieving self-sufficiency."

The committee, therefore, recommends a new day-care program as part B of title V of the Economic Opportunity Act.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Purpose

The purpose of the program would be to provide day care for children from low-income families or other families residing in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons. This would enable parents or relatives of such children to undertake or continue vocational training, basic education, or gain-

ful employment. It is intended that the program focus primarily on children of those persons who are entering training and advancing to employment and that it should be used to fill the interstices not covered by other day-care programs (sec. 521).

2. Financial Assistance

The bill authorizes the Director to make grants to appropriate public agencies and private organizations for day-care programs, including health, education, social, and other supportive services, and the costs of renovation and alteration of physical facilities, if necessary (sec. 522(a)). Federal assistance may not exceed 90 percent of the cost of such programs. If appropriate, such assistance may be provided in conjunction with or supplementary to other federally aided day-care programs.

3. Participants

Preference should be given to children from poor families or families in poverty areas whose parents or relatives desire to accept employment or to undertake vocational training or basic education under this act or related programs (sec. 522(c)). Where a family is not in the low-income category or through employment rises above the poverty line, that family may be charged part or all of the cost of services received (sec. 522(b)). This is permitted because the committee looks with favor upon a reasonable mixture of income levels and does not feel that a family should be barred from participation when, as a result of work, it is able to rise above the poverty line. Partial payment is allowable because some families cannot afford the full cost since their income will not be very far above the poverty line.

4. Training

An expansion of day care in the United States will require additional trained personnel. To meet this need, the bill requires that training be provided to welfare recipients and other low-income persons so that they can fill the new jobs which are created.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 13194

A bill to provide day care for children from low-income families, and for other purposes

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

SECTION 1. For the purpose of carrying out programs under this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $35,000,000.

DAY CARE PROJECTS

SEC. 2. Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding the following new part at the end thereof:

"PART B—DAY CARE PROJECTS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 521. The purpose of this part is to provide day care for children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons in order to enable the parents or relatives of such children to choose to undertake or to continue vocational training, basic education, or gainful employment.

"GRANTS FOR DAY CARE PROJECTS

"SEC. 522. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to appropriate public agencies and private organizations to pay not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of projects under which children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas with large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons may receive day care. Such day care projects shall provide health, education, social, and such other supportive services as may be needed. Project costs payable under this part may include costs of renovation and alternation of physical facilities. Financial assistance under this section may be provided in conjunction with or to supplement day care projects under the Social Security Act or other relevant statutes.

"(b) The Director may require a family which is not a low-income family to make payment, in whole or in part, for the day care services provided under this program where the family's financial condition is, or becomes through employment or otherwise, such as to make such payment appropriate.

"(c) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Director shall give preference to projects providing day care for children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas with large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons whose parents or relatives desire to accept employment or to undertake vocational training or basic education under this and other Acts.

"(d) The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels. The Director shall give preference to applicants which show evidence of coordination and cooperation between their projects and other day care programs in the areas which they will serve.

"(e) Each project to which payments are made hereunder shall provide for a thorough evaluation. This evaluation shall be conducted by such agency or independent public or private organization as the Director shall designate, with a view to determining, among other things, the extent to which the day care provided may have increased the employment of parents and relatives of the children served, the extent to which such day care may have reduced the costs of aid and services to such children, the extent to which such children have received health and educational benefits, and the extent to which the project has been coordinated with other day care activities in the area served. Up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid by the Director from funds appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this part. Such evaluations, together with a report on the program described in this part, shall be included in the report required by section 608.

"TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS IN DAY CARE PROJECTS

"SEC. 523. (a) The Director, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps in the operation of vocational training, work experience, and basic education programs under their jurisdiction to train unemployed or low-income individuals in day care projects under this part.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Director shall give preference to projects in which unemployed or low-income individuals are to be employed including individuals receiving or eligible to receive assistance under the Social Security Act.

"DURATION OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 524. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this part during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years."

(b) The heading of title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND DAY CARE PROGRAMS"

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following personal requests:

Mr. WHALEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MESKILL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of illness in his family.

Mr. BURKE of Florida (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BEVILL (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HENDERSON (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. KORNEGAY (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. LENNON (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. NICHOLS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to raise an issue, that two of the gentlemen that asked for official leave, to be absent from sessions from the House of Representatives, are among those who have been urging the Speaker to have sessions through Saturday, and to start sessions at 11 o'clock in the morning. I would like to know if this really is official business these two gentlemen are engaged upon, or is it some other kind of mission?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the full observation or comment of the gentleman from Ohio, but I would only say this: To my knowledge, in my 19 years here, I have never heard anybody on either side of the aisle challenge the good faith of a Member who was seeking leave of absence on account of official business.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have reserved the right to object. I was wondering if the distinguished minority leader might be able to clear up the question I raised about these gentlemen, who are among those who are very much responsible for our being here on a bill which we could have finished yesterday. They asked for sessions on Friday and Saturday, and they are not here today, and now they have asked for official leave of absence. I think this is a perfectly bona fide request, and I would like

to know, I would like to be assured they are truly involved in something that relates to the business of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat a little differently what I said a moment ago: We have never challenged the veracity of a Member who asked for a leave of absence or the basis on which a Member asked for leave of absence based on the signature of the leader. We do not intend to in the future. We have to do a great deal of business in this Chamber based on faith and trust in one another. I assume when a Member on this side of the aisle asks for a leave of absence on account of official business, that it is for a legitimate purpose. I do not know in this particular case the precise details, but I would suggest the gentleman make his inquiry to the Chair and not to me.

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to assume the two gentlemen in question are on official business and that the letter they sent was a little pleasant demagoguery which did not add too much to anything.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my opposition, but I think the point has been made. I certainly appreciate the position of the majority leader and the minority leader when they submit these requests on behalf of Members. I think the 28 signers of the letter complaining about slowness of business in the House of Representatives have, in effect, questioned the actions of the entire House of Representatives. I think, insofar as they have done this, and tried to discipline the entire House, they themselves are subject to question in their motives and in their own attendance records in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The several personal requests were agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. MCFALL) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. MILLER of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRINKLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 2, 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:

1112. A letter from the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting copies of reports of every institution, organization, corporation or association other than the United States Government, government of the District of Columbia, and foreign governments, owning property exempt under provisions of the act defining the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 77-846; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1113. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of receipt of project proposals, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1114. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report on a certain case involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1115. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of receipts and expenditures for fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 43 U.S.C. 1331, et seq.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1116. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers. Department of the Army, dated August 11, 1967, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Point Roberts, Wash., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 14, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

1117. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 25, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on Calcasieu River and Pass, La., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 29, 1962; to the Committee on Public Works.

1118. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 13237. A bill to amend title 46, section 1159, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 13238. 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.

H.R. 13239. A bill to amend section 4063 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 13240. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 13241. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize certain grants for rehabilitation of the lakes of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13242. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to provide insurance thereunder of loans made for the purchase of dwelling units in cooperative housing projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13243. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require that any rental or cooperative housing constructed in the redevelopment of an urban renewal area shall be designed for low- and middle-income groups; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13244. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to provide that mortgages covering middle-income consumer cooperative housing projects may be insured thereunder up to the full amount of the replacement cost of such projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to unremarried widows and widowers, and certain single other persons, who maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 13246. A bill to amend sections 902(b) and 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the 50-percent requirement to 25 percent between first and second levels and to include third-level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 25-percent test is met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 515. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; 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. BATTIN:

H.R. 13247. A bill for the relief of Aiko Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 13248. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Di Meglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

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

Eternal God, Father of our spirits, with a faith that will not shrink though pressed by every foe, we would this day climb the altar steps which lead through darkness up to Thee. For our greatest need is of Thee.

In this day of destiny for us and for the world, make us worthy of our high calling as keepers of the sacred flame.

The arm of flesh is futile. Thine alone, O Lord, is the greatness and the power

and the glory and the victory. Thou only art as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. We are humbly grateful that our America still stands with lamp held aloft, a beacon of freedom for all the earth.

As heralds of good will, send us forth across all the barriers of race and creed, to make our contribution to the glad day when justice and understanding shall engirdle this worn and weary earth.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 28, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR FANNIN TO ATTEND INTERNATIONAL LEAD AND ZINC STUDY GROUP AT GENEVA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Senator PAUL J. FANNIN to attend the 11th session, International Lead and Zinc Study Group, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, on October 6, 1967.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, September 29, 1967, he signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 13026) to extend through March 1968 the first general enrollment period under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (relating to supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged), and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 478) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 478) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT COVERING MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Department's contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertising, covering the period January 1 through June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES PURSUANT TO REQUIREMENTS OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT OF 1953

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, the receipts and expenditures of the Department in connection with the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE BONDING OF GOVERNMENT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations in connection with the bonding of Government officers and employees, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF EURATOM COOPERATION ACT OF 1958, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center (Rept. No. 575); which was considered and passed.

By Mr. LAUSCHE, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1314. A bill to amend section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act to modernize certain restrictions upon the application and scope of the exemption provided therein (Rept. No. 576).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 192 postmaster nominations, which I ask may be placed in the Executive Calendar.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2485. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to improve its benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. MILLER, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2486. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to adjust the amount of undistributed foreign personal holding company income included in the gross income of certain domestic corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2487. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

RESOLUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF REASONABLE RULES OF CONDUCT GOVERNING ACTIVITIES BY EACH NATION UNDER THE EXTRATERRITORIAL WATERS

Mr. PELL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 172) to express the sense of the Senate concerning the need for the establishment of reasonable rules of conduct governing activities by each nation under the extraterritorial waters, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. PELL, which appears under a separate heading.)

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I send to the desk for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, known as the amendments of 1967. This legislation is long overdue.

The proposed legislation which I am introducing today, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], proposes major improvements in the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The Longshoremen's Act, as it is commonly known, provides workmen's compensation benefits for certain private employments subject to Federal jurisdiction—primarily longshoremen and ship repairmen while on board a vessel on navigable waters of the United States. The law has also been extended to other employment, including private employment in the District of Columbia, and employment

outside the United States in the service of contractors with the United States at military, air, or naval bases.

Improvements in this basic statute are long overdue. Under our proposal—

The maximum weekly compensation for total disability is increased from $70 to $105 and the minimum weekly compensation for total disability from $18 to $35.

Where there are dependents the bill will augment the compensation and survivorship benefits by 8⅓ percent up to the maximum dollar amount. It will also authorize the continuation of benefits for educational purposes for certain dependents.

Employment of handicapped workers will be encouraged by clarifying the limitation upon the liability of their employers in cases of injuries which, added to previous impairments, result in total disability or death.

Payment of compensation will be permitted without a waiting period when the disability exceeds 21 days rather than the 28 days presently required.

Benefits will be extended to cases of disfigurement of the neck and other normally exposed areas of the body.

Mr. President, it is the purpose of this legislation to bring the Longshore Act benefits more in line with present wages and living costs and to modernize its provisions in other respects. We have an obligation to the men engaged in maritime employment on the navigable waters of the United States, and to the other workers who are covered by this workmen's compensation statute. Only recently—in 1966—the Congress provided needed improvements in the workmen's compensation statute for Federal employees—the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. It is now not only appropriate, but essential, that we turn our attention to the other area of Federal jurisdiction.

Specifically, the proposed amendments will—

First. Increase the maximum weekly benefit from $70 to $105.

Second. Increase the minimum weekly benefit from $18 to $35.

Third. Augment compensation by 8⅓ percent where there are one or more dependents.

Fourth. Extend augmented compensation on behalf of certain dependents while they are in student status from 18 years to 23 years.

Fifth. Extend the time for giving notice of injury and filing claim with respect to latent disability.

Sixth. Limit liability of employers in cases of subsequent injuries to employees with preexisting physical impairments.

Seventh. Provide for further financing of special funds by first, increased payments from $1,000 to $5,000 from employers in fatal cases where there are no survivors, and, second, assessments upon insurance carriers prorated on basis of premiums collected from risks during past year and upon self-insurers on basis of premiums they would have paid if they carried insurance.

Eighth. Provide for financing of administrative expense fund by assessments upon insurance carriers prorated on basis of premiums collected from risks during past year and upon self-insurers based on premiums they would have paid if they carried insurance.

Ninth. Provide for financing of safety program expense fund by assessments upon insurance carriers prorated on basis of compensation payments made on risks covered by such carrier during past year or, if carrier made no payments, on basis of the experience of similar carriers during such year.

Mr. President, we all know that the longshore employment can be extremely hazardous. In 1966 alone, there were over 128,000 injuries reported under the Longshore Act. And this total has been increasing steadily since 1962, when there were slightly more than 89,000 reported injuries.

To deny our longshore workers and other workers covered by this important law adequate compensation protection is unthinkable. I know I speak for the majority of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say we will enact the needed improvements in this law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of explanation of the bill and the section-by-section analysis prepared by the Department of Labor, as well as the bill itself, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2485) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to improve its benefits, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. MORSE) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2485

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1967".

TIME FOR COMMENCEMENT OF COMPENSATION

SEC. 2. Section 6(a) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (44 Stat. 1424, as amended) is amended by striking "more than twenty-eight days" and substituting "more than twenty-one days."

INCREASES IN MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM LIMITS OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND ALLOWANCE

SEC. 3. (a) Section 6(b) of such Act is amended by striking "$70" and substituting "$105," and by striking "$18," wherever it appears, and substituting "$35."

(b) Section 14 of such Act is amended by striking subsection (m).

COST OF RE-EXAMINATION

SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 7(e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"The deputy commissioner may charge the cost of such examination to the carrier or self-insurer."

DISFIGUREMENTS

SEC. 5. Section 8(c)(20) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Disfigurement: Proper and equitable compensation not to exceed $3,500, shall be awarded for serious disfigurement: (1) of the face, head, or neck; or (2) of other normally exposed areas likely to handicap the employee in securing or maintaining employment."

COMPENSATION AT END OF SCHEDULED AWARD

SEC. 6. Section 8(c) of such Act is further amended by adding a new paragraph (23) to read as follows:

"(23) With respect to any period after payments under paragraph (c)(1) through (c)(20) have terminated, compensation shall be paid as provided in subsections (a) and (b) of this section if the disability is total, or, if the disability is partial, two-thirds of the difference between the injured employee's average weekly wages before the injury and his wage-earning capacity after the injury in the same or other employment."

INJURY FOLLOWING PREVIOUS IMPAIRMENT

SEC. 7(a). Section 8(f)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"In any case in which an employee having an existing permanent physical impairment suffers injury, the employer shall provide compensation for such disability as is found to be attributable to that injury based upon the average weekly wages of the employee at the time of the injury. If following an injury falling within the provisions of section 8(c)(1)-(20), the employee is totally and permanently disabled, and the disability is found not to be due solely to that injury, the employer shall provide compensation for the applicable prescribed period of weeks provided for in that section, or for 104 weeks, whichever is the greater. In all other cases of total permanent disability or of death, found not to be due solely to that injury, of an employee having an existing permanent physical impairment, the employer shall provide, in addition to compensation under paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, compensation payments or death benefits for 104 weeks only. After cessation of the payments for the period of weeks provided for herein, the employee or his survivor entitled to benefits shall be paid the remainder of the compensation that would be due for permanent total disability or for death out of the special fund established in section 44."

(b) Section 8(f) of such Act is further amended by striking paragraph (2).

AUGMENTED COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS AND STUDENT BENEFITS

SEC. 8. (a) Section 8 of such Act is amended by adding a new subsection (j) to read as follows:

"(j) While the disabled employee has one or more dependents, his weekly basic compensation for disability payable under subsections (a), (b), or (c)(1) through (19), (22) and (23) of this section shall be augmented at the rate of 8⅓ per centum of his average weekly wages, and his basic compensation for disability payable under subparagraph (c)(21) of this section shall be augmented at the rate of 8⅓ per centum of the difference between his weekly pay and his weekly wage-earning capacity. As used in this subsection (j), the term 'dependent' shall mean any of the following:

"(1) A wife, if she is living with or dependent for support upon the employee.

"(2) A husband, if he is living with and dependent upon the employee for support.

"(3) A child as defined in section 2(14) hereof.

"(4) A parent as defined in section 2(15) hereof."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended by redesignating paragraph (19) as paragraph (20) and adding a new paragraph (19) to read as follows:

"(19) The term 'student' means a person regularly pursuing a full-time course of study or training at an institution which is—

"(A) a school or college or university op-

erated or directly supported by the United States, or by any State or local government or political subdivision thereof, or

"(B) a school or college or university which has been accredited by a State or by a State-recognized or nationally recognized accrediting agency or body, or

"(C) a school or college or university not so accredited but whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited, or

"(D) an additional type of educational or training institution as defined by the Secretary,

but not after he reaches the age of 23 or has completed four years of education beyond the high school level, except that, where his 23rd birthday occurs during a semester or other enrollment period, he shall continue to be considered a student until the end of such semester or other enrollment period. A child shall not be deemed to have ceased to be a student during any interim between school years if the interim does not exceed five months and if he shows to the satisfaction of the deputy commissioner that he has a bona fide intention of continuing to pursue a full-time course of education or training during the semester or other enrollment period immediately following the interim or during periods of reasonable duration during which, in the judgment of the deputy commissioner, he is prevented by factors beyond his control from pursuing his education. A child shall not be deemed to be a student under this Act during a period of service in the Armed Forces of the United States or while receiving educational or training benefits under any other program authorized by the Congress of the United States."

(c) The last sentence of Section 2(14) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'Child,' 'grandchild,' 'brother,' and 'sister' include only persons who are under eighteen years of age, and also persons who, though eighteen years of age or over, are (1) wholly dependent upon the employee and incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability, or (2) are students as defined in paragraph (19) of this section."

(d) Section 8(d) of such Act is amended by striking the words "under the age of eighteen years" wherever they appear therein.

INCREASE IN DEATH BENEFITS

SEC. 9. (a) Section 9(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) If there be a surviving wife or dependent husband and no child of the deceased to such surviving wife or dependent husband 45 per centum of the average weekly wages of the deceased, during widowhood, or dependent widowerhood, with two years' compensation in one sum upon remarriage; and if there be a surviving child or children of the deceased, 40 per centum of such wages to the surviving wife or dependent husband and the additional amount of 15 per centum of such wages for each child; in the case of the death or remarriage of such surviving wife or dependent husband, if there be one surviving child of the deceased employee, such child shall have his compensation increased to 35 per centum of such wages, and if there be more than one surviving child of the deceased employee, to such children, in equal parts, 35 per centum of such wages increased by 15 per centum of such wages for each child in excess of one: *Provided,* That the total amount payable shall in no case exceed 75 per centum of such wages. The deputy commissioner having jurisdiction over the claim may, in his discretion, require the appointment of a guardian for the purpose of receiving the compensation of a minor child."

(b) Section 9(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "66⅔ per centum" and substituting "75 per centum".

(c) Section 9(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "66⅔ per centum" where it appears and substituting "75 per centum" and by striking out "15 per centum" and substituting "20 per centum".

(d) Section 9(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "$105" and substituting "$140", and by striking out "$27" and substituting "$47".

(e) Section 9(g) of such Act is amended by striking the comma after "may" and the words "at his option or upon the application of the insurance carrier shall" and "one-half of".

DEFENSE BASE ACT DEATH BENEFITS TO ALIEN AND NONNATIONAL SURVIVORS

SEC. 10. Section 2(b) of the Defense Base Act (55 Stat. 622, as amended) is amended by striking the comma after "may" and the words "at his option or upon the application of the insurance carrier shall" and "one-half of."

TIME FOR NOTICE AND CLAIMS

SEC. 11(a). Section 12(a) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notice of an injury or death in respect of which compensation is payable under this Act shall be given within thirty days after the date of such injury or death, or thirty days after the employee or beneficiary is aware or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been aware of a relationship between the injury or death and the employment. Such notice shall be given (1) to the deputy commissioner in the compensation district in which the injury occurred and (2) to the employer."

(b) Section 13 of such Act is amended by substituting for subsection (a) thereof the following:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the right to compensation for disability or death under this Act shall be barred unless a claim therefor is filed within one year after the injury or death. If payment of compensation has been made without an award on account of such injury or death a claim may be filed within one year after the date of the last payment. Such claim shall be filed with the deputy commissioner in the compensation district in which such injury or such death occurred. The time for filing a claim shall not begin to run until the employee or beneficiary is aware, or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been aware, of the relationship between the injury or death and the employment."

FEES FOR SERVICES

SEC. 12. Section 28(a) of such Act is amended by adding the following sentence:

"In cases where an award is made or increased after payment under the Act is resisted, a claim for legal services approved by the deputy commissioner or a court shall be added to the compensation award and become a lien upon such award in the amount so fixed."

SPECIAL FUND

SEC. 13(a). Section 8(d) of such Act is amended by adding a new paragraph (6) to read as follows:

"(6) If there be no surviving wife, dependent husband, or child, then to the special fund established under section 44(a) of this Act."

(b) Section 44(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Payments into such fund shall be made as follows:

"(1) Each employer shall pay $5,000 as compensation for the death of an employee of such employer resulting from injury where the deputy commissioner determines that there is no person entitled under this Act to compensation for such death.

"(2) When the amount in the fund at the beginning of the calendar year is less than $300,000, each carrier or self-insurer shall be obligated to make prorated payments into the fund based on the gross premiums collected by the carrier for risks during the preceding fiscal year or the amount of premiums a self-insurer would have had to pay during the preceding fiscal year for compensation insurance. The provisions relating to assessments for administrative expenses under section 45(b), (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h) of this Act shall apply to assessments for the special fund.

"(3) All amounts collected as fines and penalties under the provisions of this Act shall be paid into such fund."

(c) Section 44 is further amended by adding a new subsection (h) as follows:

"(h) The proceeds of this fund shall be available for payments under section 8(f) and (g), under section 18(b), and under section 39(c): *Provided,* That payments authorized by section 8(f) shall have priority over other payments authorized from the fund: *Provided further,* That at the close of each fiscal year the Secretary of Labor shall submit to the Congress a complete audit of the fund."

USER CHARGES—SAFETY PROGRAM

SEC. 14. The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended by adding thereto a new section 41a which reads as follows:

"SEC. 41a. (a) At the beginning of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall estimate the cost of administering section 41 of this Act. The cost of administration shall include any expense reasonably expected to be incurred during such fiscal year.

"(b) The Secretary shall assess each carrier authorized to provide security for compensation under section 32 of this Act to meet the estimated costs of administering section 41 of this Act. The assessments shall be made in the manner and in the amount provided for in subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of this section. All assessments, when collected, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate fund.

"(c) The Secretary shall give prompt notice by certified or registered mail to each carrier of its assessment. Each assessment shall be paid upon receipt of such notice and within such time as the Secretary shall prescribe.

"(d) The assessment upon each carrier shall be in the proportion that the total compensation paid on risks covered by this Act by such carrier in the immediately preceding fiscal year bore to the total compensation payments made by all such carriers under this Act in such year.

"(e) The assessment for any carrier who made no compensation payments in the immediately preceding fiscal year shall be the amount of compensation which the carrier would most likely have had to pay in such year upon the basis of the experience of similar carriers in such year and any other relevant facts or circumstances as determined by the Secretary after notice and opportunity to be heard for the carrier involved.

"(f) At the end of each fiscal year the Secretary shall adjust the assessments of each carrier upon the basis of the actual cost of administering section 41 of this Act. Whenever the adjusted assessment exceeds the actual assessment, the Secretary may add the difference to the billing for the succeeding fiscal year, or in his discretion shall provide separate notice and billing for the additional assessment. Whenever the adjusted assessment is less than the actual assessment, the Secretary, at the discretion of the carrier, shall refund the difference, or credit the difference toward the assessment for the succeeding year.

"(g) The Secretary shall have authority to make such regulations as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the pur-

poses of this section, including, but not limited to, provisions for the making and preservation of appropriate records, the inspection of such records, and the submission by carriers of reports prescribed by the Secretary.

"(h) In the event of failure by any carrier to pay the assessments referred to in subsections (c) and (f) of this section, to make and preserve records in the form and manner required by him, or to file a report in the form and manner required by him, or a denial of the right of the Secretary to inspect records required by regulations issued under this section, the Secretary may suspend or revoke the privilege of the carrier to secure compensation payments under this Act.

"(i) The provisions of this section shall be limited by the exceptions contained in subsection (g) of section 41, and shall not apply in the case of any employment for which compensation in case of disability or death is provided for employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under authority of the Act of July 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 397).

"(j) This section shall not be construed to authorize the payment of any funds for expenses under section 41 of this Act which are not appropriated by law."

ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES—USER CHARGES

SEC. 15. Section 45 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 45. (a) At the end of each fiscal year the Secretary shall determine the cost of the administration of this Act in such fiscal year. The cost of administration shall include any expense incurred or accrued during such fiscal year as provided in section 39(a).

"(b) The total cost so determined shall be prorated among the carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of this Act. The assessment basis in respect to an insurance carrier shall be the gross premiums collected by the carrier for risks covered by this Act during the fiscal year. The assessment basis in respect to a self-insurer shall be the amount of premium, as determined by the Secretary, which such self-insurer would have had to pay during the fiscal year if he had accrued his compensation liability under this Act by insurance, such premium to be determined without regard to merit or experience rating.

"(c) The Secretary shall assess each carrier and self-insurer for its pro rata share of the total amount of administrative costs of this Act in the fiscal year as determined under this section, and shall give written notice by certified or registered mail to each carrier or self-insurer of the assessment against it.

"(d) Each assessment shall be paid upon receipt of notice provided for in subsection (c) within such time as the Secretary shall prescribe in regulations made under this section.

"(e) All assessments under this section, when collected, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate fund. There is hereby authorized to be made available for expenditure from the fund such amounts as the Congress may deem appropriate for the necessary expenses of the Secretary of Labor for the performance of his functions under the Act, except those specified in subsection (j) of this section.

"(f) The Secretary shall have authority to make such regulations as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section, including, but not limited to, provisions for the making and preservation of appropriate records, the inspection of such records, and the submission by carriers and self-insurers of reports prescribed by the Secretary.

"(g) In the event of failure by any carrier or self-insurer to pay the assessments referred to in subsection (c) of this section, to make and preserve records in the form and manner required by the Secretary, or to file a report in the form and manner required by him, or a denial of the right of the Secretary to inspect records required by regulations issued under this section, the Secretary may suspend or revoke the authorization of a carrier to insure compensation or a self-insurer to act as a self-insurer under this Act.

"(h) The provisions of this section shall apply to extensions of this Act in:

"(1) The Act of May 17, 1928, as amended, entitled 'An Act to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain employment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes' (45 Stat. 600);

"(2) The Defense Base Act, as amended, approved August 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 622);

"(3) Section 4(c) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, approved August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 462);

"(4) Section 2 of the Act of June 19, 1952, as amended, entitled 'An Act to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes' (66 Stat. 139);

and such extensions as may be made from time to time to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury occurring to persons engaged in private employment, other than extensions in which it is provided that liability for such compensation will be assumed by the United States Government or its instrumentalities. The Secretary shall treat the administration of extensions to which this section applies as a part of the administration of this Act in computing assessments due.

"(i) The provision of subsection (d) of section 44 of this Act shall be applicable to the fund established under this section.

"(j) This section shall not apply to costs incurred in administering section 41 of the Act, as added by section 1 of the Act of August 23, 1958 (72 Stat. 835)."

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 16. Section 46(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968, the sum of $1,420,000 to be deposited in the separate fund established under section 45 of this Act.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated in succeeding years sums which may be necessary to administer this Act including sums with respect to claims for which the Federal Government is liable and sums required whenever sufficient assessments are not collected and made available to the Secretary of Labor as provided by this Act."

REPEAL AND RENUMBERING

SEC. 17. Section 47 of such Act is repealed and sections 48, 49, and 50 are renumbered, 47, 48, and 49 respectively.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

SEC. 18. Section 3(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out the word "nor" and substituting the word "or".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 19. The amendments made by sections 14, 15, and 16 of this Act shall become effective July 1, 1968. All other amendments shall become effective six months after the date of enactment.

The explanation of the bill presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

INTRODUCTION

This bill proposes improvements in the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. It increases the benefits payable under the Act to afford workmen's compensation protection commensurate with the level of wages now earned by covered workers.

The bill seeks to overcome the major deficiency of the Act by increasing the limits of maximum and minimum disability compensation and death benefits. The maximum weekly compensation for total disability will be increased from $70 to $105, and the minimum weekly compensation for total disability will be increased from $18 to $35. The death benefits will be increased correspondingly with the benefits for total disability.

Where there are dependents, the bill will augment the compensation and survivorship benefits by 8⅓ percent up to the maximum dollar amount and will authorize the continuation of benefits for educational purposes in behalf of certain dependents or survivors after the age of 18 up to age 23.

Where there are no survivors in fatal cases, the employer's liability to the special fund established for equitable uses will be increased from $1,000 to $5,000.

The bill provides that the special fund will be financed further by assessments upon the carriers or self-insurers based upon the amount of premiums collected by the carriers or which would have been required by the self-insurers, as will the fund for payment of administrative expenses.

Employment of handicapped workers will be encouraged by clarifying the limitation upon the liability of their employers in cases of injuries to such employees which, added to previous impairments, result in total disability or death. Compensation at the end of employer payments will continue to be authorized from the special fund.

The bill will permit payment of compensation without a waiting period when the disability exceeds 21 days rather than the 28 days presently required and will extend the time for filing notice of injury and claim for compensation in cases of latent conditions arising from injury.

Benefits will be extended to cases of disfigurement of the neck and other normally exposed areas of the body. Compensation for total disability or for loss of wage-earning capacity following schedule awards for permanent partial disability is continued.

The Secretary at his discretion may commute future compensation payments to alien survivors. The deputy commissioner is authorized to order medical reexaminations of employees when necessary and charge the cost to the carrier.

PROVISIONS OF BILL

Increase of Present Maximum and Minimum Compensation and Reduction in Length of Disability Before Elimination of Waiting Period

The existing minimum disability compensation payments of $18 weekly was established in 1956 and the existing maximum payment of $70 weekly was established in 1961. In the interim, the average weekly wage in ship and boat building and repair has increased in excess of 17 percent and the average wage of a longshoreman working a 40-hour week has increased more than 27 percent. The bill increases the minimum compensation payment from $18 to $35 weekly to provide a totally disabled employee with sufficient funds to meet the cost of minimum subsistence. Employees whose wages do not exceed the new minimum will be entitled to their entire wages free of the Act's percentage limitation otherwise applicable. With today's living costs it is evident that employees making less than $35 weekly would not be able to subsist on 75 percent of their earnings.

The Act presently provides that temporary total disability benefits may not exceed $24,000. There are many employees who have disabilities which are considered temporary in nature but which prevent the employees

from working over long periods of time. The bill eliminates the present $24,000 limitation upon the amount of compensation an employee may draw and permits him to continue to receive compensation for as long as he is disabled.

Since 1956 the Act has provided that there must be a three-day waiting period unless the disability continues for at least 28 days. The bill reduces to 21 days the period when full compensation is available. This improvement is in line with modern workmen's compensation law trends.

In line with the 1966 amendments to the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the bill also provides that following an award under the schedule set forth in § 8(c)(1)-(20) for permanent partial disability, compensation shall be paid for continuing loss of wage-earning capacity or for total disability.

The Act now provides that notice of injury or death shall be given within 30 days and claim for compensation or death shall be filed within one year after the injury or death. These time limits do not take into consideration the later development of compensable disability from a relatively minor accident, or the development of an illness causally related to the employment. The time for giving notice of injury and filing claim for compensation or death is extended until the employee or the beneficiary is aware, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been aware, of a relationship between the disabling condition or the death and the employment.

The bill also provides that, when payment of compensation under the Act is resisted, fees for legal and other services which have been approved by the deputy commissioner shall be added to the amount of compensation payable and shall be a lien upon that compensation. The amendment shifts the cost of employees' expenses for collecting compensation to the employer or the insurance company when approved by the deputy commissioner.

Increase in dependency and survivorship benefits

The bill increases the compensation to be paid to disabled employees with one or more dependents or to survivors in certain cases from the present 66⅔ percent of the weekly wage rate to 75 percent. This amendment would bring the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act into conformity with the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, which pays augmented compensation to employees with one or more dependents.

Because the Act presently gives the deputy commissioner discretion to require the appointment of a guardian to receive the compensation of a minor child, to avoid redundancy the bill strikes the last sentence of section 9(b) of the Act—"In the absence of such a requirement the appointment of a guardian for such purposes shall not be necessary."

The Act presently provides that benefits to surviving children shall be continued only until such children reach the age of 18 years. This age occurs when most children are finishing high school, many of whom may wish to enter college. The increased family financial need could be alleviated to some extent and education encouraged if payment in behalf of a dependent or surviving child could be continued until such time as the child would normally finish college. Benefits in behalf of dependents or survivors under the age of 23 years will be continued, therefore, while they are students at approved educational institutions. This provision for continuing benefits is similar to those contained in the Veterans laws, the Old Age and Survivors and Disability Insurance Title of the Social Security Act, and the Federal Employee's Compensation Act. However, to avoid dual payments, this bill specifically excepts from student status a child during a period of service in the Armed Forces of the United States or while receiving educational or training benefits under any other program authorized by the United States Congress.

Both the Longshoremen's Act and the Defense Base Act at present require the Secretary, upon application of an insurance company, to commute future installments of death benefits payable to aliens by paying one-half the commuted amount of future compensation. This requirement can work an unfair discrimination against aliens because of the wide variety of their circumstances. The power to commute, therefore, is made discretionary with the Secretary under both Acts.

Disfigurement and medical services

The Act now provides for compensation for disfigurement of the face or head only. The bill extends the area of compensable disfigurement to include disfigurement of the neck or other normally exposed area of the body likely to result in failure to secure or maintain employment.

Although disfigurement of parts of the body other than the head or neck might not affect the employability of a longshoremen or harbor worker, the Act also covers employees in private industry in the District of Columbia and at defense bases. Many workers who are required to meet the public, waitresses, for example, would tend to have their employability affected by other disfigurements now made compensable by the bill.

The Act presently provides that only when a second medical examination necessitated by the apparent partiality of a previous examination in fact shows partiality the deputy commissioner may charge such examination to the employer or insurance carrier. The bill permits the deputy commissioner to exercise discretion in making the charge in these cases.

Special funds

To clarify the present law as to liability for injury to employees with previous physical impairments and so encourage the hiring of handicapped workers who might otherwise be rejected for employment, the bill provides that when an employee who has a previous physical impairment sustains an injury resulting in total disability or death and the disability or death is found not to be due solely to that injury, the employer's liability shall be limited to payment of compensation for 104 weeks or as prescribed by the schedule award, whichever is greater, if applicable. Continuing benefits for total disability or death will be paid from the special fund provided in section 44 of the Act.

Two special funds were established as provided under section 44 of the Act, one for longshoremen, harbor workers, and certain other workers covered by the Act, and the other for workers in the District of Columbia. These funds provide residual compensation to disabled workers for permanent total disability and residual death benefits after the cessation of payments by employers or insurance carriers for injuries to employees with physical impairments; payment of compensation and medical services awards when employers are insolvent; vocational rehabilitation, including the furnishing of necessary prosthetic appliances; and maintenance not to exceed $25 weekly to injured employees while undergoing vocational rehabilitation.

Both funds are presently in a precarious financial state. Annual disbursements are in excess of annual income and the outstanding liabilities against the funds exceed the amounts in the funds. In order to rescue these funds from threatened insolvency, the bill provides for payment into the appropriate special fund of any compensation due a deceased employee without survivors under a schedule award for permanent partial disability. The bill also provides that $5,000 instead of the $1,000 payment provided for when the longshoremen's fund was established in 1927, shall be paid into the funds in fatal cases by employers or insurance carriers when there are no survivors.

Assessments to be paid into the special fund are also authorized to be made upon each carrier or self-insurer, prorated on the basis of premiums paid to the insurance companies or the amounts self-insurers would have had to pay in premiums if they had purchased insurance. The same procedure is used for computing assessments to be paid into the District of Columbia special fund. Further, the bill authorizes financing of the Act's administration and the safety program by assessments upon insurance companies and the self-insurers. An appropriation of 1.3 million dollars is provided for to pay the costs of administration until the assessments are collected.

Finally, the bill provides that the sections providing for assessments upon the carriers for the safety program and administrative expenses funds shall become effective as of July 1, 1968, and that all other sections of the bill shall become effective six months after the date of enactment.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL TO AMEND THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Section 1—*Title:* Designates title "Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1967".

Section 2—*Waiting Period:* Amends section 6(a) of the Act to permit payment of compensation without a waiting period when the disability exceeds 21 days. A three day waiting period is now specified unless the disability exceeds 28 days.

Section 3 (a), (b) and (c)—*Maximum and Minimum:* Amends section 6(b) to increase the maximum of $70 a week to $105; the minimum from $18 to $35; and repeals section 14(m) which provides a limit of $24,000 on money allowance benefits for temporary and partial disability.

Section 4—*Re-examination costs:* Amends section 7(e) which provides that when the deputy commissioner believes that a medical examination has not been impartial he may require an examination by a physician of his own selection and charge the cost of the second examination to the carrier if the first examination is shown not to have been impartial. The amendment permits the deputy commissioner to charge the second examination to the carrier whether or not partiality in the first examination is shown.

Section 5—*Disfigurement:* Amends section 8(c)(20) to expand the meaning of compensable disfigurement to include disfigurement of the face, head or neck, or of any normally exposed area likely to result in failure to obtain or hold employment.

Section 6—*Compensation after Scheduled Award:* Adds a new subsection (23) to section 8(c) to provide for continuation of compensation for loss of wage-earning capacity or for total disability after payment of an award for permanent partial disability under the schedule set forth in that section.

Section 7—*Injury Following Previous Impairment:* (a) Amends section 8(f)(1) to limit to 104 weeks or to the number of weeks provided for schedule awards in section 8(c)(1)-(20), whichever is the greater, the employer's liability for an injury to an employee with a previous permanent physical impairment, when the injury results in permanent total disability not found to be due solely to the injury. Continuing benefits will be paid, as presently, out of the special fund established in section 44 of the Act.

(b) Further amends section 8(f) by striking paragraph (2) relating to previous disabilities now inapplicable.

Section 8—*Augmented Compensation-Student benefits:* (a) Adds a new subsection (j) to section 8 to augment compensation benefits by 8⅓ per centum when a disabled employee has one or more dependents.

(b) Amends section 2 by redesignating paragraph (19) as paragraph (20) and adding a new paragraph (19) to define "student" for the purpose of continuing benefits related to dependents of 18 to 23 years when in school.

(c) Amends section 2(14) to define "child," "grandchild," "brother," and "sister" in order to permit benefits resulting from student status.

(d) Amends section 8(d) to extend compensation benefits to persons in student status beyond the present expiration age of 18 years.

Section 9—*Death Benefits:* (a) Amends section 9(b) to increase the ceiling of death benefits to survivors from 66⅔ to 75 per centum of the average wages of the deceased employee, payable as follows: Surviving wife or dependent husband—increase payments from 35 to 45 per centum of deceased's average wage. If surviving child or children, 40 per centum to surviving wife or dependent husband and 15 per centum for each child; in the case of death or remarriage of eligible spouse, increases the benefits payable to one surviving child to 35 per centum and for each additional child 15 per centum. Strikes last sentence of section 9(b) pertaining to appointment of a guardian because redundent.

(b) Amends section 9(c) to increase the benefit ceiling for orphan children from 66⅔ to 75 per centum. The section now provides that when there is no surviving eligible spouse one surviving child will receive 35 per centum of the wages of the deceased, and each additional child 15 per centum up to 66⅔ per centum.

(c) Amends section 9(d) to increase the ceiling on total payments to collateral dependents from 66⅔ to 75 per centum, and to increase individual payments from 15 to 20 per centum. No change is made in the amount paid to each parent or grandparent.

(d) Amends section 9(e) to increase the maximum weekly wages of the deceased in computing death benefits from $105 to $140 and the minimum from $27 to $47.

(e) Amends section 9(g) which provides for the payment of compensation benefits to aliens who are not residents of the United States or Canada. The section limits payment of death benefits to the surviving wife and children, or if none, to the surviving mother or father supported by the employee in whole or in part, for one year prior to the date of the injury. The section now requires the Secretary, upon application of the insurance company, to commute future installments of compensation to such aliens by paying one-half of the commuted amount of future compensation. The amendment removes the requirement to commute payments upon the application of the insurance company and the limitation to one-half the commuted amount, and permits the Secretary to commute in his discretion.

Section 10—*Defense Base Act-Benefits to Alien Survivors.*—The Defense Base Act extends the benefits of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to employees of contractors at United States bases or on public works where such contracts are performed outside the continental United States. Section 2(b) of that Act limits payments of death benefits to aliens who are not residents of the United States in the same manner as section 9(g) of the Longshoremen's Act, with the same requirement for commutation of future installments of compensation payments. This bill amends section 2(b) of the Defense Base Act to remove the requirement to commute such payments upon the application of the insurance company and the limitation upon the commuted amount, and permits the Secretary to commute in his discretion.

Section 11—*Time for Notice and Claim:* (a) Amends section 12(a) to extend the time for giving notice of injury or death to the deputy commissioner and to the employer beyond the 30 days after the injury or death now required to include 30 days after the employee or the beneficiary is aware or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been aware of a relationship between the injury or death and the employment.

(b) Amends section 13(a) to extend the time for filing a claim for compensation for injury or death. The Act now provides that such claim must be filed within one year after the injury or death, or if payment of compensation has been made without an award a claim may be filed within one year after the date of the last payment. The amendment provides that the time for filing claim shall not begin to run until the employee or beneficiary is aware, or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been aware of the relationship between the injury or death and the employment.

Section 12—*Fees for Services:* Amends section 28(a) to provide that claims approved by the deputy commissioner for legal and other services after resistance to awards or increased benefits shall be added to the amount of compensation payable and shall be a lien upon such compensation.

Section 13—*Special Fund:* (a) Amends section 8(d) by adding a new paragraph (6) which provides for payment into the special fund described in section 44(a) of the Act, upon the death of the employee from any cause, when there are no survivors, of any disability compensation due to the employee under a scheduled award.

(b) Amends section 44(c)(1) by substituting $5,000 for $1,000 to be paid into the special fund upon the death of an employee resulting from injury when there are no survivors. Redesignates paragraph 44(c)(2) as paragraph 44(c)(3) and adds a new paragraph 44(c)(2) providing for assessments for the special fund upon each insurance carrier and self-insurer prorated on the basis of the premiums collected by the insurance carriers from their risks, and in the case of the self-insurers on the premiums they would have paid if they had purchased insurance.

(c) Redesignates the last sentence of section 44(c)(1), pertaining to the uses to which the fund is put, as section 44(h).

Section 14—*Safety Program-User Charges:* (a) Adds new section 41a to provide for an estimate of the cost of administering the safety program by the Secretary at the beginning of each fiscal year.

(b) Authorizes the Secretary to assess the carriers for such estimated costs and deposit collected assessments in a separate fund in the United States Treasury.

(c) Provides for notice of assessments to carriers and payment of assessments within prescribed time.

(d) Authorizes assessment upon carriers proportionate to compensation paid by each carrier in relation to total compensation paid by all carriers in preceding fiscal year.

(e) Provides method for assessments upon carriers who made no compensation payments during immediately preceding fiscal year.

(f) Authorizes adjustment of assessments upon carriers based on cost of administering safety program.

(g) Authorizes making of regulations to carry out the purposes of this section of the Act.

(h) Provides penalties against carriers for failure to keep records and file reports under this section of the Act.

(i) Specifically excepts certain employment from the provisions of this section of the Act.

(j) Requires appropriation before payment of expenses under this section of the Act.

Section 15—*Administration expenses-User Charges:* (a) Amends section 45 to provide for determination of the cost of administration of the Act by the Secretary at the end of each fiscal year.

(b) Authorizes prorating administrative expenses of the Act among the carriers and self-insurers based on premiums collected by the carriers and the amount of premiums that would have been paid by the self-insurers if they had taken out insurance.

(c) Provides for assessment of such costs by written notice to the carriers and self-insurers.

(d) Provides for payment of assessments by such carriers and self-insurers within a prescribed time after receipt of notice.

(e) Authorizes deposit of collected assessments in a separate fund in United States Treasury and expenditure of administrative expenses.

(f) Authorizes making of regulations to carry out the purposes of this section of the Act.

(g) Provides penalties against carriers for failure to keep records and file reports under this Act.

(h) Extends the provisions of this section of the Act to cover employees insured under the District of Columbia Compensation Act, the Defense Base Act, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (67 Stat. 462), and the Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities Act (66 Stat. 139).

(i) Permits placing of funds in depository banks and investment of funds not needed for current requirements.

(j) Specifically exempts costs incurred in administering the safety and health provisions of the Act.

Section 16—*Appropriation:* (a) Amends section 46 of the Act to add a subsection (b) authorizing appropriation of $1,420,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968 for the separate fund established under section 45 of the Longshore Act and (b) necessary sums in succeeding years, for administering the Act with respect to claims for which the Federal Government is liable and sums required whenever sufficient assessments are not collected from carriers and self-insurers.

Section 17—*Repeal and Renumbering:* Repeals section 47, relating to availability of appropriations, and renumbers sections 48, 49, and 50, as 47, 48, and 49.

Section 17—*Technical Amendments:* Makes grammatical change of substituting "or" for "nor" in section 3(a)(1) of the Act.

Section 18—*Effective Date:* Provides that amendments made by sections 14, 15 and 16 of this Act shall become effective July 1, 1968, and all other amendments six months after the date of enactment.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from time to time we modify the Internal Revenue Code. Sometimes it is never quite clear why we take a certain action with respect to one kind of entity as distinguished from another. I am referring to an amendment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1962 with respect to foreign corporations actually domestically held by U.S. corporations, with respect to certain income which qualifies, by virtual reinvestment in an underdeveloped country, to be given a certain "plowing back" or exemption status.

However, we did not do the same thing with respect to personal holding companies. I do not know why that distinction was made, but it should be remedied.

One case has now come to my attention, of which I know quite well.

Therefore, out of order, I am introducing a special bill for that purpose.

It is cosponsored by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

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

The bill (S. 2486) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to adjust the amount of undistributed foreign personal holding company income included in the gross income of certain domestic corporations, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RECLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN POSITIONS IN THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to reclassify all postal employees who are now in the first five grades of the postal field service.

The lowest five grades of the postal field service are the forgotten men of Government service. They are the backbone of that service, the very ones on whom we must depend if that service is to be upgraded and made better and more efficient. They are the people who come in contact with the public, often the only representatives among the 3 million of us in the National Government that ordinary people see.

The House committee has reported a pay increase bill which recognizes that postal employees have far more claim to consideration than others. While the general classified service is to be raised 4.5 percent, postal employees would receive an increase of 6 percent.

There is great significance in this move.

First, all of the lobbying pressure of the administration was brought to bear on the committee in an attempt to hold the line at an arbitrary and unreasonable 4.5 percent, while private industry settlements are accepted at double or more that rate.

Second, it brings a realization that postal employees are further from our announced goal of comparability with the private sector than are others in the Government service.

Most clerks and carriers in the Post Office Department are in grade 4 presently. Their rate of pay is less than that of street sweepers, garbage collectors, bus drivers, and meter readers, among others, in most metropolitan areas. This is a direct violation of section 50, part II, of Public Law 87-793, which states that it is the intent of Congress to pay Government workers comparably to what their jobs would call for in the private sector.

I believe in comparability. I have fought to achieve it.

The inequities that exist in Government pay scales are rampant throughout all levels of all services. Yet, nowhere are they more flagrant than in the postal service, especially at the lowest rungs of the ladder.

The people in the first five grades of the postal field service carry literally billions of dollars worth of business. They are entrusted with goods, money, messages, and many things of great value and importance. Yet, they are relegated to classifications and pay scales of unskilled people and people who in private industry would make far more money for far less responsibility.

There is a tremendous turnover among postal employees. It has risen alarmingly to a rate of 24 percent a year. This, obviously, is costly and inefficient for it demands training of new hands in an overburdened service which has had frequent breakdowns and crises.

A 6-percent pay increase will help solve the problem, but it will not do the whole job. It will not correct the inequities I have outlined.

There is an additional problem in the postal field service.

Throughout Government civil service there is a normal opportunity for advancement in grades. Some 40 percent of the people employed in the classified services are in the lowest five grades. Promotions through the ranks are normal. Many avenues are open for qualified people to progress to better jobs.

This is not true in the postal service. Workers are virtual prisoners in the lowest ranks. Proof lies in the fact that 90 percent of all Post Office Department people are in postal field service grades 1 through 5.

My bill would correct this inequity and raise salaries while upgrading, through reclassification, these clerks, carriers, and other postal workers.

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

The bill (S. 2487) to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

OWNERSHIP AND JURISDICTION OF EXTRATERRITORIAL SEABED AND SUPERADJACENT WATERS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as our Nation expands its technology in the marine sciences at an ever-increasing pace, we are moving toward dangerous legal confrontations with foreign nations over the ownership and jurisdiction of the extraterritorial seabed and the superadjacent waters.

Already we face frequent new problems in the fields of mining, oil well drilling, fisheries, research, and national security in the broad oceans beyond territorial jurisdiction and the Continental Shelf. The sea conventions of 1958 have brought some definition and legal order to the areas of the Continental Shelf of each nation. Bilateral fishing agreements such as those currently in negotiation with the Soviet Union, Japan, and Mexico do bring temporary solutions to certain practical problems as they arise.

My own fear is that, although these case-by-case solutions may be satisfactory for the time being, we might well paint ourselves into the corner in terms of the future national interest; and also miss future opportunities for optimum international study and exploration. We stand on the threshold of a vast technological breakthrough which may suddenly advance our Nation's—and others'—ability to carry out every type of oceanologic activity, at any depth, and in any area of the ocean. To date, there is no adequate regime to provide for order when this breakthrough comes.

Much conversation and study is in progress. Vice President HUMPHREY, as Chairman of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, is taking into consideration possible needs for a legal order to be established in the areas of the sea where we and other nations may find ourselves in competitive confrontation. An interdepartmental committee headed by Deputy Under Secretary of State Foy Kohler is examining America's own multiple inner space efforts with a view to making any necessary diplomatic initiative that may be necessary to avoid conflict with other nations. The United Nations has ordered a study of the resources of the seas partly with a view to anticipating potential conflict and extending international cooperation. Also in the United Nations, the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization—to which President Eisenhower honored me by appointing me on the original American delegation in 1959—is doing a creditable job trying to resolve ad hoc legal problems of the sea that may arise between nations. The recent *Torrey Canyon* disaster, with its vast oil pollution, provided the stimulus for a meeting of this body.

The Geneva Conventions of 1958 were helpful in dealing with those questions concerning the high seas, the Continental Shelf, and fisheries which required international action at that time.

Nevertheless, despite this useful activity to protect against underocean legal conflict between nations, I think the process should be accelerated.

The recent agreements with the Soviet Union for peaceful use of Antarctica and outer space lead me to hope that similar action might be undertaken on inner space. I recognize that the problems of the Antarctic and outer space differ considerably with those of the oceans, yet the analogy is compelling and the need is similar. With the success of these agreements in mind, I suggest that our Department of State commence the steps which would lead to an ocean space treaty with all nations for more orderly use of the sea.

Today, the area most susceptible to adoption of such a treaty is the extraterritorial seabed and the resources under the bottom of the world ocean. The other area presents a potential of more difficult legal snarls, however, which will soon require attention: I mean the high seas themselves and their natural resources.

Already, with various international agreements, coastline countries are accorded some extraterritorial rights to

the fish that may enter the waters nearest to any given country. The Geneva Fisheries Convention ratified in 1964 deals with the subject and establishes certain rights. Also, bilateral treaties such as those currently in negotiation are designed to lessen controversy over fisheries ownership.

But soon we must attend to the inevitable problems that we may expect as undersea technology continues to expand at a near geometric progression. I am thinking specifically of the jurisdictional and ownership considerations that must intrude into the development of aquaculture, fish husbandry, undersea research, scientific preserves, sport areas, undersea tourism, and many other activities now only dreamed of but sure to occur before long. As history has shown, a visionary Jules Verne today can foretell fantastic but real accomplishments of tomorrow—just as Jules Verne predicted the globe-circling nuclear submarine *Nautilus*.

It will doubtless be difficult even to try to fix the exact limits for the legally defined continental shelf at this time. Which of us is in a position to know all the economic, technologic, political, and other factors relating to any proposal for establishing a fixed limit—factors which caused so much debate and concern at the 1958 Geneva Conference? These and other problems of the extraterritorial seas must nevertheless be brought under the discipline of a reasonable legal pattern if we are to avoid hopelessly complex confrontations in the near future. The first step should be greater knowledge and broader international understanding through exploration of the ocean floor.

Another potential headache is inexorably coming closer: the question of individual crimes under the high seas. Who has jurisdiction when a murder takes place in an undersea colony, or between subsurface fishermen of different nations, or between oceanologic researchers? Who will police the mineral extraction activity, the rich fishing contents of an undersea corral formed by bubbles? No one has the answers now. We must prepare for the future lest it overtake us. As Thoreau said: "Man hits as high as he aims," or as low in this case. But let us not aim too low or be too cautious in our discussions of these problems at this time, for we may well find ourselves naked and unprotected on an unprepared beach when the inevitable tidal wave of ocean-related legal questions breaks upon us tomorrow.

When we actually sit down to draft a general treaty, we see many problems. For today, I offer for your critique only a single, partial move—a Senate resolution that sets forth the skeleton or broad outlines around which such a treaty might be constructed. I believe it is in our national interest, as the world's greatest maritime power; to think through these problems ahead of time and be prepared with our own draft. And because we are so great and powerful—our 6 percent of the world's people possessing 50 percent of the world's wealth—it is important we keep some balance of resources in the world; otherwise the rest of the world's peoples may believe that an ever widening American preserve is liable to overwhelm everybody else. In fact, there could even be a fear that we and the Soviet Union might attempt together to carve up the oceans of the world into codominions much as the Spanish and Portuguese sought to do with the New World in their agreement at Tordesillas, signed on June 7, 1494.

On the other hand, with our advanced technology and our basically fair and democratic views, our leadership in developing the exploration of ocean space can prove of immense value to the whole world.

Such a treaty or series of treaties would basically be divided into four sections—a preamble expressing the needs and purposes; a section concerning the contents of the seas themselves; a section on the ocean floor and dealing with disarmament; and a section on civil and criminal jurisdiction in ocean space. Any international agreement governing the ocean floor should consider practicable arms control measures. In a world of increasing tension, of proliferation of weapons, measures that will counteract these tensions and constrain arms races must be sought, to the extent that such measures are consistent with our national security.

I recognize that the sea represents a major and necessary defensive area for ourselves and our allies. Nevertheless, there is now the opportunity to preclude an arms race involving the stationing of nuclear weapons on or in the ocean seabed. Such a provision would be analogous to a similar measure contained in the outer space treaty and, as such, could enjoy a great degree of acceptability.

An arms control provision would have beneficial effects. It would continue our policy of seeking arms control agreements where such agreements are consistent with and enhance our overall national interests as well as the interests of all mankind. It would serve to prevent some forms of potentially inflammatory or destabilizing actions. It would be a positive contribution to the reduction of tensions. It would prevent dangers inherent in the stationing of unproven types of nuclear weapons on the ocean floor where the action and interaction of sea water, depth, pressure, temperature and water currents carry risks of accident and problems of control that are extremely great. A treaty prohibition against the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the seabed would be compatible with our national defense.

Most important, too, the prohibition against the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the seabed would not disturb our naval gunnery or missile ranges, our current submarine defenses or the operational deployment of our Polaris submarines.

Our commercial and scientific activities must also be considered. Our exploitation of the Continental Shelf under the U.N. Convention on the Continental Shelf and extensive research activities mark the advancement of our control over the resources of the sea. To date, the only use man has made of the deep ocean floor has been to rest his intercontinental telecommunication cables there, and this use has been recognized and protected by treaty since before the turn of the century. This type of arms control measure would not interfere with the communications, industrial and scientific activities.

Briefly, with careful study equivalent to that given to the arms control measures prohibiting the stationing of nuclear weapons in space contained in the Treaty on Outer Space to which the Senate gave its advice and consent in April of this year, it is hard to see why a practicable agreement cannot be reached along similar lines involving the ocean floor. I believe all the various points covered in the Outer Space Treaty should be studied and, if suitable, covered in our Ocean Space Treaty. For instance, aquanauts on the ocean floor, just as astronauts, should be regarded as envoys of mankind and "shall render to them all possible assistance in the event of accident, distress, or emergency landing on the territory of another state party or on the high seas." The ocean floor, just as outer space, should not be "subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means." This would enlarge the area of human activity which nations of all regions of the world should be prepared to agree shall be free of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. President, at this point I introduce and send to the desk for appropriate reference a resolution which addresses itself to the subject I have been discussing.

This resolution suggests action toward solution of the international legal confrontations ahead of us and calls for wide ranging steps, including arms control measures, to achieve a reasonable legal order for the extranational world ocean.

I take the liberty of reading the text of this brief resolution, which is as follows:

Whereas, through developing technology man becomes increasingly capable of exploring, and exploiting the resources of, the deep sea; and

Whereas, this technology carries with it the threat of legal confrontations between nations of the world over the ownership and jurisdiction of the bed of the deep sea and the super-adjacent waters, and the resources therein; and

Whereas, the extension of the rule of law and the development of practicable arms control measures with respect to these territories are essential if mankind is to enjoy the fruits of his efforts in the deep sea: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should remain committed to the principle that the living and mineral resources in suspension in the high seas, beyond twelve miles from the coast, are free for the use of all nations, subject to international treaty obligations and the conservation provisions of the 1958 Geneva Conventions adopted by the United Nations-sponsored Conference on the Law of the Sea;

(2) the United States should urge the United Nations to consider the problems of conservation and use of marine resources of the seabed and subsoil beyond continental

shelf limits and any licensing or other arrangements necessary for the regulation thereof;

(3) there is an urgent need for the establishment of an international agreement under which the floor of the deep sea and the resources of the seabed and subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of the continental shelf, will be considered free for the exploration and exploitation of all nations; and are incapable of coming under the sovereignty of any one nation or group of nations;

(4) any such international agreement should incorporate practicable arms control proposals looking toward mutually advantageous safeguard provisions, should encompass the results of an examination of the question of the implacement of nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction on the deep sea floor, and should contribute to a reduction of the world arms race by enjoining all nations from the stationing of unproven types of nuclear or other kinds of mass destruction weapons on the ocean floor where unique conditions are likely to cause greater risks of accidents;

(5) fixed limits must be set for defining the outer boundaries of the continental shelf of each nation, and that such limits can best be determined by an international conference to be convened by the United Nations in 1969, five years after the coming into force of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf; and

(6) the President should institute a detailed study within the Department of State and other interested departments and agencies of the United States and in cooperation with the United Nations with respect to the problems of criminal jurisdiction over, and the policing of, activities on and beneath the surface of extra-territorial seas and on the deep sea floor; should consider those situations both immediate and anticipated, which are not covered by existing international agreements, and should seek an early determination by the United Nations on the matter of developing and proposing regulations for handling those situations.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 172) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENT; DISABILITY BENEFITS FOR THE BLIND

AMENDMENT NO. 366

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I submit an amendment to H.R. 12080, the substance of S. 1681, which I presented originally on May 3. The bill has a total of 58 cosponsors, and has twice before been passed by the Senate. On the first occasion, in the 88th Congress, the social security bill into which it was incorporated as a floor amendment became deadlocked in conference at the end of the session, and it was not completed. In 1965, the House-Senate conference altered it so much as to leave only a small fraction of the intended improvement.

This is the bill which for the first time would provide for social security purposes a statutory definition of blindness identical to that in common use and incorporated in the Internal Revenue Code. It would specify that any person meeting the statutory definition is automatically to be considered as disabled for purposes of social security benefits. It would also reduce the standard which requires 20 quarters of covered employment out of the last 40 to a standard of six quarters of covered employment.

It is my hope and expectation that this amendment will this year become a part of the social security law as enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 366) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 367

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], I send to the desk an amendment to the instructions of the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment printed?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 368

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2426) to provide certain essential assistance to the U.S. fisheries industry.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2411) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the amount of groundfish imported into the United States shall not exceed the average annual amount thereof imported during 1963 and 1964.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON FRANCHISE COMPETITIVE PRACTICE ACT OF 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will hold hearings on S. 2321, the Franchise Competitive Practice Act of 1967, on October 10, 11, 13, 16, and 17, 1967.

I am advised by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and I am authorized by him to say that anyone interested in offering testimony on this proposal should contact Charles E. Bangert, assistant counsel, Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, room 414, Old Senate Office Building.

CONSENSUS ON THE BOMBING

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from today's New York Times titled "Consensus on the Bombing." The editorial reports the fact that the representatives of nation after nation engaging in the general debate in the General Assembly of the United Nations have stated that the cessation of bombing of North Vietnam is the first step toward the possibility of negotiation. Canadian External Affairs Minister Paul Martin said in a speech:

> It seems clear that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped.

This is the point I have been arguing in the Senate for 2 years. In speeches in the Senate in January 1966, May 15, 1967, and July 27, 1967, I made the point that a first step—first concession—must be made by the United States. It is my view, as I have stated so often, that negotiations or any chance for action in the U.N., as has been so strongly urged by Senator MANSFIELD, cannot be guaranteed, but clearly are conditioned upon the cessation of bombing.

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

CONSENSUS ON THE BOMBING

On the eve of the opening of the current session of the United Nations General Assembly, Secretary General U Thant again urged that the United States stop bombing North Vietnam as an essential first step toward peace. Mr. Thant said he was "convinced" that if the bombing ended unconditionally, peace talks could begin in three or four weeks.

Concurrently, Agence France-Presse reported from Hanoi that "reliable sources" had indicated talks could begin between Hanoi and Washington within three or four weeks of a bombing halt.

The appeal for a bombing halt was taken up in the General Assembly Wednesday by Canada, one of America's closest friends and a nation that has had recent diplomatic contact with North Vietnam.

"There is not the slightest doubt in my mind," Canadian External Affairs Minister Paul Martin said, "that the first step in [the direction of talks] will involve the

question of the bombing of North Vietnam. It seems clear that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped. This is a matter of first priority if we are to start the process of de-escalation and open the door of the conference room."

Canada's plea has been echoed at this session of the United Nations so far in speeches by the representatives of Denmark, Sweden, France, Somalia, Indonesia and Kenya. Many other delegates, friends as well as opponents of American policy, have privately voiced similar views. This mounting international consensus favoring a U.S. initiative for peace through a bombing halt has its counterpart at home. An increasing number of Senators and Congressmen are calling for such a step, responding to the groundswell of public sentiment for an end to the war.

No one can guarantee that stopping the bombing will produce negotiations. There would be, as Mr. Thant has freely conceded, a "limited risk" in any such American initiative. But the United States is big enough to venture such a risk. And the risk is worth taking, especially in view of the limited effectiveness of the bombing, as acknowledged by the Secretary of Defense, and in light of the alternative risks involved in continued escalation of the war.

The Administration has repeatedly protested its desire for peace. Now is the time to prove this intention by heeding the advice of close friends and the wider world community. As Danish Premier Jens Otto Krag observed the other day: "He who takes the decisive step by which to bring the fighting to an end, to get negotiations started, and to insure durable peace in Southeast Asia will inscribe his name in the books of history."

A FANTASTIC PROPOSAL THAT SHOULD BE REJECTED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the action of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives yesterday in approving a proposed constitutional amendment to entitle the District of Columbia to two U.S. Senators and as many Representatives as it would have if it were a State—two, by current standards—does violence to the Constitution of the United States and, in my opinion, constitutes a distinct disservice to the residents of the District of Columbia.

The Constitution of the United States provides that:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State . . .

The Senate Chamber in which we meet was for many, many years termed the Hall of the States. In fact, this small rectangular chamber is truly the Hall of the States and should remain so, as the Founding Fathers envisaged it would. It is fantastic that a proposal should now be advanced and considered seriously in the other body to change the entire character of the Senate of the United States by the addition of two Senators representing a city, Washington, D.C., occupying an area of less than 10 square miles, the District of Columbia.

Washington is the Federal City. The District of Columbia is not a State. It is a very special district. When it was founded in accordance with article I, section 8 of the Constitution, it was never anticipated that the seat of Government of the United States would become a State. The Founding Fathers specifically provided that—

> Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district . . . as may, by cession of particular states . . . become the seat of the government of the United States . . .

This has been part of the basic law of our Nation for 178 years. Those who have made the District of Columbia their home were well aware of, or should have been aware of, the fact that the District of Columbia is a unique governmental entity.

The action of the House Judiciary Committee radically altered a proposed constitutional amendment to give the District of Columbia a voting delegate in the House of Representatives. While I personally favor a nonvoting delegate for the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives, reasonable argument could be made for a voting delegate from the District of Columbia in the other body. The proposed amendment providing for accomplishing that stood a reasonable chance of obtaining a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States.

However, by elevating the District of Columbia to the status of a sovereign State with two U.S. Senators, the House Judiciary Committee virtually assured that this proposed constitutional amendment would not receive the required number of votes in the Congress and certainly would not be ratified by the requisite number of State legislatures. It is safe to say that this proposed amendment is assured of defeat. It is as dead as the dodo. Whereas, prior to the vote yesterday, residents of the District of Columbia did have some chance of receiving representation in the House of Representatives; they now stand no chance at all.

Mr. President, the proposed constitutional amendments go too far, indeed. The Federal City, Washington, D.C., is not entitled to two U.S. Senators. Very definitely, should this fantastic proposal be submitted to the Senate for debate and vote as a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, I will oppose it utterly and uncompromisingly. To me it seems absolutely unthinkable that such a proposal to amend our Constitution could be seriously considered in either body of Congress or in the legislatures of our States.

URBAN AMERICA: GOALS AND PROBLEMS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Joint Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], has been charting most important and valuable fields in the economy of our country. Of the many fine activities this committee has undertaken, I should like to call the attention of Senators to a compendium of articles entitled "Urban America: Goals and Problems," compiled and prepared for the Subcommittee on Urban Affairs, under the chairmanship of the able and distinguished Representative from Missouri, Mr. BOLLING, and prepared by the director of research, Mr. James W. Knowles.

I have read these articles with great care. I respectfully suggest that any Member of this body or any other person who is concerned about the future of urban America cannot really be knowledgeable in this field without having examined and read very carefully the compendium of articles prepared for the subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend our distinguished chairman, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and his entire staff for having performed a valuable public service.

The Subcommittee on Urban Affairs at present is conducting a series of hearings which go into depth on many of these problems. I am sure that the work of this subcommittee and the hearings it is conducting will be a landmark for the future direction of urban America.

I suggest that members of the executive branch, as well as Members of Congress, pay the most careful attention to the articles in the subcommittee's publication and to the hearings now being conducted.

(At this point, Mr. HARTKE assumed the chair.)

WALL STREET JOURNAL REPORTS ON USE OF AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT IN EDUCATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I was pleased to see the Friday, September 22, issue of Wall Street Journal contain a very good article by Jim Hyatt on Project Discovery. This project, which has been bringing audiovisual aid to the schools of chosen experimental areas during the last year, has picked out Terrell County, Tex., as one of its locations. The benefits that the students of this country have gained are tremendous, and have served to prove to Terrell County educators the great value of audiovisual aids in the schools.

I am especially glad to see the success of this project, as I took a special interest in the inclusion of audiovisual equipment in the provisions of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act in 1965. I am glad to see reported in this article the very positive reaction of teachers and students to the increased use of audiovisual equipment in their education. The article notes that the extra help provided in these districts has been to experts like "a little bit of heaven."

This is a timely and thoughtful article, and one which we in Congress should consider carefully in our attempts to provide the best in education for American students.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Project Discovery via the Film Library," in the Friday Wall Street Journal, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 22, 1967]

PROJECT DISCOVERY VIA THE FILM LIBRARY—WHAT'S NEW AT SCHOOL

(By Jim Hyatt)

TERRELL, TEX.—For many students, audivisual education is a projector locked in

the principal's office, a handful of outdated films and a bunch of bored teachers who use the movies for a coffee break.

Not here. The 150 teachers and 3,200 students in this small (pop. 15,000) North Texas community have films and equipment at their fingertips. Each classroom in the 12 grades has its own screen, 16mm and filmstrip projector, and portable table. Each of the five campuses has its own film library. Altogether, Terrell's school system has access to equipment, films and filmstrips worth more than $600,000.

The investment is due to Project Discovery, an experiment in audio-visual saturation sponsored by Bell & Howell Co., a manufacturer of film projectors, and Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corp., a film distributor. The two companies set out in 1964 to answer some key questions about broad-scale use of audio-visual materials. Are films used mainly to kill classroom time? Do films interrupt the lesson or contribute to it? Would students use films for outside study and research? Is the equipment reliable?

REMARKABLE RESULTS

Terrell's schools and three elementary schools, in Shaker Heights, Ohio; Daly City, Calif., and Washington, D.C., were picked for the program. The film and equipment have been in use here for two full school years. Scientific data haven't been compiled so far, but the broad results seem remarkable. School attendance has improved. Teacher turnover has declined. Circulation at the high school library doubled in a year. Achievement levels in some classes rose as much as two years.

"Even though we did it for research in the beginning," says Terrell's Superintendent Grady Hester, "Project Discovery is a way of life with us now. Our faculty can't think in terms of teaching without it."

Terrell didn't step into Project Discovery overnight, however. The faculty and administration spent the 1964–65 school year reviewing the curriculum. Thousands of films and filmstrips were previewed.

The administration here has tried to eliminate inflexible rules about film use. "The teacher is the best judge of what to use," says one official. Thus, the system doesn't require teachers to order films far ahead, or to return the film by a certain time. With such flexibility, teachers have begun to broaden use of the materials. One fourth-grade instructor used a filmstrip to teach manners, then found the captions were good examples of punctuation. A film about a fox delights first graders; older students find the story full of adjectives, their subject for the day.

An Ohio State University study of the five elementary schools in the program found that during the 1965–66 school year 127 teachers used films and film strip 8,337 times. Terrell's elementary teachers used 55% of the films and 70% of the filmstrips. In addition, the 12-grade Terrell system used more than 9,000 films and filmstrips during the 1965–66 school year.

One civics teacher uses two projectors at once, to contrast American and British government, for example. Some teachers use as many as three different films or filmstrips in one lesson.

Students have been trained to use films outside of class, too. Terrell's library has private viewing-rooms for study. Pupils earning a "projectionist's license" may take the equipment home. One high school freshman, confined to his bed for several months, completed biology, physics and chemistry courses by using films.

The sponsors insist the project isn't a rigidly scientific experiment because there are no control groups for comparison. While most teachers and students subjectively feel achievement has increased, other factors could be at work—Terrell's new buildings, the new curriculum or the new enthusiasm of teachers.

Few school systems, of course, have assumed the high cost of outfitting themselves in the fashion of Project Discovery. A typical film costs $90, and the easy-operating projectors used here retail at $755 each. One authority estimates that Texas ranks 50 in the nation in its use of audio-visual materials, with less than 1% of the state's schools owning their own film libraries.

One film manufacturing executive says that while the nation's schools probably spend 75 cents per pupil a year on audio-visual programs, a Project Discovery would cost $14 or $15 per pupil initially. Indeed, most schools fall far short of the optimum inventory: A projector for every classroom. And they probably don't even approach the standards drafted by the National Education Association's department of audio-visual instruction. The guidelines call for an elementary school to have a 16mm projector for each 10 teachers, a filmstrip viewer for each three teachers, a library of at least 500 films, and one filmstrip per student. School districts, the guidelines add, should spend at least 1% of the average per-pupil cost a year on maintenance and replacement of audio-visual supplies. Capital expenditures are extra.

Spending for such materials is rising, partly due to the influx of Federal funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. "Without Federal money, we'd all be a dead duck," concedes one equipment executive, who estimates that equipment purchases probably jumped 400% last year.

INDICATIVE TREND

School Management magazine surveyed school spending for audio-visual purposes in 1966 and concluded that the sum rose from $97.6 million in the 1962–63 school year to $187 million in the 1965–66 school year. The figures are considered low, due to the nature of the survey sample. But the trend is indicative of the national pattern. The average school district, the magazine added, spent $1.91 per pupil in 1962–63 on audio-visual instruction, compared with $3.98 per pupil in 1965–66.

Experts concede that Project Discovery "is a little bit like heaven" for a school district and conclude that the average school has to set its sights a little lower. Administrators, they insist, must learn to "swing" a little to get the best usage out of a limited budget. Too many schools still keep the equipment entirely out of student hands, and require teachers to order films a semester or a year ahead. "A teacher in a big school system of 150 buildings might have to wait four or five years to get a particular film, if she lives long enough," says one critic.

But he believes Project Discovery and similar programs are "getting at the problem of nothing happening in the classroom." He argues, "Films aren't going to make good teachers out of mediocre teachers, but they can make average teachers more effective. And make school a little more interesting for kids."

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 602) to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of September 28, 1967, pp. 27177–27178, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, action by the Senate today will bring to a close consideration of legislation reaffirming the commitment of Congress to the program designed to help revitalize the important Appalachian region of our Nation.

The areas of disagreement between the House and Senate versions of the legislation, while important, were few in number. The Senate agreed to the language of the House bill providing certain protections for employees of the Appalachian Regional Commission as well as the employees of the other regional commissions established pursuant to title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The only important difference in the two bills as relate to the highway program concerned the number of miles of access roads to be authorized. As passed by the Senate, the authorization would have been 2,000 miles; as approved by the House, it would have been 1,200 miles. The conferees adjusted the difference at 1,600 miles.

Action in the House resulted in the deletion of language in the section of the act dealing with "demonstration health projects." The House amendment deleted authority to make grants for operating such medical facilities. The Senate managers deemed these grants to be important elements of the program inasmuch as the "brick and mortar" structures themselves would have little use if adequate staff could not be hired to make them function properly. The conference report reinstates the authorizing language.

One of the needs of the region recognized in the Senate bill was the provision for a meaningful research program in hardwood technology and marketing of new hardwood products. The conference report adopted the Senate language and provided for a 2-year authorization of $2 million to carry out this research program.

The keystone of the nonhighway portion of the program is the supplemental grant section of the act. The Senate had approved an authorization of $97 million to carry out this vital program. The House had reduced that figure to $71 million. The conferees agreed to the higher Senate figure. I place emphasis on this agreement but call attention to the fact that the Senate conferees concurred in the House overall authorization ceiling of $170 million on all nonhighway items. It is the view of the Senate conferees that the reductions in program authorizations which this ceiling will necessitate should not be applied to the $97 million provided for supplemental grants under section 214 of the act.

The $170 million authorized for nonhighway activities reflects and is rela-

tively commensurate with the expenditure level achieved during the past 2 years. As I stated when the conferees concluded their deliberations:

Because of our country's extremely heavy commitments in Vietnam, there is little likelihood that the total passed by the House and agreed to by the conference could possibly be funded. When the Senate passed the bill five months ago, the fiscal situation was not as dark as it is today, and when the Senate Public Works Committee considered it and recommended it to the Senate, the budget request from the President for fiscal year 1968 had not been submitted to Congress. In the subsequent budget request, the non-highway items were asked to be funded, for the fiscal year which began July 1, by Congress with appropriations of $65 million, only slightly more than one-third of the $170 million authorized for two years.

S. 602 also contains important amendments to title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. This language provides for supplemental grant money for each of the title V regions in the amount of $5 million for each region for fiscal year 1968 and $10 million for each region for fiscal year 1969. There were differences between the Senate and House versions of this program and the conferees agreed on the Senate language which provides that the money for such supplemental funds will go through the Federal cochairman for each of the regions involved.

This conference report which has been approved by the House, and on which I ask approval this afternoon, will enable the Appalachian program to go forward at a rate commensurate with our ability to meet the original objectives of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. In the 2 years since the enactment of that legislation, the program has fully justified our early hopes for its success and its service.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I shall place in the RECORD a statement giving the details and results of the conference. I should merely like to say now that we are grateful for the leadership of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. I emphasize that the results of the conference and the conference report before the Senate are compatible with the needs of the area, and also with the budget situation.

We have been very proud of the progress of the programs under the Appalachian bill.

I emphasize again that I think the chief reason for its progress is that the bill enlists the cooperation of the States and requires that the program determinations be made by the States themselves.

It is this fact—this cooperation, and this initial determination by the States as to the kind of programs they need—as well as the opportunity to establish priorities, which has kept the program in balance. There has also been a reasonable balance fiscally.

I am happy that some years ago I had the opportunity to work with the chairman, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, in the introduction of the original bill, and again this year in conducting the hearings.

I feel, with him, great pride in the accomplishments of the Appalachian regional development program.

Mr. President, the aforementioned statement follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR COOPER

I am glad to join with Senator Randolph, the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works on which I serve, in recommending that the Senate adopt the Conference Report on S. 602, the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967.

I was a cosponsor of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, which this Act continues and, with respect to the programs other than highways, which it extends for two years. Earlier this year, on January 23, I was glad to join with the senior Senator from West Virginia in sponsoring, and managing in the Senate, S. 602.

During the two years the Appalachian program has been in effect, it has given us great hope. It is accomplishing results. I believe it is more successful than many other programs primarily because it has actually brought into the work the Governors and the States. It enlists local cooperation and initiative. Objectives are formed and moved toward with some sense of priorities. We have grounds to expect that this record of accomplishment will continue.

The bill as agreed upon by the Conference continues the authorization for the Appalachian development highway system, at a level of $715 million for the four fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1968. It provides authorization for appropriations to the nonhighway programs of $170 million for fiscal years 1968 and 1969—a realistic level in view of the President's budget and the amounts that have been appropriated and can be expected to be appropriated.

I was particularly interested in the authority contained in Section 202, which in the Senate bill provided for grants for the operating expenses of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals. The House bill restricted operating expenses to health facilities constructed under the Act. In the conference I pointed out that it would be wasteful to build facilities where existing facilities could be put to use, and I am glad the Senate language was accepted by the House.

One of the most useful programs, as Senator Randolph has emphasized, has been that for supplemental grants-in-aid—which permit the Appalachian Regional Development Commission to supplement in Appalachia the Federal matching grants available under other assistance programs, up to a level of 80 percent. The Senate bill had authorized $97 million, compared to $71 million contained in the House bill, and the Senate amount was maintained.

The House also accepted the Senate provision authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to carry out research in the utilization of Appalachian hardwoods, although the authorization was reduced from $4 million to $2 million.

We believe the wide acceptance of the Appalachian Development Program by the Congress and by the country shows what can be accomplished with better coordination of Federal efforts, and greater emphasis on State and local initiative and planning.

I may say that S. 602 as passed by the House on September 14 followed rather closely the bill reported to the Senate by the Committee on Public Works, and passed by the Senate on April 27. The authority in the conference bill to continue the Appalachian programs, and making some changes in those programs, is very much the same as the bill passed by the Senate—and my remarks in the RECORD on April 26 contain a detailed explanation of those changes. The House Committee did reduce the 2-year authorization for the non-highway programs by $53 million, from $273 million approved by the Senate to $220 million, and the House itself further reduced that amount by $50 million. But the purpose, the scope, and the effectiveness of the Appalachian programs is maintained, and we look forward to the continued progress of these programs under the guidance of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Section 201 of the bill continues the authority for the Appalachian Development Highway System, originally authorized for a period of six years at a level of $840 million. $300 million of that amount has already been appropriated. It provides an authorization of $715 million for the fiscal years 1968 through 1971. The Development Highway System will consist of 2700 miles of high-type road.

The Senate bill also authorized 2,000 miles of the local access roads; the House bill 1200 miles, and the Conference agreed upon 1600 miles of access roads.

Section 202 authorizes the program of grants for the construction, equipment and operation of multi-county demonstration health facilities. I have mentioned the importance of the Senate language—which would avoid the wasteful duplication of construction in order to provide health services, by permitting these operating funds to be used at existing hospitals and facilities, rather than only those constructed under the Act. This section is of particular interest in Kentucky, and we are very hopeful that it will make possible the development of a multi-county health program which will be of great benefit to the region and serve as an example in the nation. The Conference Report conforms to the House allowance of $50 million for this program.

Section 203 authorizes conservation, land stabilization and erosion control agreements between land owners and the Secretary of Agriculture, similar to the familiar ACP program. The House, Senate and Conference bills authorized $19 million for this purpose.

Section 204 was originally directed to timber development organizations. The Senate bill redirected this section to research on hardwood utilization, production and marketing—a neglected resource of the Region, but one which offers great opportunity. The Senate bill authorized $4 million for this work; the House bill provided $1 million to continue the timber development organizations; the Conference bill authorizes $2 million for the Appalachian hardwood research program.

Section 205 authorizes the program of mining area restoration. The Conference Report adopts the level of $30 million provided by the House.

Section 206 continues the water resources survey by the Corps of Engineers, authorizing $2 million to complete the survey.

Section 207 adds a new section to the Act, authorizing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish an Appalachian housing fund to provide loans for the cost of planning housing projects intending to qualify for insured mortgages under Section 221 of the National Housing Act. Better housing is one of the most urgent needs of the area, and this new authority, authorized at $5 million, was unchanged by the House.

Section 211 authorizes grants for the construction of vocational educational facilities. It has been one of the most valuable provisions of the Appalachian Act. In fact in Kentucky, the principal effort, other than highways, has been directed to vocational education. Recognizing its value, the House bill increased the Senate authorization to $26 million, which was adopted by the Conference.

Section 212 provides grants for sewage treatment works, to supplement those provided under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It was unchanged by the House; $6 million is authorized for this purpose.

Section 214, as I have mentioned, has proven especially useful. It provides a means for securing the concentration of effort on se-

lected projects by enabling the Commission to make supplemental grants-in-aid, up to 80 percent, for projects eligible for assistance under the other Federal programs. I believe it has encouraged orderly planning, and the assignment of priorities. Perhaps most important, this mechanism helps secure a coordinated State and local effort, assisted by the cooperation of the various Federal agencies involved. I consider it a mark of the success of the supplemental grants-in-aid that the House accepted the Senate amount of $97 million authorized for Section 214, an increase of $26 million over the House figure.

Section 215, to provide a modest amount for grants for cultural programs, was omitted at the insistence of the House.

Section 302, which provides funds for research and for the administrative expenses of local development districts, was authorized at $13 million by the Senate, $10 million by the House, and established at $11 million by the Conference.

In discussing the limitations on appropriations for each of the above non-highway programs, I think I should point out that the total for Sections 202 through 302 exceeds by $78 million the amount authorized by Section 401 for all these programs taken together—which is $170 million for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. Not more than $170 million may be appropriated for all of the programs together, but individually there is some latitude and flexibility. To put it another way, a ceiling is imposed on the amount which may be appropriated for each of the programs. The total of these program ceilings exceeds the authorization in Section 401 by $78 million.

Continuation of the Appalachian development highway system, and the 2-year extension of the other programs—together with the additional authorities granted by the bill and the administrative changes made—represent a reaffirmation of the original Act, and support for the work which has been accomplished and is under way. It will permit the Appalachian program to go forward with continued effectiveness.

I have been glad to have a part in this work. Again I thank the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Randolph) for his leadership, deep interest, and hard work which will bear fruit through the implementation of this Act—and join him in urging adoption by the Senate of the Conference Report on S. 602.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I commend the constructive contribution of the Senator from Kentucky, who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works. He was instrumental in drafting the initial legislation in 1965. He has maintained intense interest in the program and is aware of the achievements which have been wrought under the act, which has now been in operation for some 2 years.

I remind Senators that the Senate originally passed the measure by a vote of almost 3 to 1. In 1965 the Senate gave such substantial approval because of the emphasis on the creation of a State and Federal partnership requiring that decisions and programs be conceived and carried forward in the region at the State level.

In April of this year the Senate, by a vote of more than 5 to 1, expressed an even more substantial approval on extension and revision of the act.

I believe this overwhelming approval was a direct result of the fact that the program was carried out during the 2-year period, 1965–67, as an outstanding example of State and Federal cooperation.

I believe that as a result of the conference we have brought back to the Senate a bill which carries out the purposes of the original legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

NATION'S TOP EXPERT SAYS DEFENSE NOT EXERTING DEMAND PRESSURE ON ECONOMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to continue for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the No. 1 question on which our decision should depend on whether or not we enact the proposed 10-percent surtax is this: Is the tax necessary to take the inflationary steam out of the economy?

Of course, no tax increase can reduce the cost pressures that push up prices. Indeed, a tax increase is sure to contribute to the cost pressure to the extent the tax increase becomes a cost. And the proposed 10-percent corporation surtax will certainly become a cost.

If the increased tax is to play any useful economic role in stemming inflationary pressure, it must be by reducing the demand pull on prices.

Today, Mr. President, I summon as competent a witness as this country has to show that the pressures from the defense sector of the economy on demand do not require tax increase restraint.

If there is any common bromide in the tax debate, it is that we need a tax increase to pay for the Vietnam war or to stem the pressure on the economy from the increased spending for defense. Put another way—that we cannot have guns and butter, and that the guns are going to have to be produced in such quantity that America's facilities are going to be under intolerable pressure unless we increase taxes to cut down on the butter.

Mr. President, this is one ghost that was laid to rest yesterday when Prof. Murray Weidenbaum addressed the National Association of Business Economists in Detroit.

Who is Professor Weidenbaum? For several years he was an economist on the Budget Bureau staff. Thereafter he was economic adviser to the Boeing Aircraft Co. He then served for a time as a senior economist on the staff of the Stanford Research Institute, and is now chairman of the Department of Economics at Washington University.

Last spring when the Joint Economic Committee was considering what we could do to secure more timely advice for the Congress on the impact of defense spending on the economy, I—as chairman—asked the staff who was the most competent economist in the country to advise us. They replied with enthusiasm that Professor Weidenbaum was the best man in the country for this. Indeed, it was Professor Weidenbaum who gave us the principal advice on which the Defense Economic Indicators which developed from that Joint Economic Committee Inquiry developed. He told us just the kind of defense data we should secure to enable us to most clearly foresee the impact of the defense effort on the economy.

What does Professor Weidenbaum find right now, on the basis of current Defense Economic Indicators?

Does he find that the on-rush of defense orders is going to so stimulate business activity and employment that the Nation will be faced with explosive demand pressures on employment and facilities that will make the economy a shambles?

Quite the contrary. He finds, as he said just yesterday, and I quote him:

> The period of rapid rise in government spending necessitated by the Vietnam War has drawn to a close and increases in government spending through December 1968 will be much smaller than those we have witnessed in the past few years.
>
> Since the first quarter of 1966, military prime contract awards (exclusive of work to be performed outside of the United States) have shown no growth trend whatever. During the past five quarters, these awards have fluctuated between $10.1 billion and $10.7 billion. The figure for the most recent period (March to June 1967), $10.7 billion, is only slightly higher than the $10 billion for the same period in 1966. Adjusting for the substantial inflation which has occurred in military procurement during the Vietnam buildup, it seems that defense orders in real terms have been on a virtual plateau for the past year.
>
> The rise in the size of the armed forces has abated. Between the first and fourth quarters of 1966, military manpower increased by 365,000 reaching a total of 3,334,000. The increase for this year to date has been only 41,000, less than one-eighth of last year's expansion.

Mr. President, the analysis by Professor Weidenbaum showing that defense orders have stopped growing and have reached a plateau should be placed in the perspective of an American industry which has expanded at an immense rate in the past few years and continues to expand. Our facilities can produce a whopping 6 or 7 percent more each year—compounded.

Our available manpower rushes ahead at one and a half million every year. What happens as defense orders level off and industrial capacity and manpower continue to grow rapidly?

Does this mean that the defense and the Vietnam war is putting pressure on the economy that is likely to drive up prices? Does this mean that a $10 billion tax increase is necessary to stop excessive demand from pulling up prices?

Of course not. The hard facts suggest exactly the opposite. The economy is getting no pressure from the guns side of the guns-and-butter demand on our economy. The guns aspect of the pressures are diminishing—not increasing.

Indeed, we can stand a big and growing increase in demand from the nondefense sector of the American economy to keep our growing manpower and surging plant facilities busy.

Once again, Mr. President, I plead with my fellow Senators and with the administration to take a long, hard look at the nature of recent rising prices. There is no evidence that demand pressures are pulling prices up. There is no evidence that a tax increase would be the kind of demand-depressing prescription that would help keep prices down. There is much evidence that increasing costs are

pushing up prices and that increased taxes will add to those increased costs.

The Congress should not be stampeded or intimidated into support for a tax increase on the grounds that the economic facts of life support such a tax increase and that a tax increase is the only responsible course. This is simply not the case. The responsible course on the basis of present economic facts is to oppose a tax increase.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech of Professor Weidenbaum delivered in Detroit yesterday printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE OUTLOOK FOR GOVERNMENT SPENDING IN 1968: A SLOWER RATE OF GROWTH

(A paper to be presented to the annual meeting of the National Association of Business Economists, Detroit, Mich., September 28, 1967, By Murray L. Weidenbaum, chairman, Department of Economics, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.)

It is always a pleasure to prepare a forecast of government spending. There is so much room for creativity and imagination. We are not bound by such restrictions as are found in other sectors. Projections of consumer spending may only vary between 92 and 94 percent of personal income. Estimates of capital spending may only vary plus or minus a few percent from the Commerce-SEC survey results. In comparison, government spending is a wide open field with so much opportunity for individual exploration.

Taking advantage of this opportunity, I should like to suggest that—on the basis of the data now publicly available—the period of rapid rise in government spending necessitated by the Vietnam War has drawn to a close and increases in government spending through December 1968 will be much smaller than those we have witnessed in the past few years.

DEFENSE SPENDING

Federal purchases of goods and services for national defense (the defense portion of GNP) have risen from $60.5 billion in 1966 to an approximate $74.0 billion in 1967, an increase of 22 percent for the year. On the basis of current data (this in the past has often been a heroic assumption), I project national defence purchases in 1968 at $80 billion, an increase of 8 percent. A few words of explanation need to be given for this pinpoint forecast. By offering a rounded estimate, $80 billion, I am sticking my neck out and declaring that the figure will not be as low as $70 billion nor as high as $90 billion, and that is all.

Of course, it is always necessary to stipulate that another major escalation, which is not visible in any of the lead indicators available to us, would upset these calculations. Nevertheless, several important factors indicate the current leveling off in military demand in the American economy.

1. Since the first quarter of 1966, military prime contract awards (exclusive of work to be performed outside of the United States) have shown no growth trend whatever. During the past five quarters, these awards have fluctuated between $10.1 billion and $10.7 billion. The figure for the most recent period (March to June 1967), $10.7 billion, is only slightly higher than the $10.1 billion for the same period in 1966. Adjusting for the substantial inflation which has occurred in military procurement during the Vietnam buildup, it seems that defense orders in real terms have been on a virtual plateau for the past year.

2. The rise in the size of the armed forces has abated. Between the first and fourth quarters of 1966, military manpower increased by 365,000, reaching a total of 3,334,000. The increase for this year to date has been only 41,000, less than one-eighth of last year's expansion.

3. The surge of obligations over expenditures has ended, at least for the time being. Here we rely on the lead indicator relationship between the measures of the early and late stages of the government spending process to indicate future trends. Net obligations (gross obligations minus an adjustment of 8 percent for double counting and other technical factors) were running $8.2 billion over expenditures during the first half of 1966, at annual rates. The gap had narrowed to $2.6 billion for the second half of 1966. For 1967 to date, the relationship has been reversed. Net expenditures are running about $3 billion above net obligations.

From these data, it would appear that the Vietnam buildup has hit its stride and is now reaching a plateau. It is tempting to conclude from this type of analysis that the war in Vietnam is deescalating and will be terminating in the foreseeable future. This type of optimistic conclusion, of course, is not supported by any economic or statistical analysis and requires political and military expertise not possessed by the author.

However, it might be of interest to speculate as to the nature and dimensions of a cutback in U.S. defense spending following peace in Vietnam. Various "scenarios" are possible, including a sudden one-shot cessation, a phase withdrawal, a decline at the same pace as the buildup, etc. For purposes of illustration, let us assume that the reductions will follow the lines of the post-Korean adjustment.

POST-VIETNAM

We can recall that the Korean buildup lasted 12 quarters and the subsequent post-war decline took half that amount of time, six quarters. By the *end of 1967, the Vietnam buildup also will have lasted 12 quarters*. Let us assume that the Vietnam war will end in December 1967 and, following the Korean experience, the reductions will take place during the following six quarters, and the new post-Vietnam rate of military spending will continue to be higher than the level existing prior to the Vietnam buildup. It is further hypothesized that the *decline* in aggregate military spending will be about *$18 billion* or two-thirds of the estimated total Vietnam increase of $27 billion from the beginning of 1965 to the end of 1967.

Let us also assume that the $18 billion reduction will be phased out over an 18 month period in the same proportions as occurred during the post-Korean adjustment. On that basis, the major declines would occur in calendar year 1968 and would total $12.5 billion, a fairly substantial amount in absolute terms. However, in relative terms, this would be a smaller proportion of the GNP than the cutback during the first year of the Korean demobilization—less than 1.6 percent of GNP versus 2.0 percent.

Undoubtedly, the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam will give rise to pressures for expansion in those defense areas which have been squeezed, as money and manpower were shifted to meet the needs of the active conflict in Southeast Asia. Specific military program areas that are likely to compete strongly for major additions in funding after the initial post-Vietnam reductions include: an operational anti-ICBM program, a new generation of strategic weapons (either long-range bombers or missiles), and military research and development. Also, there may be need to refill inventory positions and perform maintenance operations which were deferred to meet the urgent Vietnam requirements.

NONDEFENSE GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Peace in Vietnam of course would also act as a spur to civilian government spending programs. However, these programs have continued to rise during the war period, but at a slower rate than military outlays. Assuming continuation of the Vietnam war at about the current rate of resource utilization, it is likely that other Federal purchases of goods and services would rise by about $1 billion a year, to a total of $18 billion in 1968.

The bulk of the increase in non-defense purchases, of course, will continue to take place at state and local levels. The $9 billion increase in state and local purchases during the past 12 months has been at double the growth rate of the past decade, hardly evidence of a war-time squeeze on the civilian public sector. A $6 billion increase in state and local government purchases in 1968 would still be substantial and more in line with long-term trends.

Hence, total government purchases, on the basis of continuation of the war in Vietnam, would come to $192 billion in 1968—$80 billion for defense, $18 billion for Federal non-defense purchases, and $94 billion of state and local outlays. Peace in Vietnam likely would result in a smaller total of government spending in 1968 and in increases in the two non-defense components. This assumes that much of the initial adjustment would be carried out via tax reduction, monetary ease, and expansion of transfer payments, notably unemployment compensation.

TAXES AND DEFICITS

Finally, I am hesitant to enter the great guessing game of what will be the Federal deficit in the fiscal year 1968. The Administration's sudden focus on the administrative budget and the possible huge deficit on that basis is puzzling in view of the effort in the January Budget Message to discredit the administrative budget and to highlight the so-called national income accounts budget. We were told on page 9 of the January 1967 Budget Message, "I am emphasizing the national income accounts as a measure of Federal fiscal activity because the traditional administrative budget is becoming an increasingly less complete and less reliable measure of the Government's activities and their economic impact."

Now I for one have always been a supporter of the cash budget. However, if we bow to the wisdom of the Budget Message and rely on the so-called NIA budget, we find that the prospective deficit for fiscal 1968 is nowhere near the order of magnitude of $24–28 billion used in the August 3 tax message. Some estimates indicate a range more like $6–12 billion, the lower end of the range assuming a tax increase. It is a great game, but I see little utility in forecasting administrative budget deficits as an aid to analyzing the economic outlook. I do wish to offer the firm prediction that, yes, Virginia, there will be a budget deficit in 1968 and that it will be in three figures—on administrative, cash, and NIA bases—and that during the coming year we will find all three bases utilized, whichever best serves the purpose at hand.

SUMMARY

In brief, 1968 is likely to be another year of expansion in public expenditures, but the increase in government purchases of goods and services estimated here would not be at the rapid and sometime feverish rate of the past few years. Government, and especially military, spending will be an important area of strength in the economy as a whole, but perhaps not the pacing element.

MOST RECENT DEFENSE INDICATORS SHOW NO INFLATIONARY PRESSURE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on the same subject, because I hope that Senators will find time to spend a little while with the latest Defense Indicators, I want to take an additional minute to call to their attention the August figures, which have just been made available to me. As I said, this series is prepared once

a month by the Department of Defense at the request of the Joint Economic Committee, in response to a request submitted to Secretary McNamara by the Joint Economic Committee. The request was made in April of this year after our hearings on the "Costs and Effects of the Vietnam War," where it became painfully obvious that better reporting on military contract awards and expenditures was essential to proper economic policy management under the Full Employment Act.

Mr. President, the figures for defense contract awards in the month of August are slightly above the July level. The amount of increase—$100 million—has to be gaged against contract awards in excess of $40 billion a year. Thus, the increase is a small fraction of 1 percent and probably can be accounted for by price changes—with no physical increase at all. While we cannot rely on the figures for 1 month as a completely reliable index of economic change, it is highly significant to me that the rate of increase in defense contracts this year has been very small in dollar figures and probably has not increased at all in physical terms.

This supports and underlines the Weidenbaum thesis that the economy is getting no inflationary pressure from the guns part of the guns-and-butter economic pressures we have been hearing so much about.

I ask unanimous consent that the August report of the Department of Defense on Selected Economic Indicators be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SELECTED ECONOMIC INDICATORS

The attached table and chart show selected financial and employment data related to the impact of Defense programs on the economy. The data reflected in the table 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. The chart covers three areas—obligations, expenditures and contracts—by quarter year. 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. Oustanding 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.

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

[Quarters by calendar year]

	1966				1967						
	1st quarter Millions	2d quarter Millions	3d quarter Millions	4th quarter Millions	1st quarter Millions	April Millions	May Millions	June Millions	2d quarter Millions	July Millions	August Millions
I. Military prime contract awards:											
Aircraft	$1,945	$2,989	$2,696	$2,262	$2,102	$432	$1,240	$1,377	$3,049	$394	[1] $541
Missile and space systems	1,040	987	1,314	861	1,230	300	260	606	1,166	535	[1] 582
Ships	355	491	876	239	679	72	129	206	407	178	[1] 175
Weapons and ammunition	555	1,486	692	940	818	279	518	972	1,769	92	[1] 416
Electronics and communications equipment	918	1,574	666	915	971	480	338	1,030	1,848	169	[1] 318
Other hard goods	843	1,842	660	1,029	915	298	362	904	1,564	202	[1] 332
Soft goods	709	922	1,078	989	638	171	199	282	652	588	[1] 277
Construction	207	392	198	150	232	126	160	340	626	56	[1] 70
All other	1,406	1,963	2,356	1,639	1,605	517	507	963	1,987	1,194	[1] 669
Total (exclusive of work outside the United States)	7,978	12,646	10,536	9,024	9,190	2,675	3,713	6,680	13,068	3,408	[1] 3,380
Total, seasonally adjusted	8,703	10,144	10,716	10,149	10,171	2,920	4,121	3,626	10,667	3,610	[1] 3,727
Work outside the United States	521	1,195	856	672	453	227	228	379	834	314	[1] 342

See footnotes at end of table.

SELECTED DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ECONOMIC INDICATORS—Continued

[Quarters by calendar year]

	1966				1967						
	1st quarter Millions	2d quarter Millions	3d quarter Millions	4th quarter Millions	1st quarter Millions	April Millions	May Millions	June Millions	2d quarter Millions	July Millions	August Millions
II. Gross obligations incurred:											
Operations	8,326	9,604	10,426	9,702	10,229	3,664	3,531	[1] 4,016	[1] 11,211	(2)	(2)
Procurement	4,374	8,539	5,368	5,276	5,113	1,801	2,485	[1] 4,350	[1] 8,636	(2)	(2)
Other	2,429	3,470	3,453	2,230	2,519	726	1,130	[1] 1,631	[1] 3,487	(2)	(2)
Total	15,129	21,613	19,247	17,208	17,861	6,191	7,146	[1] 9,997	[1] 23,334	(2)	(2)
III Gross unpaid obligations outstanding:											
Operations	3,828	3,777	4,792	5,024	4,644	4,761	4,765	[1] 4,543	[1] 4,543	(2)	(2)
Procurement	18,023	22,119	22,736	23,173	22,780	22,613	22,947	[1] 24,886	[1] 24,886	(2)	(2)
Other	5,747	7,392	8,179	7,888	7,626	7,453	7,628	[1] 8,354	[1] 8,354	(2)	(2)
Total	27,598	33,288	35,707	36,085	35,050	34,827	35,340	[1] 37,783	[1] 37,783	(2)	(2)
IV. Net expenditures:											
Operations	7,689	9,076	8,968	9,087	10,002	3,416	3,335	[1] 3,745	[1] 10,496	[1] 2,898	[1] 3,722
Procurement	3,651	3,886	4,392	4,264	5,074	1,783	1,850	[1] 1,702	[1] 5,335	[1] 2,037	[1] 1,982
Other	2,757	2,647	2,484	3,092	3,179	918	749	[1] 399	[1] 2,066	[1] 1,231	[1] 881
Total	14,097	15,609	15,844	16,443	18,255	6,117	5,934	[1] 5,846	[1] 17,897	[1] 6,166	[1] 6,585
V. DOD personal compensation:											
Military	3,181	3,249	3,551	3,606	3,624	1,230	1,196	[1] 1,226	[1] 3,653	(2)	(2)
Civilian	1,937	2,015	2,105	2,135	2,163	700	776	[1] 766	[1] 2,242	[1] 724	[1] 791
Total	5,118	5,264	5,656	5,741	5,787	1,930	1,972	[1] 1,992	[1] 5,895	(2)	(2)
VI. Outstanding payments: [3]											
Advance payments	66	79	90	83	92	----------	----------	----------	80	----------	----------
Progress payments	4,402	4,346	4,750	5,461	5,981	----------	----------	----------	6,765	----------	----------
Total	4,468	4,425	4,840	5,544	6,073	----------	----------	----------	6,845	----------	----------
VII. Strength (manpower):	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands
Military	2,969	3,094	3,229	3,334	3,371	3,371	3,368	3,377	3,377	3,382	[1] 3,393
Civilian	1,088	1,138	1,184	1,230	1,268	1,273	1,274	1,303	1,303	1,311	[1] 1,308

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Information not available at time of publication.
[3] Indicator No. VI information available only on a quarterly basis.

JEWISH WAR VETERANS URGE SENATE ACTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—CXLVII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, certainly one of America's most respected veterans' organizations, at its 72d annual national convention this August overwhelmingly adopted a resolution endorsing U.S. ratification of the Human Rights Conventions.

I am both encouraged and gratified by this action of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. This outstanding organization thus joins another respected veterans group, the American Veterans Committee, whose representative, Andrew E. Rice, testified before the Dodd subcommittee this past March, in formally supporting ratification of the Human Rights Conventions.

I commend both of these groups for their responsible action. I welcome their support. Both of these organizations are composed of men who have witnessed firsthand the brutality and misery of war, who have proved beyond doubt their selfless dedication to our country, and who labor positively for peace and freedom for the United States and all the people of the world.

Because I am confident that this resolution of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States on the Human Rights Conventions will be of real interest and value to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES—GENOCIDE

For the first time, affirmative action was taken in the Congress on Human Rights Treaties when an ad hoc subcommittee, this year, considered and reported favorably to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The conventions considered deal with forced labor, slavery and women's rights. Although advocacy for ratification of the Genocide Convention was introduced into the hearings, it was not an agenda item.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America regrets that the United States Senate has not, as yet, considered the Genocide Convention. The language in the treaty consistent with domestic law and basic American principles found in the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence and other documents basic to our open pluralistic society. The time has long since passed for joining with approximately seventy other countries by ratifying the Genocide Convention.

* * * * *

International Human Rights Year will be celebrated during 1968. The cause of Human Rights could receive no greater nor more fitting impetus than the ratification of these treaties by the United States. A positive first step towards such a noteworthy achievement would be the prompt consideration and ratification of the Genocide Convention.

The Jewish War Veterans considers ratification of the Genocide Convention and other Human Rights treaties as a matter of great urgency. It would serve the best interests of the United States by bringing real meaning to the many noble utterances made in the world of international relations and diplomacy. We shall continue to work towards the realization of this most laudable goal—United States ratification of the Genocide Convention and the other Human Rights treaties.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANGLEY RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably Senate Joint Resolution 109.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Langley Research Center at Hampton, Virginia, and calling upon the people of the United States, during the first full calendar week in October 1967, to observe such anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities honoring such Center's fifty years of service to the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the preamble is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on

the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND], and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] have reported from the Committee on the Judiciary Senate Joint Resolution 109; and the Senate has unanimously passed it.

I wish to express my warm appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the committee for his great cooperation in handling this joint resolution.

Mr. President, the joint resolution commemorates the 50th anniversary of the Langley Research Center, located on the peninsula of Virginia. It authorizes and requests the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

The Langley Research Center is one of the major research facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, engaged in significant programs of advanced research and technology relating to aeronautics and the manned and unmanned exploration of space, including, among others, the development of vertical and short take-off and landing aircraft, the Apollo lunar mission, and a variety of other projects designed to accelerate our flight progress and expand our knowledge of the universe.

Mr. President, the people of Virginia are very proud of the work being done by the Langley Research Center.

The people of Virginia are proud of the dedicated, able, and competent employees of the research center at Langley.

I am pleased today to bring before the Senate the splendid work which is being done at Langley Research Center, and I am pleased that the Senate has unanimously passed Senate Joint Resolution 109, to commemorate 50 years of outstanding service to the Nation, which has been rendered by this space facility in Virginia.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I should like to join with my colleague, Senator BYRD of Virginia, in expressing my pleasure that the Senate has unanimously passed this joint resolution today. I should like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for his role in bringing the joint resolution to the floor of the Senate.

The Langley Research Center for 50 years has played a vital part in the development of our aviation and space programs. It is one of the finest facilities of its kind in the United States, and we are very proud to have it located in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

On this occasion, when its 50th anniversary is being celebrated, I take great pleasure in saluting the splendid personnel of that fine facility, and I thank the Senate for its action today.

VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the New York Times this morning contains a most interesting editorial entitled "Consensus on the Bombing." The article points out that, on the eve of the opening of the current session of the United Nations General Assembly, Secretary General U Thant again urged that the United States stop bombing North Vietnam as an essential first step toward peace. At the same time, the French press agency reported from Hanoi that reliable sources indicated talks could begin between Hanoi and Washington within 3 or 4 weeks of a bombing halt.

We next find the Canadian Foreign Minister, Paul Martin, who represents one of America's closest friends, and a nation that has had recent diplomatic contact with North Vietnam, reporting that there is not the slightest doubt in his mind that the first step in the direction of talks will involve the question of the bombing of North Vietnam.

The editorial states that this position has been echoed at the United Nations so far in speeches by the representatives of Denmark, Sweden, France, Somalia, Indonesia, and Kenya, and that many other delegates, friends as well as opponents of the American policy, have privately voiced similar views.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] made a most important foreign policy speech to a group of businessmen a few days ago in which he indicated that he had switched his position on the bombing of Vietnam, and now is of the view that it is essential that we should stop the bombing if we really want to stop the war. It is really as simple as that. If we want to stop the war we have to stop the bombing. I have been saying this for well over a year, and so has my good friend from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I am happy to hear the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I commend him, and I agree with him entirely.

By the Senator's statement that we should stop the bombing, I assume that the Senator means our President should announce to the world that we will stop the bombing unconditionally, that we will do so without imposing any conditions whatever. It would be an act of statesmanship if our President would announce that we have unconditionally stopped bombing North Vietnam and that such policy will continue for a sufficient time for us to determine if a diplomatic ending to this conflict can be achieved by a meeting of delegates representing the Hanoi government, the Vietcong or its political arm, the National Liberation Front, the Saigon regime of Thieu and Ky, and our representatives.

Obviously, if there is ever to be a meeting of delegates of the Hanoi regime and the Saigon regime, there must also be independent delegates representing the National Liberation Front, or what is now termed the VC. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. CLARK. I thoroughly agree. It seems to me absurd for us to pretend any longer that this is not a civil war. Mr. President, when you want to stop a civil war you have to bring both parties of the war to the conference table.

I ask the Senator from Ohio if he does not agree with me that when we say we want to stop the bombing we mean the bombing of the north; in fact, we advocate continued protection of our ground troops by bombing in the south and the demilitarized zone, which has been violated by Hanoi.

That policy should be advocated because bombing of the north has not only failed to destroy the capacity of Hanoi, with the assistance of Russia and China, to equip its men in the south, but also it has had no perceptible effect on the infiltration. There are about as many troops going into South Vietnam as Ho Chi Minh wants to send there. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator is correct. Infiltration of VC forces from North Vietnam into the south has not been stopped by our incessant bombing. They are infiltrating all the time across the demarcation line, which the Geneva Accords of 1954 specifically stated was a temporary demarcation line, until the elections promised for 1956 could be held. We were instrumental, through our then Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and our CIA in having those elections called off.

This is an American war which we are waging, a war in the swamps and jungles of Vietnam, the worst place in the world for Americans to wage a war. Furthermore, the so-called friendly forces of South Vietnam are much too friendly. They do very little fighting but very much deserting. Unfortunately, we have been fighting an American war which has broadened and expanded, although there is more evidence now than even before the election of September 3 that the Saigon regime represents a minority group and is definitely not a viable government.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his intervention.

Mr. President, as the editorial points out:

> No one can guarantee that stopping the bombing will produce negotiations. There would be, as Mr. Thant has freely conceded, a "limited risk" in any such American initiative. But the United States is big enough to venture such a risk. And the risk is worth taking, especially in view of the limited effectiveness of the bombing, as acknowledged by the Secretary of Defense, and in light of the alternative risks involved in continued escalation of the war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, the editorial which was published in the New York Times today.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if my friend from Ohio would not think it might be worth speculating whether the 17th parallel is any more of a demarcation line between two nations than the Mason-Dixon Line was in our country at the time of the Civil War.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Of course, it is not. Historically there never was a North Vietnam or a South Vietnam. I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania on the fine statement he has made.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Ohio.

EXHIBIT 1

CONSENSUS ON THE BOMBING

On the eve of the opening of the current session of the United Nations General Assembly, Secretary General U Thant again urged that the United States stop bombing North Vietnam as an essential first step toward peace. Mr. Thant said he was "convinced" that if the bombing ended unconditionally, peace talks could begin in three or four weeks.

Concurrently, Agence France-Presse reported from Hanoi that "reliable sources" had indicated talks could begin between Hanoi and Washington within three or four weeks of a bombing halt.

The appeal for a bombing halt was taken up in the General Assembly Wednesday by Canada, one of America's closest friends and a nation that has had recent diplomatic contact with North Vietnam.

"There is not the slightest doubt in my mind," Canadian External Affairs Minister Paul Martin said, "that the first step in [the direction of talks] will involve the question of the bombing of North Vietnam. It seems clear that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped. This is a matter of first priority if we are to start the process of de-escalation and open the door of the conference room."

Canada's plea has been echoed at this session of the United Nations so far in speeches by the representatives of Denmark, Sweden, France, Somalia, Indonesia and Kenya. Many other delegates, friends as well as opponents of American policy, have privately voiced similar views. This mounting international consensus favoring a U.S. initiative for peace through a bombing halt has its counterpart at home. An increasing number of Senators and Congressmen are calling for such a step, responding to the groundswell of public sentiment for an end to the war.

No one can guarantee that stopping the bombing will produce negotiations. There would be, as Mr. Thant has freely conceded, a "limited risk" in any such American initiative. But the United States is big enough to venture such a risk. And the risk is worth taking, especially in view of the limited effectiveness of the bombing, as acknowledged by the Secretary of Defense, and in light of the alternative risks involved in continued escalation of the war.

The Administration has repeatedly protested its desire for peace. Now is the time to prove this intention by heeding the advice of close friends and the wider world community. As Danish Premier Jens Otto Krag observed the other day: "He who takes the decisive step by which to bring the fighting to an end, to get negotiations started, and to insure durable peace in Southeast Asia will inscribe his name in the books of history."

REQUEST FOR CORRECTION OF NOTICES TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] have filed notices of their intention to move to suspend the rule for the purpose of proposing amendments to H.R. 11456 and H.R. 11641, respectively.

I ask unanimous consent that the notices they have filed be corrected to show the proper identification of pages and lines.

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

Mr. CLARK. 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.

HOUSING PROBLEMS AT FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, earlier this week, when the Senate was considering the military construction bill, I entered into discussion and colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill, in regard to the elimination of housing units at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans., is the home and location of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College of the United States. I stated at that time I was confident that housing was badly needed, and that it was regrettable the subcommittee had stricken out the housing units. There could be no question as to the need for additional housing in view of doubling the enrollment for this school year.

Since that time, I have received a letter from Maj. Gen. Michael S. Davison, the commandant at Fort Leavenworth Staff College. It is dated September 27, and I read it into the RECORD:

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: In response to press inquiries concerning the action of the Senate Armed Services Committee in deleting 400 sets of quarters programed for Fort Leavenworth, I believed it necessary to make a news release concerning our student housing problems. A copy of that release is attached for your information.

This morning's issue of the Kansas City Times carried an editorial concerning our need for housing at Fort Leavenworth. A copy of this is also attached for your information.

On behalf of the officers, men and their families stationed at Fort Leavenworth, I wish to express our appreciation for your warm understanding and support.

Sincerely yours.

In this news release, it states in part:

Living in off-post civilian housing as far away as 45 miles from Ft. Leavenworth are 526 student officers in the 1967–68 class at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College.

Three hundred seventy-six live in the Leavenworth and Lansing area, 12 in small local communities, 1 in Olathe, 54 in the Kansas City, Kans., area including Wyandotte and Johnson counties; 62 in the Kansas City, Mo., area including Platte and Clay counties; 15 in Atchison and 6 in Lawrence, Kans.

Commuting distance for those in the Lawrence area is 90 miles a day and for those in the Kansas City area, 50 miles.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire news release printed in the RECORD, as well as the editorial, which was published in the Kansas City Times on September 27, entitled "Surely We Can Afford To House Our Soldiers."

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

HOUSING

FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS., September 26.—Living in off-post civilian housing as far away as 45 miles from Ft. Leavenworth are 526 student officers in the 1967–68 class at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College.

Three hundred seventy-six live in the Leavenworth and Lansing area, 12 in small local communities, 1 in Olathe, 54 in the Kansas City, Kans., area including Wyandotte and Johnson counties; 62 in the Kansas City, Mo., area including Platte and Clay counties; 15 in Atchison and 6 in Lawrence, Kans.

Commuting distance for those in the Lawrence area is 90 miles a day and for those in the Kansas City area, 50 miles.

Among these 526 student officers, housing costs for rent and utilities run as high as $285 per month paid by a student officer with four children. The average costs paid for rent and utilities by student officers is $200 per month.

(A major with a family receives $145 per month to cover housing costs, including utilities, when government housing is not furnished. Student families of the college class this year have an average of four children per family.)

Only 60 of these 526 students are living in housing which meets the Department of Defense adequacy criteria.

The principal factor in determining adequacy is the total cost of rent and utilities. Other criteria are size and quality of the house and commuting distance.

Living in family quarters on-post are 583 students—475 in adequate quarters and 108 in inadequate quarters. The inadequate quarters are World War II barracks, designed for 10-year life, which were converted to family quarters.

Of the 1247 U.S. students in the 1967–68 class, a total of 1171 needed family housing; the remainder are bachelors. Of the 97 allied student officers, 47 needed off-post family housing.

The requirement for additional housing at Ft. Leavenworth was caused by a change in the composition of the student body rather than an increase in its size. For over a decade the college has graduated about 1400 resident students a year—half in a course of 10 months duration and half in two shorter courses of 18 weeks each.

As a result of a survey of the Army's educational system made in the spring of 1965, the college was reorganized to consolidate these three courses into one 10-month course. The students in the 10-month course bring their families with them (those in the short course did not), thus doubling the requirement for family housing.

This consolidation of courses is not related to the Vietnamese situation. The number of resident students to be graduated now is approximately the same as the number graduated in previous years and reflects the long-term needs of the Army.

The long-range housing program figure set by the U.S. Continental Army Command is 2405 sets of family quarters for officers and enlisted men at Ft. Leavenworth.

The fort has 1245 on-post adequate quarters. Construction of an additional 50 has been approved. Presently available in the local communities are 295 off-post houses determined adequate by DOD criteria.

Should Congress later approve the 400 housing units for Ft. Leavenworth, the fort

would still have a requirement for 531 sets of adequate family quarters in the local civilian community.

[From the Kansas City Times, Sept. 27, 1967]

SURELY WE CAN AFFORD TO HOUSE OUR SOLDIERS

The Senate armed services committee's refusal to authorize funds for construction of 400 on-post family housing units at Ft. Leavenworth is more than a little baffling. The House already had authorized $8,800,000 in construction at the fort, and surely there can be no question of a housing need. The figures speak plainly.

At the moment there are 1,344 U.S. and allied officers on the post to attend the 10-month Command and General Staff officers' course. The 97 Allied officers are suitably housed, but among the married U.S. officers the situation is acute. Because of the quarters crisis, some left their families behind. Of the 1,171 requiring family housing, 583 live on the post. More than 100 are in inadequate quarters—temporary World War II troop barracks, converted into 4-apartment dwellings.

Seventy-four officers and their families are quartered in government-leased housing in the Leavenworth area and in Wyandotte County. But more than 500 have had to look for private rental property off the post. Many are in the Leavenworth-Lansing vicinity, but nearly 120 live in Greater Kansas City and others must commute from communities as far away as Olathe and Lawrence. There is an obvious cost in time that officers facing four to six hours of homework a night can ill afford.

There is also a dollar cost. Most of the students are majors, drawing a quarters allowance of $145 monthly. Surveys have shown the average of off-post house and apartment rentals to be $200, to which must be added the extra expense of commuting—as much as 90 miles a day round-trip.

Part of the requested housing would have been for staff and faculty at the college, which has increased along with the rising student load. Among Ft. Leavenworth garrison personnel, not associated with the college, there is a 60- to 90-day wait for on-post housing for married officers and enlisted men.

The military profession has its special hazards and inconveniences, some of which are unavoidable. But it is one thing for servicemen to be separated from their families while they are away fighting a war. It is quite another for them to be separated, or shoddily housed, simply because of the unwillingness of a congressional committee to look squarely at the facts.

As House and Senate conferees set about resolving the differences between the two pieces of legislation, we hope the Ft. Leavenworth construction request will come in for serious reconsideration. The outstanding officers who make up the faculty and student body of the Command and General Staff college are not there for a lark. It is an essential part of the national military preparedness program. The country, and Congress, have an obligation to provide these men and their families with a decent place to live.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am now advised in conference between the House and Senate, that the conferees have agreed to include 100 housing units at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

I deeply appreciate that, and while I am confident that it will be helpful, in next year's military construction bill, we shall have to request additional units in view of the expansion of the staff college, which has doubled its number of students this year. Normally, the students average around 700. This year, it is approximately 1,400 officers and men from our own military services and foreign countries. The country and the Congress have an obligation to see that our military personnel are properly housed.

"SNOOPING" PURSUANT TO COURT ORDER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "Snooping" was published in the Washington Post of yesterday, September 28, 1967.

Mr. President, the editorial is a deserving criticism of the action taken by the Judicial Conference of the United States in endorsing legislation that would permit Federal and State investigators to tap telephones and eavesdrop electronically under court orders, as though court orders gave any guarantee as to the rights of free men under our Constitution.

In my opinion, every judge who endorsed the action was guilty of prejudgment of the basic juridical questions, some involving constitutional law and rights.

I think every one of the judges sullied his judicial robe. Certainly every one of them needs to attend a refresher course in the basic constitutional rights of privacy to which free men and women are entitled.

The snooping they seek to authorize is not cleansed one whit when it is done by judges instead of by policemen. It is the snooping that is evil. It is the invasion of the precious constitutional right of privacy that is evil. It is the protection of the presumption of innocence that is essential.

I am saddened to think that any judge wearing the robe either of a State or a Federal court would be a party to this kind of political action, for that is what it is, and he became guilty when he went along with the endorsement of this "legislation" that the Judicial Conference brought forth.

The Federal judges involved apparently think they are above checks by the people. Maybe the time has come to check them with ballots, too. Perhaps unchecked life tenure positions on the courts of this land need to be checked by the people through their ballots, by requiring that judges be elected.

If the judiciary of this country becomes involved in seeking to amend the Constitution by this kind of judicial action, I am one Senator who will advocate taking away from the judiciary life tenure on the bench. We shall have to check judges, as well as Senators, Representatives, and Presidents if we want to preserve our basic constitutional guarantees.

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

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

SNOOPING

The Judicial Conference of the United States has voted to endorse legislation that would permit Federal and state investigators to tap telephones and eavesdrop electronically under court order. With the highest respect for the authority of the Conference, we offer an opposition to its view. The social costs of such intrusion into privacy would, in our judgment, heavily outweigh the gains to law enforcement.

The Conference gave its approval to pending eavesdropping legislation with the proviso that it be amended to meet the restrictions laid down in last June's Supreme Court decision in the *Berger* case. In that case, the Court struck down as constitutionally invalid a New York statute authorizing eavesdropping under court order because it failed to meet the Fourth Amendment requirement of a reasonable search—that is, that it particularly describe "the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized."

The truth is, we think, that this requirement cannot be met by any court order authorizing eavesdropping. As Mr. Justice Black observed in a dissenting opinion in the *Berger* case, the Court's decision "makes constitutional eavesdropping improbable."

It is a fallacy to suppose that a court order can circumscribe or control eavesdropping in the way that a warrant can limit an ordinary search. When a telephone is tapped or a room is bugged, the privacy of everyone using the telephone or the room is invaded, whether or not he is under suspicion of criminal conduct. The conversation of anyone calling the telephone or entering the room is recorded, whether or not it is related to a crime under investigation. Intimacies of every sort—social, business, conjugal—may thus be divulged to the eavesdroppers.

More serious, perhaps, than the eavesdropping itself is the pall which fear of it may put upon normal conversation. The most law-abiding men and women have things to say to each other which they want to say in confidence. Any official intrusion into such privacy is, as Lord Camden put it two centuries ago, "subversive of all the comforts of society." People who fear that government agents may be covertly listening to all that they say are not free people. They speak under constraint. And where this fear is endemic, freedom of communication is a casualty.

The community must choose, as is so often the case, between the claims of freedom and the claims of safety. Acknowledging that bugging and tapping may give the police some assistance in combatting organized crime—or may at any rate make it necessary for criminals to be extremely circumspect in communicating with each other—the question is whether the inhibition on lawful conversation is worth the cost. The choice is between facilitating the work of the police and facilitating free communication. Men cannot be free if they live in fear of official surveillance. "It is more than desirable, it is necessary, that criminals be detected and prosecuted as vigorously as possible. It is more necessary," as President Roosevelt put it, "that citizens of a democracy be protected in their rights of privacy from unwarranted snooping."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LONG OF LOUISIANA BEFORE THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, during the early months of this year, sometime in February, I addressed the Economic Club of New York, setting forth my views with regard to the Nation's monetary and fiscal problems.

That was roughly 8 months ago and, with the passage of time, some of the suggestions which I made then have been heeded by those in the executive branch of the Government. I was at

variance in some instances with the policy of the administration.

In the belief that Senators might find it interesting to read my remarks at this date, I ask unanimous consent to have my speech printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. President and Members of the Economic Club of New York; while I am not familiar with all of your impressive history, I feel a deep sense of kinship to your group, dating back to the fall of 1962 when the late President John F. Kennedy was your speaker.

On that occasion he described his attitude toward our nation's tax laws. He said that they were antiquated, designed to meet the problems of an earlier day, that they should be modified to meet the problems of his day and the challenge of the future.

At that time our much-beloved friend, the late Harry F. Byrd was chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance. From the first moment I saw the John Kennedy speech, I knew, as did everyone else, that the Kennedy proposal for a major tax reduction, which necessarily involved a substantial federal deficit for at least two years, could not and would not meet with the approval of that consistent, dedicated conservative who learned his economics before John Kennedy was born on this earth, and who had not conformed to the thinking of the New Deal of 1933 or the Fair Deal of 1948, much less the New Frontier. It was my guess that Robert Kerr of Oklahoma, the ranking member of the Committee on Finance, would speak for the Kennedy Administration if and when the idea that John Kennedy outlined before you on that occasion should come to a vote in the Senate. The thought never occurred to me that, before this imaginative suggestion could come to a vote in the Senate, Allen Frear would have been defeated and that Bob Kerr and John Kennedy would have passed on to meet their reward, and that I, the number four Democrat on the committee at the time of the speech, would be the committee spokesman for the largest revenue measure in the Nation's history—the first major bill to be enacted under President Johnson.

The bill which emerged from John Kennedy's speech to you on that occasion involved a reduction of Federal taxes by more than 14 billion dollars. It provided great reductions in personal income taxes, to increase demand and consumption of new production. It provided major reductions in corporation income taxes. It provided incentives for new investments. When the bill came to a final vote, I pointed out that this nation was enjoying the longest continued prosperity in its history. At that point the nation had enjoyed more than 45 months of continued increases in production, income and employment. It was my argument, and that of the Administration, that this bill, the Revenue Act of 1964, would mean a continued increase in production, income, and employment for as far into the future as any of us were then privileged to see. The events that have transpired since that date are worthy of study in connection with the predictions which we made at the time. Our predictions for employment and production were safely within the events that have transpired. Our prediction for national growth was vindicated.

The only prediction on which we fell short was that we would have by now achieved a balanced budget. With regard to the budget, it is fair to submit that, had this nation not elected to make an expensive and determined sacrifice to prevent a communist takeover in Southeast Asia, we could easily have had a balanced budget for last year and for this year.

While the national debt has increased in terms of dollars, it has declined in terms of the ability of our people to pay. For example, in 1962 the federal debt was 142% of our gross national product. In 1966 it was less than 43% of our gross national product.

Furthermore, when we talk about our national debt, it is appropriate that we make a distinction between our gross national debt and our net national debt. Of the national debt which we are required to report to the American people, approximately 113 billion dollars of that figure is money that the federal government owes to the federal government.

When I speak of money that the federal government owes to itself, I am thinking of the government bonds and funds held by the Federal Reserve Board and other agencies of the federal government. Included in that figure would be government-held trust funds, such as the social security fund of 22 billion dollars plus.

Some of my more conservative-thinking friends challenge my view that a government-held trust fund in the last analysis is money which the federal government owes to the federal government.

If I might use the social security fund as an example, we have contingent liabilities running into hundreds of billions of dollars. Yet, insofar as the federal government holds money in the social security trust fund, it is that much ahead in meeting its obligations. Other trust funds financed by federal taxes and appropriations appear to me to fall in the same category. Therefore, when I speak of the national debt of 329 billion dollars, I am tempted to point out that 113 billion dollars of this debt is money that the federal government owes to the federal government and that debt which the federal government owes to the public is actually 217 billion dollars.

Then when we relate our national debt to our gross national production, we find that our net federal debt in 1945 was approximately 116% of our gross national product, and today it is approximately 28% of our gross national product. It is comforting to note that the tangible assets held by the federal government in terms of property, real and personal, exceed our national debt in value without reference to the nation's greatest financial asset, its ability to tax the income and the property of its citizens.

With the combination of the increases in our population and production, together with the inflation that we experienced after World War II, our per capita federal debt has declined in terms of 1966 dollars from $3,557 to $1,641—less than half of what it was 22 years ago.

Therefore, I am inclined to say when businessmen talk to me about the national debt, "Look who's talking." Measured by a relative standard, our debt is less than half what it was while yours has increased by anywhere from 50% to 200% when measured by the same standard.

Of course, this is not a fair comparison, because each decision to increase the amount of debt outstanding involves a different set of problems. Inasmuch as we have an enormous public and private debt, exceeding 1 trillion, 500 billion dollars, we would do well to recognize that the growth of our economy, the expansion of our assets, the increase in the number of jobs, as well as the increase in the pay which those jobs earn, have been made possible during the past 26 years by a steady increase in the public and private debt of the United States, the overwhelming bulk of that increase being in the private sector. So long as our economy continues to grow in any way that is acceptable to any man here tonight, the total figure of public and private debt outstanding will continue to grow. It is well for us to recognize that most of this debt was incurred for good reason, that it was soundly based, that it has created a credit without which the growth of our economy could hardly have occurred.

It stands to reason that we can carry on indefinitely with continued prosperity, or even as we have done for the past 6 years, so long as the debt which we owe is soundly based. The soundness of our debt is greater because we have a number of government programs to assure that Americans stand together in guaranteeing the payment of most of it.

Perhaps I am overly optimistic about the future, but I am satisfied that, if we continue the kind of economic approach that we have been pursuing in recent years, nothing can destroy the strength and greatness of our nation, other than a devastating war beyond anything that we have ever witnessed.

Such a war we constantly pray and strive to avoid.

Having recognized the existence of a large public and private debt, I would like to make it clear that this Senator for one favors the lowest practical level of interest rates, in order that the burden of carrying our debts may be as light as possible. In the last analysis, the interest cost of carrying our debts falls on the consumer and on the taxpayer. While it is true that corporations pay large amounts of interest, it is a cost of doing business and, so long as competition will permit, they will pass it along to their customer in the price of the product.

Forthrightness compels me to express my difference of opinion with the Federal Reserve Board.

There is much misunderstanding about the degree of independence which the Federal Reserve Board should possess. The board is not a creature of the executive branch. If a majority of the board desires to do so, it may exercise a judgment contrary to the views of the executive branch of the government. If anyone has ever contended that the board is independent of the Congress, it has never come to my attention.

Thirteen months ago the Federal Reserve Board, by a majority of one vote, decided to embark upon a monetary program against the advice of the executive and without the concurrence of the Congress.

Having protested about the matter, President Johnson then bowed to what he seemed to regard as inevitable and undertook to adjust his policies accordingly. Since that date, some members of that board have undertaken to suggest that we in Congress should adjust this nation's tax laws to conform to economic policies decided by this small group which meets in an imposing building on Constitution Avenue. It has been suggested that some of us in the Congress should sit down with members who can speak for the Federal Reserve Board and agree to a given tax policy to conform to the judgment of a majority of the Federal Reserve Board.

Lest it be misunderstood in any source, I want to make it crystal clear that, as far as this Senator is concerned, the Federal Reserve Board is a creature of the Congress; they are exercising powers which belong to us. We are elected to represent 190 million people of the United States, as is the President. Whenever the Congress and the President can agree upon fiscal and monetary policy, it is the duty of the Federal Reserve to modify its policies to come into accord with us, not the other way around.

The tight-money, high-interest-rate policy of the Federal Reserve Board for the past 13 months has been very unpopular with the overwhelming majority of the population of this nation. Those policies have imposed an almost disastrous depression in the housing industry. Those policies have increased the cost of government. They have had a retarding effect upon the growth of our economy. Those policies had much to do with our decision to suspend the investment

credit. From the point of view of most of us, we rejoice that the Federal Reserve is now retreating from that policy as some of us have been advocating it should do.

Now it has been suggested by the President that Congress should increase taxes, which would further retard an economy which at this moment is showing signs of becoming sluggish, with the suggestion that, if we do so, the Federal Reserve would further ease its tight grip on the nation's money supply.

We are willing to consider the President's suggestion on some other basis. At the moment there is no compelling economic case for the proposed tax increase. Few economists are attempting to make any such case.

The request for tax increase is based on the assumption that a failure to increase taxes will lead to a large federal deficit. It is argued that, while men fight and die on the field of battle, it is a small enough sacrifice for Americans to pay more taxes. Yet, a tax increase of 10 times the size recommended by the President would still not begin to equate the sacrifice of our courageous young men fighting and dying in the swamps and jungles of Vietnam, with Americans who are enjoying income and prosperity greater than they have ever known.

It has not yet been demonstrated that large reductions cannot be made, nor that expenditures cannot be postponed, until some later date. Nor has it been demonstrated that a number of new programs which the President is recommending even now might not better be deferred than to increase the taxes on the American people.

The Congress is not disposed to deny the best weapons, the best food, and every benefit of medical science to our fighting men. The Congress *is* disposed to make reductions in new domestic programs and even in old domestic programs before it votes another tax increase.

As an example of a new domestic program that can be cut, I would point to the poverty program, which is poorly and inefficiently managed. Many of the activities of that program are of very doubtful value. Most Americans would support a poverty program, or any part of it, so long as they are getting 70 cents or even 50 cents return for their investment. They will not in conscience support any part of such a program which yields them less than 10% return on the dollar, and some parts of that program appear to be yielding an even negative return.

In peacetime, the poverty program could cost several billion dollars annually. But, with the pressure of a war on our hands, it is well that this program be confined to those areas where it has definitely proved its value and that it serve more in the nature of an experimental pilot program to prove the merit or demerit of new ideas before we attempt to expand it into a multi-billion dollar undertaking.

As an example of an old program that can be cut, I would point to the policy whereby this nation continues to maintain approximately 1 million Americans at taxpayers' expense on European soil. This matter was studied by the Democratic Policy Committee. That committee of fifteen Senators included some of the most outstanding members of the Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, Appropriations, and several other major committees in the Congress. It included some of the most trusted friends of the President. Having discussed this matter with the Secretary of State, the Ambassador to the West German Republic, and the other able spokesmen suggested by the Administration, this group, composed of Democratic leaders in the Senate, signed a unanimous proposal that the number of troops and dependents in Europe should be drastically reduced.

Thus far, our suggestion has met with nothing more than a few additional flimsy and weak reasons for continuing a program which no longer makes sense long after the facts of life which dictated it have changed drastically, compelling a different answer.

One of the facts of life which has changed since the troops for Europe proposal was voted in 1949, my first year in the Senate, has been that this program, along with other grants—or, to use a better word, gift-programs—have so depleted our supply of gold that this nation is finding it necessary to plead with former beneficiaries of our largesse not to call upon us to pay in the only recognized international currency, gold, the money which we owe to them. In replying, these nations, which we have aided in the past are exercising their proper right to insist upon this nation doing things which we would not otherwise do in the absence of our monetary distress. Of all the items which would relieve this nation's difficulties with its balance of payments, none would do as much good or make as much sense as a reduction, a major reduction, of American troop strength in Europe.

This nation's contribution to the defense effort is roughly 10% of our national product. Our European allies are making a contribution which is about 5% or less of their national product. Those nations and Japan are the most prosperous nations on earth, except for the United States. If they are not so concerned about the threat of aggressive communism that they will not make a sacrifice to compare with our own, then we have no business and no proper right bleeding this nation white economically until America becomes an international beggar to do for our friends things which they are well able to do for themselves.

The strongest single reason for continuing the existing level of American troop strength in Europe from the viewpoint of a European is the bountiful blessing of the money that this policy pours into their domestic economy. While some of us may not begrudge this blessing to the economy of Europe, we can no longer afford it.

Another good argument for a continuation of this situation has been that the Soviet Union might be willing to agree to withdraw some of its troops from Eastern Europe if we withdraw some American troops strength. But, why should the communist world wish to arrive at any such arrangement? The maintenance of a million Americans on European soil is the largest reduceable item of those factors that are making the leader of world capitalism an international pauper. Any such program which brings us to our knees before first one lesser power and then another serves the purpose of international communism, in that it undermines and destroys the ability of the leader of the capitalistic world to continue to lead.

It is my fervent hope that this nation may soon reach an honorable termination of hostilities in Vietnam. When we are able to do that, we should embark immediately upon a number of policies which the future and prosperity of our nation would require. Meanwhile we should be planning for them so that they could be put into effect immediately. The investment tax credit should be restored, if indeed it has not been restored before that time. We should make up for lost time in providing adequate highways and eliminating slums, rebuilding the center of our great cities, beautifying our countryside, eliminating pollution from water and air.

At the first possible moment, we should start rebuilding our American Merchant Marine, to provide this nation with the strength on the seas and in world trade which that arm of our national policy once possessed. The neglect of our Merchant Marine has been so tragic and so lacking in understanding of the over-all problem that the present trend would make this nation impotent to carry its strength around the world to meet emergencies. Russia is launching a dozen new merchant ships for every time this nation launches one. To meet this problem and to help with our balance-of-payments problem in the future, I will introduce a bill next week to place a small tax on all cargo entering and leaving this country, and directing the receipts from that tax to the reestablishment of the American Merchant Marine to its proper position among maritime powers.

In other trade programs, the combination of taxes, tariffs, and quotas has not been successful in maintaining American industry at the desired level. Our trade policies need a thorough new look and some hard-headed American businessmen are needed to devote a great deal of independent thought and study to the over-all program. This nation in its trade and aid programs has played the part of an Andy Gump until it is on the verge of becoming an international Barney Google. Personnel that have manned the international giveaway programs for a great number of years are poorly equipped to change costumes and play the opposite role for the future even if their intellectual makeup could be so transformed.

This next year we will be passing additional trade legislation. The tendency in recent years has been to reduce American tariff protection while foreign countries have given little if anything in return, other than to agree to continue their existing practices, without making trade more onerous for us than it had been in the past. The reduction in levels of American tariffs has brought an increase in imports. The program has not brought us a corresponding increase in our exports. The result is that our favorable balance of trade is being reduced to the vanishing point.

When our unfavorable balance of tourist trade is added to the scales, together with our foreign aid program, troops for Europe, and the war in Vietnam, we find ourselves in a serious deficit position which is steadily growing worse. It cannot be corrected entirely while the Vietnam war continues, but we must start improving the situation so that it can be corrected when the Vietnam war is over.

This nation has it well within its power to correct all of these things which give an unfavorable balance of payments and move toward an unfavorable balance of trade. We can do it by expanding our Merchant Marine, by providing more rather than less protection for any American industry that is threatened, by insisting upon a quid pro quo from those countries which are enjoying favors from Uncle Sam.

The most imperative item is that we must stop American negotiators from committing this nation to international agreements which bind our hands and prevent us from using those tools which could save us in the future.

Lest someone be confused that I have expressed some opinions at variance with the Johnson Administration, I believe it well to make it clear that I am elected to represent the State of Louisiana and its three million people. Under our Federal system it was intended that there be room for differences of opinion. That is one of the reasons we have so many Congressmen and Senators. The fact that a man is chosen by his colleagues to be a part of their leadership does not reduce for one moment his duty to his nation, to the people who elect him, and to his convictions. As a part of the leadership, he has the duty to go an extra mile in bringing men of good will together to support policies and agree on decisions which are good for this country. So long as he remains a part of the legislative branch, he does not relinquish his duty to speak for what he believes.

This great and powerful nation holds its

place in the world in spite of many mistakes, disasters and adversities with which its people have been confronted. It holds its place foremost among free people because we have realized our mistakes in time and with the guidance of a merciful Lord we have been able to correct our mistakes and find the right course to justice, wealth, and leadership. From time to time we would do well to rejoice in our good fortune. Having done so, we should then rededicate ourselves to the task ahead and accept whatever danger or sacrifice may be necessary to achieve it.

THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY—THE NATION'S WHIPPING BOY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the Government seems once more determined to make a whipping boy of the country's tobacco industry.

Latest evidence of that is the Federal Communications Commission's effort to apply the so-called fairness doctrine to the smoking question, so that both sides of the story can be told.

That being the case, fairness seems to require that the basis for the Government's antismoking campaign be subjected to an objective analysis, and Columnist James Kilpatrick, a highly respected and competent newsman, seems to have done an excellent job of that in his report entitled "Antismoking Figures Look Flimsy," published in the Washington Star of September 27, 1967.

Because the article so well puts the case into perspective, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ANTISMOKING FIGURES LOOK FLIMSY

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

"Get the facts!" said the authoritative voice on the boob tube. "A quarter of a million extra heart conditions. A million cases of bronchitis and emphysema. Eleven million cases of long-term illness. Write for your free copy of 'Smoking and Illness.'"

This free government leaflet, if you're curious, purports to "present the highlights" of a study released in May by the Public Health Service, "Cigarette Smoking and Health Characteristics." If the really curious viewer pursues the matter, and also obtains a copy of this parent study, he may discover at first hand what is meant by a credibility gap.

In plain words, both the free leaflet and the larger study on which it is based, in terms of the impression they seek deliberately to convey, are frauds. Prevaricators, it is said, are divided among three classes—liars, damn liars, and those who misuse statistics. By picking and choosing among some figures that are shaky to begin with, by glossing over necessary qualifications, and by mixing reasoned inference with pure surmise, the authors of these publications have perpetrated a shabby piece of propaganda.

The PHS study, conducted over 52 weeks in 1964–65, was intended to discover the relationship, if any, between smoking and a variety of chronic and acute illnesses. The raw figures were derived from interviews in a random sample of 42,000 households.

So far, so good. But the key figures, on which all the conclusions are based, are the figures covering smoking habits. How many cigarettes per day? Did the respondent ever smoke? If so, how many cigarettes did he smoke? What was his heaviest rate of smoking? If these figures are not solid, the whole study begins to fall apart. And the astounding fact, glossed over in the report, is that "data on 60 percent of the males who had ever smoked were obtained from other persons." The interviewers simply accepted answers from whoever happened to be at home at the time.

This is a study of smoking and "illness." To get the figures, the interviewers presented a list of chronic and acute conditions, and asked the householder to check appropriate boxes. Bronchitis, sinusitis, upper respiratory infection, emphysema, "heart trouble," "liver trouble," "chronic nervous trouble," "hypertension without heart involvement." The typical layman may be able to answer some of these questions generally; it is unbelievable that he could answer them precisely; but in this study the diagnoses of any 19-year-old who happened to be at home are given the impressive weight, down to two decimal places, of laboratory findings.

The authors of this study kept tripping over the inadequacy of their own data. They were thus reduced to guessing: "It could well be that . . . Had data been available, it might have been found that . . . This could indicate that . . . This could be affected by . . . This could result from . . ." In a moment of candor, they confess the truth: Their figures do not establish any cause-and-effect relationship between smoking and illness.

Still, their job was to leave precisely that impression—that cigarette smoking does result in illness and lost time. So they carefully bear down on the horrendous figures dealing with men who smoke more than two packs a day. Such smokers are in a small minority. Here they are made to bulk large. It is the pick-and-choose technique.

Two can play that game. With the same validity, on the basis of the PHS statistics, a critic can assure you that pack-a-day smokers spend fewer days in bed than persons who have never smoked; that the pack-a-day man is likely to have less hypertension, less arthritis, and better hearing than the never-smoked man. Amazingly, men who are presently smoking even have a lower incidence of upper respiratory conditions than persons who have never smoked. And believe it if you will, from Table 21 of the PHS report: Heavy-smokers over 65—the two-pack-a-day volcanoes—spend 8.5 days sick in bed each year, while their counterparts, men over 65 who never have smoked at all, are sick in bed nearly two weeks. What do you make of that?

Bosh! The figures are flimsy and the conclusions cannot rise above them. Caution, one would say to the curious TV viewer: Relying upon these statistics may result in your being bamboozled.

THE BOOM IN EDUCATION

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, about 6 million young Americans are studying this year at our colleges and universities. This is nearly twice as many college and university students as there were 10 years ago, and almost three times as many as there were 20 years ago. The figures are ample proof that higher education in this country is a boom industry.

An editorial published recently by the Charlottesville Daily Progress suggests one very good reason for the boom. Americans believe in the value of higher education, and they support it. The editorial points out that "nowhere have Americans undertaken a commitment as willingly and enthusiastically as the one they have made to themselves and their children in the field of higher education."

As a nation, we are spending $20 billion a year for the higher education of these 6 million students. I think it is most significant that half of this $20 billion is coming from private sources. Five billion is being provided by State legislatures. The Federal Government is allocating the remaining $5 billion.

The Daily Progress warns, however, that Federal spending may multiply more than three times within the next decade as private and State sources reach their limit. It also observes that "nearly universal higher education is a necessity if the Nation is to remain a leader in a shrinking world run by technology."

Mr. President, this is a timely warning. It implies that an even greater commitment by Americans to the support of higher education will be necessary in the 10 years just ahead. I certainly hope we will be able to maintain a balance among private, State, and Federal sources of support, and I am confident that Americans will respond to the needs as they have responded in the past 20 years. I ask unanimous consent that the Daily Progress editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

EDUCATION A BOOM INDUSTRY

Never in the course of human events have so many spent so much to educate so many.

Higher education—education beyond high school—now ranks as a major growth industry. It is a boom industry, with college enrollments rising faster than population, investment in college and university facilities and equipment expanding, the ranks of teachers, administrators, clerical and custodial personnel burgeoning—and tuition costs soaring.

No end to the boom is in sight.

Today, six million young Americans are enrolled in institutions of higher education, about two-thirds in public and one-third in private schools. This is nearly twice as many as 10 years ago and nearly three times as many as 20 years ago.

The number can only go on multiplying as the belief takes hold that a college education is not the privilege of a minority but the right of everyone capable of benefiting from it—indeed that nearly universal higher education is a necessity if the nation is to remain a leader in a shrinking world run by technology.

Yet few people realize that Americans are collectively spending $20 billion a year educating these six million students Juan T. Trippe chairman of Pan American World Airways recently pointed out.

By contrast he said, England, with a quarter of the U.S. population, has but a 30th as many collegians—200,000—and spends but a 28th as much on their education—$700 million.

Fully half this $20 billion comes from private sources—endowments, tuition, alumni contributions, corporate gifts and foundation grants.

Another $5 billion is allocated by state legislatures.

Federal financial support makes up the balance reaching a new high $5 billion last year—25 times more than it was after World War II when federal participation in higher education began.

The outlook is for federal spending to more than triple in the coming decade as private and state sources reach their limit.

We talk a lot about "commitments" these days. We have commitments to our allies, commitments to South Vietnam, commitments to land on the moon, commitments to elevate the impoverished and discriminated-against in our own land.

But nowhere have Americans undertaken a commitment as willingly and enthusiastically as the one they have made to themselves and their children in the field of higher education.

THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS: ITS FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of the important private organizations contributing immensely valuable assistance to underdeveloped countries is the International Executive Service Corps. Since its inauguration on June 14, 1964, in a launching which included a White House ceremony some of us in this body attended, it has quietly and very soundly gone about the business of providing managerial aid to mainly private businesses in other countries. The American know-how provided by the volunteers whom the IESC has so carefully selected is helping to fill a great need.

One of the clearest, and certainly from many standpoints one of the most official, statements of its evolvement and principles, its program and achievement, was made some months ago at an international management congress, sponsored by the Conseil International pour l'Organisation Scientifique—CIOS—by Mr. States Mead, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank. Mr. Mead was one who worked closely toward the formation of the IESC and has since been a member of its Board and Executive Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that his report to the CIOS meeting, held at Rotterdam, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[The CIOS XIV Congress, Rotterdam, Sept. 20, 1966]

THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS

(By States M. Mead)

In September 1963 at the CIOS XIII International Management Congress in New York, Mr. David Rockefeller, President of the Chase Manhattan Bank, delivered the keynote address on the subject of "Managerial Work and Human Progress". In that address Mr. Rockefeller proposed the creation of a "Managerial Task Force of Free Enterprise", to be made up of businessmen-volunteers from the advanced nations who would serve as advisers or consultants to enterprises in the emerging nations in order to assist the growth of strong and free economies.

The proposal won a warm response, from both the immediate audience and others in both government and private circles. However, as we all know, much lies between ideas or words, on the one hand, and action and accomplishment, on the other hand. It is for that reason that I am both delighted and privileged to be able to report, just three years after Mr. Rockefeller's address, that the idea has borne fruit. Thanks to the attention and efforts of a number of responsible business and government leaders following the CIOS XIII Congress the International Executive Service Corps has been brought into existence, and is a going concern. To date, it has accepted nearly 300 individual projects in 33 countries of the developing nations and has completed one-third of them. It has assembled a remarkable roster of experienced American executives available for such assignment. And in the projects thus far completed, the IESC has proved that the concepts on which it was developed are sound and workable.

Besides Mr. Rockefeller, two individuals who must receive credit as "founding fathers" of the IESC, are U.S. Senators Vance Hartke of Indiana and Jacob Javits of New York. Senator Hartke, following a trip abroad in 1962 had proposed the establishment of a "businessman's peace corps" to make available to developing economies the talent and know-how of retired American business executives. Senator Javits had called on U.S. corporations to create a pool of skills for overseas assistance. What these proposals and Mr. Rockefeller's had in common was that the experts to be sent abroad would come from the private sector.

It so happened that this line of thought paralleled one that was being discussed within the Federal Administration, particularly in the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.): Could not the private sector to be encouraged to play a larger role in the continuing United States program of economic aid to the developing nations?

In response to the very favorable reaction and a deluge of mail which followed Mr. David Rockefeller's CIOS XIII keynote address, he subsequently had a staff study made for the purpose of putting some meat on the skeleton of his basic idea.

A.I.D. also had undertaken some very thorough studies, based both upon various independent proposals and upon its own soundings of opinions and attitudes in the United States and abroad. The conclusion to which A.I.D. came was: that some sort of executive service corps could and should be established to make the human skills of U.S. business directly available to business in the developing nations. Hence, a small planning staff was created within A.I.D., and early in 1964 A.I.D. sponsored a voluntary organizing conference of business leaders, both from companies and all major business associations and management groups, as well as from government. The conference participants, in turn, created an organizing committee which, significantly, was made up entirely of seven private businessmen, including Mr. David Rockefeller and Mr. Sol Linowitz of Xerox Corporation, as the organizing co-chairmen.

In the following two months, those seven men met frequently to plan and to direct the staff work necessary to develop a charter, select a suitable name, formulate basic policies, establish fundamental operating practices, elicit initial financial support, select and form a strong and highly representative Board of Directors. During this period valuable assistance was given by the Council for International Progress in Management (U.S.A.) and by the National Industrial Conference Board.

As the principal staff aide to the seven men of the Organizing Committee, I can bear witness to the intense interest, dedication and time they gave to the subject. In addition to Messrs. Rockefeller and Linowitz, these men were Mr. Ray R. Eppert, President of the Burroughs Corporation; Mr. Dan A. Kimball, Chairman of the Board of the Aerojet-General Corporation; Mr. William S. Paley, Chairman of the Board of the Columbia Broadcasting System; Mr. John H. Johnson, President of Johnson Publications; and the late Mr. C. D. Jackson, Senior Vice-President of Time Inc. We should note that Mr. Jackson was the General Program Chairman of CIOS XIII Congress and that he served as the first Chairman of the Board of Directors at the founding of the I.E.S.C.

By June 1964, the IESC had become a reality; incorporated as a non-profit organization in New York State, with tax free status under United States law. Following the initial meeting of the IESC Board of Directors on June 14, 1964 the directors were received at the White House by President Johnson, who indicated his enthusiasm for the organization in saying: "You are making a most important contribution . . . to the economic development of the free world."

It was accepted at the outset that A.I.D. would provide initial grants, as "seed money", to help the IESC come into existence and grow—and that the contributions of the private sector would grow increasingly as a part of the total.

The recruitment of a small but very high grade initial headquarders organization reqiured several months time—as also did the obtaining of suitable office space in New York City.

We were fortunate in convincing one of our IESC Directors to devote his services full time to the management of IESC as its President. This man is Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., a former Secretary of the Army and former President and Chairman of the General Dynamics Corp. In November 1964, the offices of IESC were opened in New York, and in January 1965, the first active project was initiated with the assignment of Mr. Howard Rose, a semi-retired consulting engineer of Connecticut to the Amado Engineering Co. in the small provincial city of David, Panama. Amado had asked for suggestions on problems encountered in growing from a small engineering firm into a metal fabricating and construction complex. Mr. Rose spent about four months there, recommended reorganization and personnel development and changes in pricing policies. The company subsequently benefited much from the managerial assistance. Now, hardly 21 months later, there are 90 projects completed, 32 underway, 37 more to which the assigned volunteer is now en route, and over 120 for which a qualified executive is being recruited. By the end of this year it is expected that a total of about 400 projects will have been accepted since the beginning. It is anticipated that in the future IESC will take on some 400 to 500 new projects each year.

Its activities already span the world—the length of Latin America and across Africa, the Middle East and Southern Asia to the Pacific. There are 80 projects in Central America, 43 in South America, 74 in the Far East, 72 in the Middle East, and now 10 in Africa with more anticipated.

In most cases, IESC projects consist of the assignment of a carefully selected executive to the top-management level of an overseas business firm. The program rests on two fundamental premises. One is that the service rendered must be of high quality. The other is that the enterprises assisted should be significant to the local economy.

Among other IESC principles are these:

1. The function of the IESC executive is only to help an enterprise, not to run it. Experience has shown that a three or four-month assignment is usually adequate, with a later follow-up assignment desired in some cases.

2. Although IESC is subsidized by public and private sources in the United States, overseas client firms must make a measurable contribution toward the cost of the services they receive. Such contributions are negotiated on the basis of local standards of compensation and the firm's ability to pay.

The principle of charging something for IESC service is basic. It is not a giveaway program. It is a business proposition among businessmen.

3. IESC provides service only where the necessary assistance cannot be obtained locally, either because of its cost or because it is not available.

4. IESC executives must be experienced businessmen, with records of substantial achievement, who volunteer to serve. They and the organizations they represent are interested in the opportunity to be of help rather than in salary or other material rewards.

IESC provides assistance principally to the private sector, but will consider any project that is likely to strengthen the local business community. In a few cases this includes assisting government agencies, when such assistance is likely to improve the environment for free enterprise.

The procedure for requesting IESC assistance is very simple. All that is necessary is for a firm to make its interest known to any of the IESC representatives now stationed in key countries around the developing world, or write directly to IESC in New York. It is not necessary to go through any official channel, although economic offices of both local governments and United States missions are ready to help establish contact with IESC when asked to do so.

After a proposed project is approved by the IESC field representative, it is submitted to New York for final approval. When this is given, IESC then—and only then—looks for the executive who can best do the job. For this is not an employment agency trying to turn up jobs for businessmen at loose ends; the client firm comes first. Although there have been thousands of inquiries from United States businessmen willing to volunteer for the program, IESC has firmly pruned this list down to fewer than 1,500 names of men considered qualified for overseas assignment. Even so, the file often does not yield the name of just the right man. When this happens, a specific search is made throughout the country to find him. IESC has a substantial recruiting office in New York (now manned by one paid and six volunteer recruiting officers) and a network of volunteer representatives in some 35 cities to assist the search. To date IESC has been very successful in matching the clients' needs with executives who are not only technically qualified but, equally important, are suited by personality and temperament to adjust to working conditions that may be quite different from those they are used to.

Many of these men have recently retired from United States firms. Others have their own businesses, in which they are now freed of day-to-day responsibilities. Still others may be what are called "mid-career" men, executives still actively at work who are loaned to IESC for a few months by their U.S. employers.

All of them have one thing in common—they are volunteers. They serve IESC without compensation, except for basic expenses. This requirement that executives serve without salary is perhaps the most important single factor in assuring the quality of the service; it automatically weeds out the self-seeker.

Of the approximately 75 men who have so far completed more than 90 assignments (some have already gone out twice), nearly every one has said that the experience, and the opportunity to give of himself, has been one of the most satisfying episodes of his life. From the viewpoint of the client companies, it is of more significance that they, too, have found the association satisfying and rewarding.

There have inevitably been a few cases—but only a few—where personal or business problems have created serious obstacles; IESC considers seven or eight projects so far to have been unsuccessful, or a little less than one in ten. Thus the goal which President Frank Pace set—90 per cent success—is being met.

Approximately two-thirds of IESC's initial financial requirements have been met by grants from the U.S. Government and one-third by contributions from the private sector. The Government's participation reflects the continuing interest of the President of the United States in encouraging American business to assist foreign economic development. The private contributions reflect support for the IESC concept by the business community at home and abroad. It is important to note that the governmental grants to IESC through A.I.D., have been strictly with "no strings attached". Policy and programs are directed only by the IESC Board of Directors.

In this brief outline of the origins and progress of IESC we can detect a characteristic that is still today one of the most significant features of the program. It is a *private* effort, *publicly* sponsored. IESC's Board of Directors continues to be made up entirely of distinguished private businessmen.

It has 55 members, including some from various industries and regions and few outstanding figures from major business schools. Initial members of the IESC Board of Directors have been the outgoing President of CIOS, Mr. Gerrit van der Wal of the Netherlands, and his predecessor, Mr. A. M. Lederer of the United States. The Board meets twice a year, and its Executive Committee of 15 members meets 4 times a year to review management. The IESC budget continues to be assisted by A.I.D. contributions.

In this respect IESC has become an unusual, if not unique, experiment. Its sponsors like to think that after too many years in which the public sector and the private sector looked upon each other as natural enemies, they are helping to clear a path toward the fruitful collaboration.

IESC's special blend of private and public effort carries over from the United States to the countries where it engages in active projects. The executive advisers assigned to overseas firms are strictly private individuals, but they function with the full knowledge and approval of the local government, which normally enters into a simple agreement with IESC regulating such matters as the tax status of the executive volunteer. Similarly, the client companies to which these volunteers are assigned, for periods of three or four or six months, are private enterprises, almost without exception. One exception for example, is in Ghana where an IESC volunteer, a public-utility executive from Columbus, Ohio, is now helping that troubled country to unscramble the economic omelet dished up by its former government. IESC was one of the first Western agencies Ghana turned to in its effort to chart a new course for the future. IESC projects are broadly conceived in terms of the economic future of the country as a whole. Still others, far more numerous, are more limited in scope but collectively no less significant. There are volunteers working on management and technical problems with individual firms throughout almost the entire range of business activity. As the total number of projects multiplies in such fields as these, IESC hopes also for a multiplying effect on economic growth and international cooperation.

Now let me recall that the various suggestions which gave birth to the IESC varied greatly in detail. They had in common, however, the general observation that large scale government-to-government aid lacked two important elements as a stimulus to the growth of vigorous free economies in the developing nations. In the first place, it did not provide sufficient opportunity for the private sector in American life to participate directly in the creation of a strong private sector overseas.

In the second place, massive injections of funds to close the capital gap between the developed and the developing nations did not alleviate what has been called the second gap—namely, the discrepancy in human skills, and primarily managerial knowledge and skills.

The developing nations simply do not have the vast resources of managerial talent and experience that have been such vital factors in our dynamic American economy.

Thus, the IESC concept is one of growth through international cooperation, very much in keeping with our topic here today at CIOS XIIII. Although initiated primarily through American stimulus and action, it does not exclude the participation of the businessmen of other advanced nations, who share an interest in the objectives of IESC.

I believe the establishment and progress of the International Executive Service Corps, in these three short years since our last CIOS Congress, is a tribute both to the international spirit and dedication to management science (which is exemplified by CIOS) and to the generous, practical efforts of the IESC founders. IESC is both a succesful experiment and a reality—in cooperation between the U.S. Government and private enterprise and in international cooperation for growth and economic development through better management. I am confident that by the time of the next CIOS Congress in 1969, this cooperation will have been carried still further.

WHY ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM HAS TROUBLE IN CONGRESS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during this debate on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, it is timely indeed to heed the counsel of those individuals who are on the "front line" of the "war on poverty," the mayors of our Nation's great cities.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued on September 25 by Hon. Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., mayor of Providence, R.I., in which he discusses the true reasons why the antipoverty program has had such trouble in Congress.

Mayor Doorley has compiled one of the most successful records of any municipal chief executive in the Nation, and I know that Senators will want to give his views careful attention.

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

STATEMENT BY MAYOR JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, JR., PROVIDENCE, R.I., SEPTEMBER 25, 1967

The city has formulated and is now operating one of the most comprehensive programs in the Nation to combat poverty. We provide legal services, educational programs, consumer assistance, employment aid, and a host of other projects which are giving the alienated poor an opportunity which they never have shared before.

The war on poverty is not an effort simply to support people or to make them dependent upon the generosity of others; it is designed to give the poor a chance to help themselves. Our program in Providence has made it possible for thousands of inner city inhabitants to secure a chance and an opportunity to rejoin the mainstream of American life and share in its affluence and prosperity.

Today's *Providence Journal* on page 28 reports that the anti-poverty bill pending in Congress is in trouble. And that trouble stems from Republican opposition to the bill.

Not too many days ago, the Policy Committee of the Republican Governors' Conference met in New York at the request of Governor Rockefeller. They discussed means of relaxing tension in the Nation's racial ghettoes. Their report charged that the Federal government had failed to allot sufficient funds for its programs dealing with urban poverty.

It is ironic that the Republican governors have so little influence over their Congressional representatives. It is also ironic that the Republican Party which only last August called for more aid to eliminate urban poverty now, one month later, is about to

destroy the hope and aspiration of all the Nation's ghetto dwellers.

The politically motivated utterances of the Governors' Policy Committee show clearly that the Republicans are more interested in developing a national candidate than they are in helping the impoverished people of the Nation's cities.

The people of this city and those of every other city should marshal their resources in protest to the politically inspired conduct of the Republicans in Congress who are about to destroy this important program.

ANOTHER FAMOUS MARINE CORPS GENERAL SPEAKS OUT AGAINST U.S. MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, there has been for too long a mistaken impression in the country that all military men are in favor of the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

This is not so.

More and more experienced military men are speaking out against U.S. military involvement.

I have previously alluded to the fact that Gen. Douglas MacArthur, undoubtedly one of the greatest soldiers of our time, warned repeatedly against engaging in a ground war on the continent of Asia. He said:

> Anyone in favor of sending American ground troops to fight on Chinese soil should have his head examined.

Gen. Matthew Ridgway and Gen. Omar Bradley also warned against such action. Gen. David M. Shoup, retired Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, in addressing the annual Junior College World Affairs Convention in Los Angeles in May 1966, said:

> I want to tell you I don't think the whole of Southeast Asia, as related to the present and future safety and freedom of the people of this country, is worth the life or limb of a single American.

To this respectable chorus of experienced military men warning against U.S. military involvement in a land war in Asia, there is now added the voice of a distinguished former Marine Corps officer, Samuel D. Griffith II, retired brigadier general of the Marine Corps—who, in a message to the Business Executives for Peace in Vietnam, meeting on September 27, 1967, said, in part:

> If we *really* want negotiation, we must begin to de-escalate the war rather than continue to escalate . . . Even if we were to obliterate North Vietnam completely, the guerrilla war in the South could continue. . . . Why is it not possible for America, the most powerful nation in the world, to take a first step toward what practically everybody in the world except Mao Tse Tung wants?

General Griffith is a China scholar as well as a much decorated Marine officer. Guerrilla warfare is not unknown to him. In World War II, he commanded the 1st Marine Raiders, winning the Navy Cross and the Purple Heart at Guadalcanal and the Army Distinguished Cross at New Georgia. After his retirement in 1956, General Grffith earned a Ph. D. in Chinese military history at Oxford. He translated Mao Tse-tung's "On Guerrilla Warfare" and, more recently, wrote "The Battle for Guadalcanal." He is a research fellow on China studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York City and is a member of the Institute for Strategic Studies in London.

As a student of Chinese military history, he said:

> Our country . . . is now beginning to be hurt both in body and spirit. And who stands to reap the benefits of our misguided strategy? None other than Moscow and Peking.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the message sent by General Griffith to the Business Executive for Peace in Vietnam, meeting on September 27, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

MESSAGE TO HENRY E. NILES, COCHAIRMAN, BUSINESS EXECUTIVES FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM, BALTIMORE, MD.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1967.

DEAR MR. NILES: I regret that my scheduled trip to the Far East makes it impossible for me to attend the Washington Meeting of Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace.

I heartily endorse the objectives of your organization so clearly set forth in your Open Letter to the President printed in the New York Times on May 28, 1967.

Mr. Chairman, our country is indeed troubled. American casualties in the Vietnam War are increasing at an alarming rate. In one three-day period last week more than 400 U.S. Marines were killed or wounded at Con Thien, a position on the border of the so-called demilitarized zone in Vietnam. There the Viet Cong used artillery, heavy mortars, and rockets. This bombardment was no isolated incident but the scale of it is a grim portent of the future. It is high time for the American people to ask bluntly, "For what purpose are Americans still being killed and maimed in Vietnam?" We, of course, know the official answers to this question. We have heard them countless times but the situation today requires something more than the tired clichés of the Secretary of State.

What is imperatively demanded is a positive policy designed to end the fighting in Vietnam so that those unhappy people who have not known peace for two decades may once again enjoy it and so that we may stop expending lives, blood, energy, and resources in an area which is not of critical importance either to our national security or to our strategic position in the Far East.

Despite optimistic statements to the contrary, the end of the Vietnam War is not yet in sight. Indeed, the chances for a peaceful settlement grow daily more remote as the Administration stubbornly persists in its desperate determination to force Ho Chi Minh to negotiate. Let us ask whether further Americanization of the war and its progressive escalation toward a confrontation with China is the way to persuade Hanoi to talk peace. This is, however, precisely the policy which the Administration pursues. It is, in my opinion, as I believe it is in yours, a disastrous policy.

If we *really* want negotiation, we must begin to de-escalate the war rather than continue to escalate. The obvious action we can take, and I believe should take and at once, is to cease bombing Hanoi. Even were we to obliterate North Vietnam completely, the guerrilla war in the South would continue.

Our bombing of the North does not and cannot, as Mr. McNamara has testified, stop the flow of the relatively small tonnage required to sustain guerrilla war in South Vietnam.

Why is it not possible for America, the most powerful nation in the world, to take a first step toward what practically everybody in the world except Mao Tse Tung wants?

If a strategy proves unproductive, it is the first responsibility of a commander to change it. But how long are we going to have to wait?

How long would a business man wait to change a manifestly wrong policy? Not long, or he would soon be out of business. I am not suggesting that our country is going out of business, but it is now beginning to be hurt both in body and in spirit. And, who stands to reap the benefits of our misguided strategy? None other than Moscow and Peking.

Surely respect for our President both at home and abroad would not diminish should he take a first positive step which, hopefully, could lead us eventually out of this costly morass into which we daily sink deeper and deeper.

Finally, Sir, I want to congratulate you, Mr. Willens, and your Executive Committee for organizing "Business Executives Move For Vietnam Peace" and again to express my regret that I cannot be with you.

Sincerely,

Brig. Gen. SAMUEL D. GRIFFITH II,
U.S. Marine Corps, Retired.

THE FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN MOTORS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, American Motors Corp., is in a most serious situation as it introduces its new models this year. When its books are tallied up for the fiscal year ending September 30, they may well show a loss of $60,000,000 for the year, while it faces loans due December 31 in the staggering amount of $66,600,000.

Yet the management is optimistic about changes now in process. With a current sale of only 3 percent of all cars leaving dealer showrooms, American Motors is aiming at 4.2 percent of sales by next summer. In a field where most of the business is shared by only three companies, the American economy needs the preservation of this smaller company lest the monopolistic trend toward fewer companies—a trend not confined to the automobile field—be accentuated still further.

On August 11 the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] introduced a bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, dealing with the tax situation of tihs company. I am a cosponsor of the bill.

An enlightening article detailing this company's situation, in the form of a Detroit dispatch, was published in the National Observer of September 25. Mr. Roy Chapin, as American's chairman and chief executive officer since early this year, and his team of executives are moving positively to cope with the situation, as the article shows. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN MOTORS: "WE'VE QUIT RAMBLING"—SHIFTING FOR AN UPHILL CLIMB

DETROIT.—The is American Motors Corp.'s week of hope and horror.

The company hopes for the beginning of a 20 percent annual sales gain when the 1968 models go on sale Sept. 26 with a flashy new advertising campaign for a flashy new car, the Javelin, AMC's first entry in the "Mustang market." But the company still shudders at the red ink splashed so freely through AMC's ledger for its fiscal year ending Sept. 30.

Indeed, this loss, which may reach $60,000,000, forces the question of whether AMC can survive. If it does, its recovery will have to be splendid as its decline was calamitous, because its 1967 loss approaches some of the most spectacular deficits in recent business history—General Dynamics Corp.'s $69,437,000 loss in 1961 and the $76,932,000 loss in 1965 by Brunswick Corp.

These companies quickly rebounded into profits. Brunswick's loss came primarily from a onetime write-off when the company overextended its bowling investments. General Dynamics abandoned in 1962 its production of Convair 880 and 990 jets, which had drained its treasury. AMC's potential recovery appears tougher.

AMC, for example, can't drop autos; its only other business is the lagging Kelvinator appliance division, which accounts for 12 to 14 per cent of the company's sales. AMC must sell more cars. A legacy of questionable management decisions helped cut domestic sales during the 1967 model year to about 243,000 cars from 441,472 in 1963. And bankers may press AMC for the $66,500,000 due Dec. 31 and secured by mortgages on the company's plants, equipment, and inventories.

At AMC's headquarters on Plymouth Road here, management bubbles with determination. The word "survival" has been stricken from the accepted corporate lexicon. Ask William V. Luneburg, the peppery American Motors' president, if the company can be saved, and he snarls: "What the hell do you think I'm doing here? This outfit isn't planning on optimism."

RECOVERY PROGRAM OUTLINED

Roy D. Chapin, Jr., AMC's chairman and chief executive officer since January, last spring outlined a recovery plan to the 24 creditor banks, with month by month projections on sales and costs. "We're right where we said we would be," he declares now. "They [the banks] are in a more positive frame of mind. I'm confident we can live up to our commitments until next June."

Mr. Chapin won't specify that June goal, but a vice president suggests AMC will grab 4.2 per cent of the auto market by next summer; it currently makes 3 of every 100 cars sold in the nation.

Such optimism has encouraged some investors. No large institutional investors a few months ago owned any of AMC's 19,000,000 common shares. AMC now proudly declares that mutual funds own 3,000,000 of the company's shares; its stock closed last week at $15.13 a share, compared with a 1966 low of $6.38.

"I've been through a lot of mock burials before, and we've always recovered," chuckles one top AMC official. American Motors was created in 1954 by merging two dying companies, Nash-Kelvinator Co. and Hudson Motor Co. The financial hemorrhage continued. In 1956 the company lost $30,000,000, and AMC was selling less than 2 per cent of the nation's cars. Then came economic recession, and boom times for AMC's little car. AMC in 1959 turned a $60,000,000 profit. Sales the following year reached 7.2 per cent of the market.

This success had a side effect; it lured George Romney into politics in 1962. For a successor as AMC president, Mr. Romney tapped Roy Abernethy, his bluff, cigar-smoking sales chief. The Abernethy management posted profit gains in 1962 and 1963. As competition tightened the compact market, Mr. Abernethy decided to expand AMC's market; he called it "moving the fence" within which AMC operated.

The company jazzed up its cars, adding inches, horsepower, options, and cost. "We've got everything everyone else has," Mr. Abernethy boasted. Laments an insider: "The proliferating number of body styles and frequent changes in models created tremendous costs of tooling. If they had sparked adequate volume, fine, but they didn't. At least our old boxy compact was distinctive." After a $37,800,000 profit in 1963, profits and sales tailed off steadily, until AMC lost $12,600,000 in fiscal 1966, and ran a $47,985,000 loss in the first nine months of this fiscal year.

The mistakes ran deeper than styling. AMC paid generous cash dividends to shareholders. From 1961 through 1965 the company accumulated a profit equal to $6.97 per share of its common stock, and paid out dividends of $4.71 a share, or 69 per cent of its profit. By comparison Ford Motor Co. over the same five-year period paid less than 40 per cent of its profit in dividends, saving the rest for expansion, modernization, and other expenses.

Then auto buyers discovered the Mustang. To get in on the market for small, sporty cars, AMC decided to build, beginning in 1965, a car it called the Marlin. One insider on reflection concedes AMC should never have built this car, which was planned as a sporty version of its American series. The American was the smallest of AMC's three model lines, which included the Classic (now called Rebel), and the top-of-the-line Ambassador. But to give Marlin plenty of power and zip, AMC decided to equip it with a V-8 engine. "The V-8 engine didn't fit the American chassis, so we put the Marlin on a Classic chassis. That made the car too big to sell well," this official admits. Before it was dropped earlier this year, Marlin reached a top selling pace of 1,000 a month.

In search of cash, AMC mortgaged its plants and equipment, then spent $60,000,000 to restyle the 1967-model cars. Mr. Abernethy predicted domestic sales of 375,000 AMC cars, up from 280,000 in the 1966 model run. When the sales slump continued, AMC directors eased Mr. Abernethy aside last January.

The shift brought a sharp personality change in the corporate management. Mr. Abernethy came up through sales, and he seemed to feel most at home with dealers. Mr. Chapin prefers, as now he must, bankers. Thin, articulate, patrician, and wealthy, Mr. Chapin chats easily and confidently of AMC recovery. As a sign of where the company's problems lie, only 2 of 15 vice presidents report to Mr. Chapin directly: the vice presidents for public relations and finance.

AN EXPENSIVE SHUTDOWN

With a 150-day stock of unsold cars, the Chapin-Luneburg management shut down production early this year for several weeks at the AMC assembly plant in Kenosha, Wis. Mr. Chapin talks of the shutdown as "excruciating," and its cost at running into the "tens of millions of dollars."

Then, to boost sales, AMC cut the suggested retail price by $234 to $1,839 on its lowest-priced American model; about half the cut was in the wholesale price to the dealer, the remainder in the dealer's suggested mark-up. In April, AMC sold 7,400 Americans, compared with 3,200 in January. AMC blames a shortage of cars for the drop in sales of the American last month to 4,255, off from a year-earlier 6,740.

The company trimmed costs, reducing the number of salaried employes to a current 7,000 from nearly 8,400 at the end of 1966. It dropped "marginal" development work on a rotary engine.

AMC seeks to refashion its image. "We've quit rambling," declares a vice president. "With a name like Rambler, you can't have a sharp company." So the name Rambler now appears only on the American series, and the company has begun a program to help dealers pay for new "American Motors" signs to replace "Rambler" signs. The company hired the Wells, Rich, Greene, Inc., advertising agency to add zip to its advertising. The campaign, which concentrates on the Javelin, includes one TV pitch showing six gangsters stealing a Javelin for a get-away car because its got such a big engine and so much backseat leg room.

Doubt persists among many business analysts over a very basic question: whether Mr. Chapin has the necessary freedom and time to accomplish his goals. AMC last May sold its Redisco, Inc., financial subsidiary to Chrysler Corp. for a fire-sale price of around $28,500,000, sustaining a $5,289,178 loss on the transaction. Says a Wall Street analyst: "They sold a property earning a profit of $3,000,000 yearly to pay off part of their loan and reduce their annual debt costs by maybe $1,500,000 a year. That sounds to me like the creditors are running the company, and running it to their benefit."

Mr. Chapin denies this. "The bankers are trying to be as helpful as they can. David Rockefeller [president of Chase Manhattan Bank, the key lender] made a TV tape for our dealer show. He didn't have to spend time doing that. He feels a desire to see us succeed. Everybody in the country wants us to make it." Ford and General Motors Corp. have opened their safety-testing facilities for AMC use. GM is selling AMC a new, collapsible steering column. "They made it available to us immediately. They didn't have to."

Good wishes don't sell cars. Javelin may accomplish that. Mr. Chapin plots this formula for AMC success in 1968: Sell as many Americans, Rebels, and Ambassadors as during the 1967 model run, 243,000, then top that with 60,000 Javelins. But with an uncertain economic year ahead and only a "light face-lift" in styling of its non-Javelin models, holding at 1967 levels may not come easily.

And will buyers take to a car that seems a me-too copy of Ford's Mustang? Granted, there are differences, such as two extra inches of rear-seat leg room, compared with Mustang, three added gallons of gas-tank capacity, and a plastic grille.

"You don't have to offer radical differences," Mr. Chapin believes. "You just must give people a reason to buy, a reason to say why they bought an American Motors car." Leg space is a big Javelin difference. Price is a big American difference. At the suggestion of Mary Wells of the advertising agency, air conditioning will come as standard equipment on the 1968 Ambassadors. "No other car this side of $10,000 offers air conditioning as standard equipment," boasts a vice president.

If AMC rebounds once again, analysts will hail it as a classic example of what good management can accomplish. Says Mr. Luneburg. "We're all on the same wave length, as opposed to before, when we had problems of communication; a number of people had set ways." He refuses to cite examples, but will concede that the Abernethy era was beset with "hauling and tugging," which Mr. Luneburg says resulted in constant indecision and delay.

Throughout this talk of problems and proffered remedies, designers busily sculpture clay mock-ups of the potential 1970 AMC cars. A dozen or so full-sized designs are scattered around the second-floor design room, two Americans are off to one side, an Ambassador nearby, and several potential variations on the Javelin. Mr. Chapin and his associates must decide next month which designs to select to give time for engineering and tooling work. On the success of the 1968 cars rests the hope that there will be a point to making this selection.

—HAROLD H. BRAYMAN.

THE REDISCOVERY OF THE AMERICAN CITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently, the Under Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Robert Wood, addressed the annual alumni seminar at the Massachusetts Institue of Technology. His speech, "The Rediscovery of the American City," is most noteworthy because it provides a

new, intelligent framework for our thinking in urban affairs. It summarizes the accomplishments of the last few years and outlines the priorities for future inquiry and action in urban questions.

The Under Secretary rightly points out that there have been improvements, that we have made progress, and that there is reason for confidence in our urban society. Specifically, Mr. Wood lists three principle reasons for this optimism:

First, the recognition that the urban system is a complex "set of relations of people and space involving many dimensions";

Second, the development of ideas that recognize this complexity of the urban system; and

Third, the development of a national policy that is committed to "city-building in the broadest sense of the word everywhere across this continent."

But Mr. Wood clearly indicates that there is a need for a continual expansion of our commitment to a better urban society, encompassing the center city, the suburb, and the exurb. This commitment to the total improvement of urban America shapes "a common cause among the urban poor, the urban middle-class, the urban rich."

Likewise, Mr. Wood praises the efforts of the private sector and details the need for more of this cooperation. The formation of the urban coalition, and the recent commitment of $1 billion from the insurance industry for mortgage credit are examples of this new effort from those outside the public sector concerned about the urban future. The private sector must help, must share in the responsibility for a better urban environment.

Mr. President, these words from the Under Secretary are encouraging in light of the pessimism that developed in response to the urban disorders this summer. The speech helps us see the entire urban picture and highlights the need for comprehensive thinking.

I ask unanimous consent that the Under Secretary's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE REDISCOVERY OF THE AMERICAN CITY

(Address by Robert C. Wood, Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, MIT Alumni Seminar, 1967, Cambridge, Mass., September 8, 1967)

Good evening, it has been twenty months since my sabbatical year was suddenly transformed from one of political speculation to political experimentation—and extended somewhat in duration. But three times since then one group or another on this lively, diverse and changing campus has welcomed me home again. I appreciate every opportunity.

Early in my Washington days, I explored with undergraduates the new career challenges urban affairs offers young scientists and engineers.

Later on, I talked with faculty friends as they took up Jim Killian's and Howard Johnson's charge to bring the resources of this great university to bear on urban problems in a major new commitment. And I salute the program's first great accomplishment, persuading one of the country's great urban leaders. John Collins, to join MIT's ranks.

Tonight, I meet with this distinguished group of alumni and alumnae—hoping to help make clear how your fortunes and interests are intertwined with the American urban community and to encourage the use of your talents and energies in its behalf.

From each visit to MIT I take more than I give. There are older universities in this nation and some that profess a more cosmopolitan style. But none can claim to be in closer touch with those distinctive features of the American character and culture that have generated this nation's uniquely successful development:

A reliance on reason in place of emotion or illusion as a means to solve problems both human and material;

An emphasis on productivity, on action, on work, on results—not talk—as the measure of competence;

An insistence on quality in the application of reason and the execution of tasks, so that the mark of the professional stamps the men and women of MIT from their freshman year onward.

It is worth recalling these characteristics. They underlie the Institute's reputation. They are also qualities sorely needed in our present struggle to build cities that reflect the best of America's aspirations.

For, since the time I accepted Bob Bishop's invitation to join this Seminar today, we have passed through a series of calamitous events in our cities. In President Johnson's words, "We have been through a time no nation should endure." Since last May, storms of urban discontent have broken over Cincinnati and Tampa, over Newark and Detroit, here over Boston—indeed over more than a score of American cities.

This is the fourth consecutive year of urban violence and the intensity is increasing.

These outbreaks were not unexpected. Nor were they, to the professional observer, inexplicable. But they have produced the torrent of commentary and explanation that now swirls around us and the sense of urgency and concern with our urban civilization that was lacking in earlier years.

All of us in the urban business welcome every indication of the public's sense of heightened urgency and broader concern. However, the solemn predictions of disaster, and the panicky search for panaceas is another—and disturbing—matter.

Urban problems we have aplenty—and inventory of ills assembled over years of indifference and inattention. Yet the potential for city-building in the United States grand in scale and fine in quality has never been greater.

Indeed, my central theme is that we are in fact further along in understanding the urban system, developing the capabilities to direct it, and deciding in what direction it should go than most Americans appreciate—or, given the decades of neglect, than we probably deserve.

This thesis runs contrary, of course, to the cloudburst of criticism that now falls on our city policies. The urban wailing wall is lined today with eloquent communicators urging us in this direction or that. Some of these are old colleagues who only a few short years ago wrote learned treatises entitled "There is no Urban Problem" or "Cities are Better Than Ever." Others are the experts who called for the abolition of the automobile as a practical solution to the unspecified ills of suburbia.

Now while these observers come forward with a different set of opinions and assertions, prescriptions and philosophies, let me present some evidence for long-run confidence in Americans as urbanites. The foundation for this optimism is principally that the characteristics of reason and problem solving which give validity to this Institute's approach, are now being applied to urban affairs.

Specifically—

We come increasingly to understand the city as a system of many variables in precise and accurate terms, as a complex set of relations of people and space involving many dimensions. This may sound theoretical, but an accurate description of the phenomenon is a prerequisite for guiding it. Until very recently in urban scholarship there was a clear and present danger of committing the single-factor fallacy in diagnosing our cities ills. The special error was a tendency to analyze them solely in terms of race.

Second, we are beginning to develop a balanced capacity to design and build better city systems. We are learning that, as in all great national endeavors, manpower, know-how, talent, and commitment are as important as dollars. We ignore any one component at the peril of the total enterprise. And when we emphasize only one, we invite waste and error.

Third, our national policy states clearly that the task is still city-building in the broadest sense of the word everywhere across this continent. It is not only the ghetto and the ghetto resident that concerns us, but all urban dwellers and all parts of the urban complex. This means we must develop a broader system and direct it toward goals we identify and come to agree upon more clearly.

Let me expand on each of these points.

The first reason for some confidence in our urban future is that, despite the spate of Sunday supplement commentary, we are beginning to define and study urban behavior systematically. It has been ten years since Raymond Vernon began directing the New York Metropolitan Study. This was a truly extraordinary nine volume inquiry into the economic functioning of our largest metropolitan area.

This thirty-man professional group effort established a new direction in urban scholarship. It shifted the study of the city away from the emotionally oriented, intuitive, historical and architectural approaches of the lonely scholar tradition. It moved urban scholarship toward a carefully designed, multi-disciplinary exploration of the varied relationships between the location of jobs and households in urban space.

The economic focus of the New York Study had its limitations. Vernon's policy conclusions were largely comforting and reassuring. They gave heavy emphasis to the fact that *relatively speaking* city dwellers are better off in material terms than ever before.

With ten years' hindsight, it is possible to identify some critical missing elements of analysis. They include the failure to recognize that there is a psychological identity crisis among the new migrants from rural American circumstances; that we wrote off too quickly the potential role of government in the process of urban development; that we did not take into account the full meaning of changing technology.

But the foundations of urban systems analysis were clearly set by the Study. They still stand in stark contrast to some contemporary diagnoses by latecomers in the field who even now persist in treating a multivariable situation in single cause and effect terms. The Study carefully avoided any simple classification of a special category of urban people, a single source of discontent, or a particular kind of family problem.

As we build on the work of the 1950's we have come to know that urban conditions of stability or instability, squalor or decency, efficiency or inefficiency, beauty or ugliness, are not the functions of single factors.

They are not the result of—

just obsolescence of our housing supply;

just the changing requirements of industrial location;

just a racial change in the character of the jobs technology makes available;

just the vast migration of rural citizens to strange and complex urban circumstances;

just discrimination;

just the desire of new urban residents to be heard;

just hostility between generations;
just the increase in sheer numbers.

The urban condition is all of these. The issue is not the intuitive search for the single thesis, be it anomie, or the unemployment rate among central city residents, or the family structure of poor people. The issue is how to balance and take into account, on some weighted basis, the play and pull of all these varied forces.

The Woods Hole Conference which the President's Science Advisor, Donald Hornig, and Secretary Weaver sponsored in the summer of 1966 marked the first official effort to move in this direction. Walter Rosenblith, Chairman of the Faculty at MIT, led some fifty largely "hardware" researchers in the search for simultaneous equations to locate and remove the sources of urban discontent. That Summer Study began the process that continues today within the Department. Its work was the basis that led the Congress to approve our first meaningful research and development budget.

Where one appreciates that a problem is complex and subtle, not responsive to massive undirected applications of energy or simple professions of good will and heartfelt concern, one is likely to search for a reasonably comprehensive and carefully developed response. This is the second reason for some optimism for urban America. Our public policy today, proposed by the President, enacted by the Congress, is of that character.

In the tumult of this summer, it is easy to forget—but vital to remember—that urban aid legislation enacted in 1965 and 1966 was designed to remove the causes of the tumult. We have many new efforts underway to provide more housing for those who desperately need it. For the first time we are seeing the leaders of private enterprise focusing their talents and energies on the nation's most pressing urban problem. Here I mean the involvement of private industry in the Rent Supplements Program which makes privately developed housing available to low-income families by helping them to pay the rent. I also mean the new program of leasing private housing which increases our supply of low-cost public housing. I mean the Turnkey process by which private enterprise uses its ingenuity and efficiency to build low-cost housing for sale to local authorities. And I mean the new refinement of Turnkey—we call it Turnkey II—in which private management firms will operate public housing.

The Model Cities Program of the 1966 Act is designed explicitly to bring comprehensiveness to the rebuilding of older portions of older cities. It will provide more housing. But, more than that, the Model Cities Program seeks to restore all aspects of the neighborhood environment—by merging social, physical, public and private programs from many sources into a total attack. For the first time, it introduces quality control into urban rebuilding. For the first time, it offers bonuses to stimulate local innovation, local ingenuity, local solutions of local problems.

Then there is the Metropolitan Development Program of 1966. It would reward, and therefore, encourage collaboration between local governments. Finally, there is the new program to stimulate the development of entirely new communities. This offers the hope of providing fresh alternatives to urban living.

Taken together, these new efforts represent a reasoned strategy. They will expand the freedom of choice for urbanites. For all of us, they will increase our options for where we seek to live, to work, and to invest our leisure time.

These, among others, are programs now on the statute books. Now they are all in the process of first funding.

They already authorize many of the programs proposed in the 30-odd new bills introduced in the Congress in the aftermath of Newark and Detroit.

Their principal limitation at the moment is the size of the investment they call for.

But here, amid calls for billion dollar emergency funds, and a thirty billion dollar housing investment, three comments are in order.

The urban professional recognizes that all three levels of government and the private sector as well must be involved in the process of rebuilding our cities. The Federal investment is not the total investment, as it is in space or national security programs. Those who make facile comparisons of just the gross Federal budget figures are either amateurs in urban affairs, or worse, they are actors engaging in political chicanery.

The urban professional also recognizes that the investment of economic resources alone does not assure effective capacity. Talent and knowledge are equally essential components and our shortages in each are awesome. This year is the first year of urban planning fellowships supported by the Federal government. Our $500,000 authorization this year will support 95 fellowships against an estimated shortage in urban planners of 1,500 to 1,700. This is also the first year of operation for our new Office of Urban Technology and Research in HUD. At a time when Federal Research and Development expenditures were 16 billion, we in HUD have spent only $70 million. Though we have begun the development of a genuine research program, we remain woefully behind other areas of national concern.

Meantime, the popular battle cry of many local officials remains: 'Give us the money and we will do the job." This does not ring so true when they cannot show that they have people to spend the money on programs and enterprises that are well designed, carefully tested, and certain to achieve the purposes for which they were intended.

Finally, the urban professional recognizes that the true test for an effective urban response is how it helps people. An effective program, at a minimum, involves an appreciation of the needs of the human personality and the human spirit. There is an oft-quoted line of Martin Lomasney, the old political boss of Boston, to the effect that "there's got to be in every ward somebody that any bloke can come to and get help. Help, you understand, none of your law and justice, but help."

But, it is no less true today than it was at the opening of this century that "the greatest of evils and the worst of crimes is poverty." Help these days is more than more urban renewal funds, more jobs, more housing. Help is all of these and law and justice, too. But, help is first communicating with those who now feel debarred from our society and consequently debased. Second, it is assurance of genuine participation in the process of city rebuilding and neighborhood restoration. Access to those in authority, a share in decision-making—these are the vital components today.

It was this desire to show tangible, visible concern for the current conditions of the poor—and to take at least one specific step to eliminate at least one shameful condition—that led the Administration to propose the so-called Rat control bill to the Congress. Those members of the House of Representatives who thoughtlessly laughed it out of the chamber, and those outside observers who wrote it off as budgetary trivia, and therefore, of no consequence, underestimate grievously one whole dimension of the urban challenge.

The same drive for action underlies our new program of making Federal surplus property available for new community development. Our first project is building a new town in town for 25,000 people on the site of the National Training School in Washington.

Admittedly, human concerns are the most elusive elements of a truly capable response. Effective programs and activities are evolving slowly from the trial and error, and success and triumph, in our economic opportunity programs. But they are vital components and those who would have us return to New Deal days—of simply providing dole for the poor until their children or their children's children struggle forward to a state of middle class blessedness—place more faith in economics and less faith in other social skills than I do.

At rockbottom, I cannot believe that we do not have the ability to engage our urban poor in democracy today nor any prospect of increasing their competence to deal with urban life today.

I cannot accept the proposition that there is no hope for my contemporaries in this urban world who did not have the luck of a good education and equal opportunity for a job.

I cannot believe that the only way to assure eventual economic well-being for all Americans is to relive the miseries, pain, despair and human costs of the Industrial Revolution of the 19th Century.

Understanding the pattern of urban development as a complex system fashioning a capacity with manpower and knowhow, as well as money, to respond to the urban challenges, these two processes are well underway. But unless we are prepared to deal with our urban future as well as correct the mistakes of our urban past, they will not be enough. That is, no genuine urban response is sufficient that focuses solely on the American core city or identifies only the urban poor as the beneficiary of our public and private policies.

The truth is that the entire pattern of urban development, from central city to suburb to exurb, is robbing us all of genuine freedom. We are all losing the choice of a clean, healthful and pleasing environment—with pure air and water, a landscape unimpaired by destructive building processes. We are all losers when we are hit in the pocket book by excessive and unnecessary costs in the construction of housing and provision of community facilities and services today. Unplanned, unguided, sporadic urban development cheapens our common environment and places prohibitive prices on land and improvements.

As we prepare for the generation of city building that lies just ahead—when we distribute 100 million more Americans across the continent in the next 30 years—these spiraling costs, this waste, and the despoliation are common concerns. They shape a common cause among the urban poor, the urban middle class, the urban rich—Caucasian, Negro, Mexican-American, and Puerto Rican.

There is a final common concern and challenge. How do we build our new urban communities on a geographical and numerical scale unanticipated even twenty years ago and still retain a sense of genuine community? What modern counterparts do we have for barn-raisings, street dancing, Fourth of July celebrations? Where are our new village greens and town commons?

To rediscover community on a larger scale will surely mean making real again the old colonial adage, "You are as good as any man—and better than none." Today, this means, at a minimum, freedom of choice for any family to live anywhere that its home economics makes possible. Open occupancy is a rudimentary necessity of an urban civilization today. Our increasingly urban character only serves to make more compelling than ever the fulfillment of the promises of democracy.

But genuine community building in our urban circumstances will require more positive action. Urban and suburban communities must recognize more explicitly that they have common concerns and common obligations.

We now, for example, at HUD are using

some of our assistance grants in mass transportation to carry workers from poor neighborhoods in the central city to factories on the suburban fringe.

This is, we believe, a socially beneficial and well justified policy. It is, however, only a substitute for workers freely following their jobs and taking up residence close to where they work. If that freedom already existed, we could use this investment for other vital transportation needs.

Indeed, if we provide genuine variety in occupations, in income, in race and religion in cities and towns across our metropolitan regions, we accomplish two other things simultaneously—

We insure that no single part of the new urban community has to care for the majority of the poor, the old, and the helpless;

We provide the excitement of variety and complexity to the human experience in all parts of the community. For our children, free exchanges and encounters in early life can prevent prejudicial confrontations later on.

These are aspirations of community life yet to be realized of course. Major changes in public attitude, in private industrial performance, in labor practices, in governmental patterns of behavior must occur before these aspirations are realized. But they are the objectives to which present, established national policy is committed.

Let me add, that one of the most encouraging developments of this summer has been the unmistakable evidence of the community commitment by the private sector. Representatives of business associations, of individual industries, of community enterprises: group after group have been visiting with us in Washington. They all seek effective ways to expand their commitment to our urban communities. They no longer withdraw, retreat, or simply complain about the urban condition. We welcome each and every step in the direction of massive commitment by private enterprise.

Those, then, are the bases for urban optimism. Urban programs fashioned by reason and not illusion, emphasizing practical and tangible results, committed to quality, are now underway.

They will not immediately quiet urban discontent nor instantly make competent citizens of the newest migrants from rural circumstances. They will not magically introduce effective local land development and tax policy nor will they easily eliminate hazards to health and beauty. They never will—without expanded and sustained commitment from the private sector and the academy on a scale never before undertaken. Thus, in the unspoken words of Franklin Roosevelt, "The only limit to their realization will be our doubts of today."

But given such commitment and common effort the America of the 21st Century can offer its urbanites greater hope than the newly urbanized nation entering the 20th Century offered earlier generations.

This nation will have come to peaceful terms with the urban destiny that it now no longer refuses to acknowledge. It will have arrived at the time the President pictured when he said: "Those who came to this land sought to build more than just a new country. They sought a new world. . . . Let us from this moment begin our work so that in the future men will look back and say, 'It was then, after a long and weary way, that man turned the exploits of his genius to the full enrichment of his life.'"

WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN, JR.—DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I read of the death of a distinguished public servant, William Zimmerman, Jr.

Bill Zimmerman was one of the key officials in the Interior Department during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, one of several outstanding midwesterners whom Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes tapped for public service in 1933. He served for several years in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including a period as Acting Commissioner. He was Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management. Subsequent to leaving Government service, he headed the Washington office of the Association on American Indian Affairs and served the Wilderness Society and the Sierra Club.

Bill Zimmerman was a good friend and wise counselor of many of us in the legislative branch. He understood Government as few men do, and gave unstintingly of his time toward workable solutions of complex conservation and resource development programs. His areas of special competence and significant contributions ranged from the first Americans to the last redwoods. I mourn his passing and extend my condolences to his wife and family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the obituary published in the Washington Evening Star.

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

WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN, JR., 77, AUTHORITY ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

William Zimmerman, Jr., 77, a specialist in American Indian affairs who was assistant commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs from 1933 to 1940, died Tuesday at the Woodbine Nursing Home in Alexandria. Mr. Zimmerman had been ill with heart disease for about five months.

He lived at 4713 Rock Spring Road, Arlington.

Mr. Zimmerman was appointed to the bureau in 1933 by Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes.

Until he came to Washington, he had been vice president of a fruit preserving company in Indianapolis, Ind., sold stocks and bonds and had been an editor for several encyclopedias in Chicago, Ill.

His first contact with American Indians came after passage of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, when he and the commissioner of the bureau, John Collier, spent 18 months visiting different reservations to explain the bill's provisions for self-government for Indian tribes.

Mr. Zimmerman was acting commissioner when the commissioner was traveling and when the top position was vacant.

He was appointed associate director of the Bureau of Land Management in 1949 and retired in 1954 to head the newly opened Washington office of the Association on American Indian Affairs.

He had been manager of the Robert Marshall Wilderness Fund, a conservation organization, since 1939.

In recent years, Mr. Zimmerman had been a consultant here to the Sierra Club, a conservation group with headquarters in San Francisco.

Last spring, he actively lobbied for an extension of the Indian Claims Commission Act, first passed in 1947 while he was with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. Zimmerman was born in Chicago. He graduated from Harvard University in 1910, and then studied one year at Harvard Business School.

He leaves his wife, Eleanor; a son, Peter B., a senior at Harvard University; a daughter, Mary, a sophomore at Sullins College in Bristol, Va.; three children by his first wife, William III of 6418 13th St., Alexandria, Edward J. P. of Briarcliff Manor, Westchester County, N.Y., and Mrs. Talbot Wegg of Bainbridge Island, Wash.; 10 grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren.

His first wife, Susan, died in 1941.

Memorial services will be at 1 p.m. tomorrow at the Walker Chapel Methodist Church, 4102 N. Glebe Road, Arlington.

The family requests that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to the Children's Hospital or the Sierra Club Foundation.

THE ECONOMIC PICTURE DOES NOT WARRANT THE SURTAX

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have on several occasions stated my opposition to the adoption of the proposed surtax. I have taken that position not on political but also on economic grounds.

Some of the economic factors which belie the optimism of those who fear a revival of inflation were recently detailed in the National Observer. Durable goods orders, for example, have been down successively in July and still further in August from their June level—and this is an indicator which stands as "a key gage of future factory production." Business inventories remain high—higher than the average for last year and the year before. A slight gain in industrial production needs to be seen in the perspective of the fact that some of that gain arises from deferred production because of strikes in the tire and television-set industries.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "How's Business?" published in the National Observer, be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOW'S BUSINESS?—SIGNS OF JOY AND CONCERN

The economy's sluggishness "is already over" and the nation enters autumn on a "clear and accelerating upturn," proclaims Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. With business again robust, according to the Administration's theory, Congress must now pass the 10 per cent tax surcharge to dampen excessive private spending that would accelerate inflation.

One disquieting factor creeps into Mr. Ackley's declaration—a lack of clear evidence that the economy is suddenly shooting upward. Signs indicate plenty of sloth left in the economy, even before Ford Motor Co. was struck, which could curtail some growth in the coming months.

Durable-goods orders, for example, slipped in August to $22.8 billion, seasonally adjusted, from July's $23.4 billion and June's $24.3 billion. The order level, which trailed the year-ago total by $700,000,000, is a key gauge of future factory production.

Business inventories continue to drag at the economy; salesmen must clean out some overstocked warehouses before industry can bolster production dramatically. Business during July, the latest figure, held inventories equal to 1.54 months of selling. That's down from a 1.58-month supply in April, but it remains well above the average of 1.48 last year and 1.46 during 1965, considered more normal levels.

At 158 per cent of the 1957–58 average, industrial production last month rose from 156.7 in July; it held below the record 159

per cent last December. Government economists find that some of the recent gain came in catch-up production following strikes in the tire and television-set industries.

Some indicators are available to justify the boast of one government economist that "the upturn is a fact, it isn't a forecast any longer." Housing starts in August rose to 1,381,000, figured at an annual rate, the highest seasonally adjusted rate since March 1966. The gain topped July's rate by 19,000 dwelling units, but this is not considered a vigorous advance. Steel demand in September, according to major producers, is running 3 to 4 per cent above the August level, about in line with seasonal expectations.

Retail sales set a record for the third consecutive month in August, and personal income reached an annual rate of $631.2 billion in August, up $4.5 billion from the July rate. But inflation has evaporated some of this buying power, diluting the impact of dollars spent at retail on actual production demand.

These figures, of course, may form a solid base for rapid fall expansion in the economy. Certainly the money exists to finance it. The Federal Reserve System has pumped new money into the economy at an extraordinary rate recently, increasing the nation's money supply to $179 billion in currency and checking-account funds. That's $9 billion above January's supply. When the Government was striving to rescue the economy from the last recession in 1961, it increased the money supply during all of 1961 by $4 billion.

In peering ahead at the nation's economy, a member of Mr. Ackley's council last week found business "is rounding a treacherous curve and the road ahead is bumpy and slippery." The same might be said for forecasting.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERIES TO BENEFIT AGRICULTURE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last month a series of 11 articles written by Dick Youngblood, staff writer for the Minneapolis Tribune, surveyed the tremendous advances in agricultural efficiency and productivity which will result from new technological and scientific discoveries.

Changes in the future will be even more revolutionary than they have in the past—from the use of crop computers to the possibility of high rise cattle growing in or near metropolitan areas. Mr. Youngblood's articles are fascinating and informative. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMPUTERIZATION OR CANNIBALISM—SCIENCE SADDLED TO BEAT FAMINE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first in a series of 11 articles exploring the massive changes that will shape the farm of the future—its science, its technology, its precision and, most important to an exploding world population, its productivity.)

(By Dick Youngblood)

In a laboratory near Tarrytown, N.Y., scientists are growing corn completely submerged in water.

They're raising cotton in a computer at the University of Arizona.

Across the nation, in these and more than 40,000 other research projects, scientists are shaping the American agriculture of tomorrow—an agriculture that would be all but unrecognizable to the farmer of today.

It will be a world of computerized business management and robot machinery, of skyscraper truck farms and high-rise livestock feedlots located in or near large cities.

It will be populated with strangely shaped "supercrops" and with cattle "custom-designed" to yield more steaks and less hamburger.

It will be served by crop-monitoring space satellites and protected by precise systems of weather modification.

It will be almost totally free of insects and crop-choking weeds.

These are not pipe dreams. The exciting changes envisioned by agricultural researchers will evolve, the experts agree, for one critical reason:

The grim mathematics of a world population that swiftly is outracing its food-production capacity will make these changes not only economically feasible, but absolutely essential.

Simply, the highly sophisticated, push-button agriculture of the future also will be an exceedingly efficient, far more productive agriculture.

The pressures forcing this transition are clear right now.

Hunger already is a daily fact of life for a billion of the world's 3.3 billion people.

Studies by the World Health Organization indicate that at least 3 million children die every year of malnutrition.

Even now, world food production is increasing at a rate of 1 per cent a year, while the rate of population growth is 2 per cent—and this has been the ominous trend since 1961.

Yet, world population is expected to more than double to nearly 7 billion, within 33 years.

IN LESS than 20 years, in fact, mass starvation may be stalking many of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, where much of the population growth will occur.

Recently, the possibility of widespread cannibalism in some of these countries in the 1980s was suggested by two officials of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).

This—the crucial race for more food—is the common link between that laboratory in New York, the computer in Arizona, and the thousands of agricultural research projects around the country.

The cotton growing in the computer promises a dramatic speed-up in this race against famine.

Simply, what engineers have managed to do is reduce to numbers the physical and biological data that allows them to simulate a growing cotton plant in the computer.

With this complex model, in effect, they can plant weeds in the computer, or infest it with insects, or create a drought. They can sprinkle it with fertilizer or drench it with pesticides.

In this fashion, they quickly may assess the effects of a multitude of variables on a living plant.

This is an imposing breakthrough, says Wendell A. Clithero, Chicago, agricultural representative of International Business Machines (IBM) Corps., for it promises a tremendous speed-up in the crop research aimed at uncovering more productive varieties.

No longer must researchers wait through the life cycle of a test plant for their results. They are not chained to the hit-or-miss system of field tests and random selection.

Instead, says Clithero, the computer can point to the direction the researchers might take for promising new varieties.

It could predict research results, he says, that could then be validated with field tests—but with, perhaps, five tests instead of 500.

H. N. Stapleton, the engineer who built the cotton computer model, says that the simulation program already has yielded "reasonable" results, "near those obtained from field tests . . ."

But most important, he says, "with cotton, we undoubtedly tackled the toughest crop system—without question, this same concept can be applied to any crop or animal production system."

The corn growing under water, in a Union Carbide Corp. lab, has even more exciting implications.

A research team led by Dr. S. M. Siegel has discovered that conventional crop seeds not only can live, but actually thrive in a carefully controlled environment containing less oxygen than the 21 per cent found in the atmosphere, or even the 5 per cent contained in good soil.

"Nature has provided us with clues to this," says Siegel, who left Union Carbide recently to head the University of Hawaii Biology Department. "Take, for example, rice growing in low-oxygen muck."

In the laboratory, the seeds are placed in water, Siegel explains, into which oxygen and nutrients are injected at varying levels, depending on what the researchers find to be the optimum for a particular plant.

The oxygen rate can vary between 1 and 5 per cent.

Some nonflowering plants—lettuce, celery, carrots, cabbage—actually can be carried to maturity in this fashion.

Others—corn and cucumbers, wheat and tomatoes, rye and barley—merely are sprouted and incubated for a short time in this watery environment.

The frequent result says Siegel:

Germination is more even; the plant is hardier; its stems are sturdier; its growth is faster.

Resistance to cold is enhanced, which could extend the growing season for many important crops grown in Minnesota.

Cereal-crop content of vitamins B1, C and E is boosted 50 to 300 per cent, and resistance to fungus disease and drought is heightened.

In short, the result is a sort of "superplant"—and, most important, these characteristics are retained even when a plant is taken out of the water and replanted in the ground.

The result of all this, Siegel theorizes, might one day be a crop with enough drought resistance to grow in desert land.

At the least, he predicts that farmers of the future will be producing their own superplants, sprouting them in water "incubators" right on the farm and replanting them in the fields.

Ultimately, he foresees plants selected to endure in salt water, or at least in the brackish water that lines the world's coastal areas.

"If we could grow rice in salt water," Siegel says, "the implications for Asia would be fantastic."

Siegel seems confident that something like this is in the offing.

"In the next generation," he says, "the sea will be a major new addition to the world's 'tillable soil.'"

THE AGRI-REVOLUTION: FARMING GOES FANTASTIC—COMPUTERS TO GET MAJOR FARM OPERATIONS ROLE

(*Second of a series*)

(By Dick Youngblood)

It took a computer precisely nine minutes to tell an eastern Nebraska crop-and-livestock farmer how a few small changes in his operation could triple his net returns.

Another helped Dale and Harold Anderson, Blooming Prairie, Minn., boost corn profits $15 an acre last year. (It advised them to increase their plant populations and fertilizer rates.)

An Iowa representative of a big chemical firm can talk directly to a computer in Chicago—by telephone—to get weed control advice for his customers.

A large poultry farm in New York is running a computerized "dating bureau" for its chickens—carefully blending parental characteristics to breed the best possible egg-producing offspring.

Across the country, these and other field tests are laying the groundwork for the farm management systems of the future.

"Any large manufacturer today will tell you he just couldn't compete without the help of a computer," says Wendell A. Clithero, national agricultural representative of International Business Machines Corp. (IBM).

"Yet the farmer, who's actually running a big chemical factory, may have hundred times more variables and options, which he's trying to cope with using a stub pencil and the back of an envelope."

Not for long.

Within 20 years, Clithero predicts, the farmer with management problems simply will pick up a telephone and tell his trouble to his friendly neighborhood computer.

The computer—provided by a regional cooperative, a farm supply company or even the local bank—will fire back its answers almost immediately, perhaps over a teletype in the farmer's office.

It will tell him not only which crops would be most profitable on his particular farm, but which fields to put them on, how much fertilizer to apply, precisely how to control weeds and insects.

It will advise him on the kind and number of livestock to raise, the limit he can afford to pay for feeder animals—even the ration to use for optimum profits.

It will tell him, from miles away, more about the soil moisture situation on his "north forty" than he knows himself, then give him an idea of how best to adjust to these conditions.

And all along the line, he'll have options from which to choose, depending on the investment and risk he's willing to accept.

"The farmer of tomorrow may not know a damned thing about the details of farming," suggests J. D. Canton, until recently an executive at International Minerals and Chemicals Corp. (IMC) in Skokie, Ill.

"He'll be a money-manager, a businessman, more than a farmer."

Clithero says the computer can handle in minutes the countless details that would take a farmer months to deal with manually—and with less precision or objectivity.

It can account, for example, for soil type, fertility, cropping history and amount of land available to a farmer.

It can inventory his capital resources, equipment and machinery, his borrowing capacity and labor supply.

It can calculate projected costs and assess supply-and-demand data on past price trends and projected market conditions.

And it can race through this maze of detail to produce the farm plan that means the optimum profit.

In this fashion, a computer told that eastern Nebraska farmer that his farm plan was all wet—that his available resources were being sorely wasted.

By shifting to a few more profitable crops, adding normally to the debt and labor load and substantially increasing the livestock operations, the computer raised that farmer's net return from just over $6,000 to more than $19,000.

The computer's potential as a farmer, in fact, goes even beyond this. In Skokie, for example, all of this data—and a bit more—is fed into an IMC computer, which serves 1,300 farmers in five states in an experimental program called "M.O.R.E. Profits."

The "bit more" stored in the computer's memory involves the opinions of experts on the cropping practices necessary to produce optimum yields.

Thus, IMS's farmers are told not only which crops to plant and where to plant them, but the amount of fertilizer to apply and the density of plants to seed to achieve their yield "goals."

Clithero goes one step further: Someday he says, computers will tell a farmer not only how to feed his crops for best results, but his livestock as well. It will sort the feeds available, assess their relative cost and nutritional value and produce a "least-cost" ration for optimum profit.

Ultimately, he projects, sensors in the stomach of an animal might even transmit its nutritional requirements to a computer, which then would adjust the ration automatically to fill these needs.

Two other IMC computer programs promise to handle some of the more difficult variables that always will confront the farm manager.

One allows IMC representatives in several states to draw on the combined talent of a dozen weed experts, whose solutions to a wide range of weed problems have been fed into the computer.

Using a portable Teletype and an adapter that translates the Teletype's signals into language the computer can understand, the IMC man can telephone the computer right from a farmer's home.

Even more fascinating, an IMC computer is keeping a running check on soil moisture and temperature conditions across the entire eastern two-thirds of the United States.

To do the job, which is called "wealth impact," IMC has transformed its computer into the best-informed agronomist in the world.

Exhaustive data on past weather conditions, as well as the moisture-holding characteristics of all soil types from the Atlantic to the Continental Divide, are fed into the computer.

Next, information is added on how such conditions as moisture, air temperature, wind and humidity affect soil moisture and temperature.

Finally, this data is updated from 230 weather stations every four hours, digested by the computer and translated into a very accurate estimate of current soil conditions across the region.

This can be extremely important.

If moisture is short, for example, a Minnesota corn farmer can plan to reduce plant populations and fertilizer expenditures to minimize the effects of a prospective drought. Or he may shift to a crop like soybeans that is less susceptible to dry conditions.

If, on the other hand, he's told that his soil is saturated with moisture, he can go for broke with high plant populations, heavy fertilizer rates—the works.

And if, as can be done today, the computer also tells him when his soil is warm enough to seed, he's even further ahead.

THE AGRI-REVOLUTION: FARMING GOES FANTASTIC—ROBOTS WILL PUT IN 24-HOUR DAY TILLING, HARVESTING FARM LAND

(*Third of a series*)

(By Dick Youngblood)

Huge unmanned machines chugging through the fields 24 hours a day, will make a full-time management executive out of the farmer in the year 2000.

Remote sensing systems or numerical tape-controlled programs will guide the robot's direction and speed, while the desk-bound farm manager monitors its movements over closed-circuit television.

One machine will do all or most of the spring field work, with built-in sensing devices automatically gearing tillage, seed depth, fertilizer and chemical rates to changing soil conditions.

And sensors on harvesting machines will adjust ground speed and intake to the varying conditions of a grain crop, or select and pick only the vegetables in a field that are ready for market.

The technology for these and other mechanical marvels of the future is available today, experts say.

"If we can send up a machine to dig in the moon's surface, and analyze and transmit its findings, we can jolly well build a robot to do a precise job right here on the ground," says Dr. Gordon H. Millar, director of research at Deere & Co., Moline, Ill.

Dr. John Dempsey, corporate vice-president for science and engineering at Honeywell Inc., agrees.

"There are darned few things we can't build a sensor for," he says, "if you tell us what needs to be sensed and with what degree of accuracy."

The limiting factor, today, is cost. Nevertheless, automation in agriculture will become economically feasible within 30 years, experts agree, for several reasons:

The pressures of mounting world food needs will demand it.

And the trend to ever-larger, heavily capitalized farms, coupled with dwindling rural labor supplies, will insure it.

"With hundreds of thousands, even a million dollars invested, the farmer of the future will be sitting in an office managing not out riding a tractor," predicts J. D. Canton, until recently an executive with International Minerals and Chemicals Corp., Skokie, Ill.

The shift to automation, however, will be "evolutionary rather than revolutionary," says Dr. L. S. Fife, agricultural economist with International Harvester Co. (IH), Chicago, Ill.

In a few years, he thinks, an auto-pilot will be available to the farmer, who already has plenty to do on the tractor without worrying about steering a straight line or sustaining ground speed.

In a planting operation, for example, this would free him to concentrate on as many as 32 different systems that he must keep track of—seeding units, fertilizer attachments and chemical applicators for each row he is covering.

And in harvesting, he would be better able to adjust the ground speed, the intake and the speed of the threshing cylinders to the density and moisture content of the crop.

Eventually, the man in the cab of the auto-piloted planter will have a control panel to monitor all of these functions, suggests R. W. Hough, executive head of IH's Farm Equipment Division.

And from there, he says, the step would be to full automation, using television scanners out in the field and some type of sensor or tape-control system to direct the machine.

With other sensors, Millar envisions a similar unmanned harvester that would adjust speed, intake and threshing rates to optimum levels to reduce field losses substantially.

Dempsey sees the hardware for these automated farm machines as "an application engineering task of no great difficulty."

Already available are heat sensors so delicate they can detect the difference in body temperature emitted when a man opens or closes his suitcoat several yards away. Others can spot a lighted cigarette hundreds of yards away.

Dempsey suggests that some type of heat sensor might be spotted at the ends of each field row, with a homing device on the farm machine to keep it operating in a straight line.

If it strayed out of line, the homing device would feed this information to the control system for automatic compensation.

In some crops, notably vegetables, highly selective harvesters will replace the judgment now applied by man.

At the University of California at Davis, engineers already are developing a lettuce harvester that, first, uses an electronic sensor to decide on the size of the head—then literally "feels" the lettuce with a pressure sensing device to see if it's firm enough for harvest.

If it is, the head is cut, if not, it's left for a later pass over the field.

At the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) research center at Beltsville, Md., for example, low-frequency sound waves are used to sense the size, shape and firmness of a tomato.

And researchers are using light beams to determine when a green tomato is mature enough to be shipped to market with the assurance it will require a minimum of ripening time.

Thus, these devices might one day be applied to harvesting, or simply mounted on a pole in a field to tell the farmer when his crop is at its peak of flavor and quality.

The preferred technique, of course, would be once-over harvest, which will come as plants are developed to mature simultaneously.

Two varieties of a canning tomato, in fact, already have been bred with 80 per cent simultaneous maturity by USDA researchers.

And in experiments at Deere & Co. agronomists are treating specially selected seeds with a hormone growth regulator to produce more vigorous uniform plants.

Planted in a field, but surrounded by vermiculite to prevent soil crusting, these seeds pushed germination well above 90 per cent.

Ultimately, development of uniform maturity might result in The Compleat Harvesting Machine, as IH's Fife envisions it.

Not only would the machine harvest some crops, he predicts, but it would clean, grade, package and freeze them in the same operation—then load them into refrigerated vehicles for "fresh-from-the-farm" delivery.

THE AGRI-REVOLUTION: FARMING GOES FANTASTIC—WESTERN KANSAS IN SARAN WRAP?—ASPHALT SUBFLOOR IN IRRIGATED POTATO FIELD RAISES YIELD 82 PERCENT

(Fourth in a series)

(By Dick Youngblood)

Millions of miles of asphalt highways—built two feet under the ground—may be one answer to the world food shortages threatened in the next 30 years.

Electric heating cables imbedded in the soil of the northern climes may be another approach.

Or you might—as one distinguished scientist suggests only half-facetiously—do something like encase the whole of western Kansas in Saran Wrap.

All three make sense in terms of what they would be designed to do, which is to make the soil a more habitable, and more productive, medium for a growing plant.

What's more, there are scientists willing to predict that all three may well become a reality, in one form or another, in the next three decades.

In less time than that, in fact, the underground highways promise to reclaim, or improve the productivity of hundreds of millions of acres throughout the world.

Simply, there is a vast acreage of porous, sandy soils that are not productive because rainfall is inadequate, or because the available moisture is lost to rapid infiltration into the ground.

Now, scientists at American Oil Co. and Michigan State University have developed a system for laying an impermeable layer of asphalt under the ground, to trap moisture within reach of growing plants.

The process involves a special, hollow plow into which asphalt is pumped. The plow gently lifts the soil, deposits the asphalt two feet down, then allows the earth to slip back into place.

Not only does the barrier reduce the rainfall or irrigation required by a crop, but it prevents the loss of nutrients that otherwise would filter rapidly out of a plant's root zone.

Results to date have been impressive. In tests on irrigated land, yields of cucumbers and cabbage jumped one-third and potato production rose 82 percent, compared with untreated plots.

On non-irrigated land, the yield gains were 33 percent for the cucumbers, 43 percent for cabbage and 51 percent on potatoes.

The potential here is enormous: According to a recent American Oil report on the process, 100 million acres could be reclaimed in the United States alone—and a billion acres world-wide.

L. C. Brunstrum, American Oil's project manager, is unwilling to predict that crops suddenly will begin blooming on the deserts. For one thing, the cost still is a little steep—$225 to $450 an acre.

But he foresees widespread use of the technique in a few years on the world's sandy coastal plains. And he expects that refinements in the process, coupled with swelling food needs, will take care of the economics in the near future.

Moisture conservation is much the same thing that Dr. Sterling B. Hendricks has in mind when he talks about wrapping western Kansas up in plastic.

It's simple, explains Hendricks, the head of the Agriculture Department's Mineral Nutrition Laboratory in Beltsville, Md.

The plastic would cut the intensity of the sunlight—most of which is wasted anyway—and the soil moisture lost to evaporation would be reduced considerably.

Actually, the Saran Wrap people may never get their product out of the kitchen and onto the farm.

But something very much like Hendricks' brainstorm may be commonplace on the farms of the future—in fact, it's being explored by researchers right now.

William A. Bailey, a USDA research engineer, Beltsville, says private industry is experimenting with the use of a black plastic, which is treated with chemical sterilants and laid out across a field prior to planting.

The sterilants kill disease organisms in the soil, while the dark plastic prevents the sun from evaporating soil moisture or germinating weed seeds.

Whereupon, you go along through the fields with some futuristic type of machine, poke holes in the plastic, and plant your crops.

Not only will this be common farming practice in the future, Bailey predicts, but the plants that go in through the plastic cover will be something special as well.

Bailey is one of the directors of a new USDA laboratory, where plants are being grown in artificial environments in an effort to learn exactly what they need in the way of temperature, light, moisture and nutrition for optimum growth.

When a seed is sprouted and allowed to grow under these carefully controlled conditions, Bailey explains, indications are that it will be a hardier, faster-growing, higher-yielding plant even after it finally is transferred to the soil outdoors.

Thus, Bailey foresees the future equipped with growth chambers, or incubators, in which seeds might be sprouted artificially for later replanting and higher yields.

At the same time, Bailey envisions the drive for optimum field conditions leading to the installation of electric heating cables below plow depth out in the fields.

With the dark plastic covering to trap escaping heat, he says, the cables might extend the crop-growing season several weeks by allowing planting to begin much earlier in areas like Minnesota.

The result: Higher-yielding varieties, with their longer growing seasons, could be planted without fear of frost damage in the fall.

While these techniques for improving soil conditions are promising, the major drive of the future still will be in the area of moisture conservation.

Dr. Thomas J. Army, senior research associate at International Minerals and Chemicals Corp., Skokie, Ill., predicts that this will be enough of a concern that it will become economically feasible to manipulate—or even rebuild—the soil structure to increase moisture retention.

THE AGRI-REVOLUTION: FARMING GOES FANTASTIC—CANADIAN SCIENCE WEDS WHEAT, RYE

(Fifth in a series)

(By Dick Youngblood)

The farmer of tomorrow will be raising crops the farmer of today never heard of.

Other crops will have familiar names—corn, for example, or soybeans—but today's farmer wouldn't recognize them growing in a field.

Chemical growth regulators may well allow a man to speed the maturity of his crops to avoid a frost, or hold them back to dodge a temporary market glut.

Production per acre will reach unheard-of levels: 3, 4, even 10 times the average yields of the present.

Science already has given man the key to this remarkable production system of the future.

History's first man-made crop species, a high-yielding, protein-rich grain born of a cross between wheat and rye, has grown out of nearly 10 years of research at the University of Manitoba.

Plant breeders have produced a corn species whose erect, almost-vertical leaves expose the entire plant to more sunlight, which allows closer planting and significantly-higher yields.

Similarly, a new chemical, which makes the broad, bushy soybean plant look more like a Christmas tree than an umbrella, promises to boost the yield potential of this important Midwestern crop.

The most fascinating scientific adventure of all, however, has to be the Canadian research, which bypassed literally thousands of years of natural evolution to produce a completely new form of plant life.

The result: A new supergrain called triticale (tritt-uh-kay-lee).

It's a giant, this off-spring of rye and durum wheat, with a head that's nearly twice as long as a wheat head. It has a yield potential that exceeds wheat's by as much as 50 per cent.

And, almost as important, it has a protein content that is at least two percentage points above even the high-quality wheats raised in the Upper Midwest and Canada.

Several strains are being increased and tested. They will be available in Canada and the United States by 1970, predicts Dr. R. C. McGinnis, head of plant science at the University of Manitoba.

It will be used here primarily as a high-quality stock feed, he says, because it produces a flat bread loaf, rather than the light, fluffy loaf, preferred by our consumers.

But in food-short nations, McGinnis feels, it could be made into easily acceptable human foods like the chappattie, a bread-like Indian food staple made from ground wheat.

McGinnis predicts that a concentrated plant breeding program could give India an adaptable variety within five to six years.

The birth of this significant new hybrid wasn't easy.

It meant not only the complex task of blending the diverse genetic makeup of two different species, but also the job of sorting through a huge array of rye and wheat varieties in search of the superior qualities the researchers wanted in their hybrid.

Most important, it unscrambled the problem of sterility that normally results in a hybrid produced from two different species. The solution was colchicine, a drug used in treating gout.

The drug creates fertility when injected into growing hybrid plants. Fortunately, the treated plants also yield fertile offspring.

Now, McGinnis says, efforts are under way to get an even higher producing hybrid from a cross of wheat and a form of quackgrass.

In more conventional areas, the corn that farmers would plant someday would look slightly ill alongside a tall, green stand of present-day corn.

It will be much shorter, with small upright leaves instead of the lush, droopy ones that are familiar today. Its corn ears will be runts compared with those harvested now.

But it will yield three or four times more than current corn varieties—500 bushels an acre within 10 years, predicts Tom Army, senior research associate for International Minerals and Chemicals Corp. (IMC), Skokie, Ill.

Because its strange shape allows sunlight to reach the entire plant more easily, plant populations of 100,000 to 150,000 an acre will be possible, compared with the 25,000 now considered high.

Energy now going into producing leaves and stover will go instead into corn on the smaller plant. Thus, it might produce several runty ears that yield almost as much corn as the one big ear on a plant today.

Scientists already have isolated a semidwarf variety that can withstand populations of 50,000 an acre, and Army projects that the goal of 100,000-plus is just a decade away.

A chemical called TIBA, developed by IMC, does much the same thing for soybeans.

It halts plant growth beyond flowering, so that energy usually directed into leaf and stem production is channeled to producing more beans. It also reduces height, increases stem strength and causes the Christmas tree effect that allows closer planting.

Even without higher plant populations, TIBA promises to boost soybean yields 10 to 20 per cent. And when farmers start packing more and more plants onto each acre, researchers hope that yields will climb tenfold, to 200 or more bushels an acre.

TIBA is one of a lengthening list of growth-regulating chemicals that effect the internal signals governing the life process of a plant.

There are growth inhibitors, for example, to reduce plant height and eliminate lodging and wind damage.

Others close the stoma—the tiny breathing holes on a leaf—to prevent moisture from being expelled and help offset the effects of a drought.

Growth stimulators have been found to speed coloring and increase the sugar content of oranges, or boost the size of certain seedless grapes.

These chemicals are just the first step—they are extremely difficult to use and effective under only very limited conditions—says Dr. Henry M. Cathy, a plant physiologist at the U.S. Department of Agriculture's research center in Beltsville, Md.

Nevertheless, 10 years of research have added a broad array of chemical growth-regulating characteristics for scientists to blend and mix in their search for the chemical regulators of the future.

And by the year 2000, Cathy is optimistic that we will have the kind of capabilities envisioned by Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman in a recent speech on the agriculture of the future.

Some day, Freeman said, farmers in, say, Oklahoma will be able to apply chemicals to slow the maturity of their wheat crop and avoid a local market glut while farmers in Kansas use another chemical to speed their wheat to meet a scheduled export shipment.

THE AGRI-REVOLUTION: FARMING GOES FANTASTIC—SKYSCRAPER FEEDLOTS, FARMS FORESEEN TO FREE LAND

(*Sixth in a series*)

(By Dick Youngblood)

Sawdust, or some equally improbable cattle feed, may produce the steak you broil for dinner 20 or 30 years from now.

The steer which furnishes that T-bone probably will be raised in a multi-level livestock hotel, where precise environment control relieves him of all cares save that of eating and growing.

And the vegetables served with the steak might well come from a skyscraper truck farm, probably located in or near a major metropolitan market, where crops are grown in synthetic soil, under artificial light and in a gaseous environment that would kill a man quickly.

With a nervous eye on the exploding world population, scientists today are exploring these and other fanciful advances, all of which have one thing in common:

They would free millions of acres—now devoted to such things as livestock feed-growing, truck crops or feedlots—for use in producing food grains for direct consumption by man.

More to the point, the rich nations would be assured a steady supply of fresh meat, fruits and vegetables, no matter what pressures widespread starvation places on the world's land resources.

An angus cow employed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) several years ago served as the pilot model for researchers beginning work toward the totally synthetic cattle ration of the future.

Weaned in 1962, old No. 248 as she was affectionately known munched contentedly for nearly three years on a ration of wood pulp and urea, fortified with sugar, starch, vitamins and minerals—the longest period a ruminant animal has lived on a synthetic diet.

(The woodpulp provides bulk and energy, and the urea, a synthetic source of nitrogen, replaces natural protein in the diet.)

In the spring of 1962, she gave birth to a bouncing heifer calf. Since then, a number of her colleagues—cows, steers, and bulls alike—have demonstrated their ability to thrive on a similar diet.

This does not mean that the still-costly synthetic rations are a commercial fact today, says Dr. Paul A. Putnam, a leader in beef cattle nutrition studies at the USDA's Beltsville, Md., research center.

Rather, the pulp-and-urea ration is a valuable research tool, he explains designed to do two things:

Provide basic information on the dietary needs that must be filled by a synthetic diet for an animal's growth, reproduction, and lactation.

Ultimately, give reserchers an idea of the kinds of rations that will produce high-quality beef without competing with man for land resources.

A variety of waste products might finally be used for bulk in a ration Putnam suggests. Such materials as straw or stalks from food grains, for example, or the tops from beets or carrots.

The high-rise truck farms envisioned by another USDA researcher, engineer William A. Bailey, would have many advantages beyond the conservation of land for food-grain production.

Crops could be raised year-around, he points out, and they would be harvested close to the urban markets, reducing storage and transportation costs while insuring fresh-from-the-farm delivery.

The plants would grow in synthetic soil. A photocell would regulate artificial light for optimum intensity to speed growth 25 to 30 per cent. Finely measured doses of essential carbon dioxide, as well as nutrients and water, would be fed automatically into the environment.

Bailey is one of the directors of a new USDA laboratory at Beltsville, where plants are being grown in precisely controlled, artificial environments.

"We're trying to learn precisely what a plant needs for optimum growth," Bailey explains, "just how it is affected by changes in light, temperature, moisture, nutrition, air flow and day-length."

In short, they are refining the techniques that will go into these urban farm factories of the future.

High-rise livestock hotels appear to be even more of a certainty.

Already, the poultry industry has moved indoors, and many hog and cattle producers are finding that a controlled environment means a more comfortable animal that will grow faster and cheaper.

Thus, it would seem that a healthy nudge from rising land values could easily send livestock feedlots soaring into the air.

The animals, themselves, could also provide an important new source of food or feed, says Harry J. Eby, a USDA engineer at the University of Maryland.

Eby has been grappling with the problem of what to do with the two billion tons of livestock and poultry waste produced annually in the United States. And he's come up with an answer.

He has designed a system for the waste to be pumped out of a lagoon into a series of hydroponic beds in which crops are growing in fine gravel. The waste nutrients would feed the crops—which could supply either feed for livestock or (if our delicate sensibilities don't rebel) food for humans.

Eby also suggests—very quietly—that the protein level of the waste could be raised by incubating it, allowing the bacteria to grow, then sterilizing it and feeding it back to the livestock as protein supplement.

Many other alternatives are being explored in the hope of relieving the growing competition between man and animal for the world's food resources.

An obvious one is to get each animal to produce more of what the consumer wants, but without increasing its feed intake or, hopefully, its cost to the housewife.

For a decade, swine researchers at Beltsville have been selecting, breeding and reselecting hogs with low-fat characteristics. The results to date:

A smaller, longer, more efficient animal that yields five more pounds of lean cuts (ham, loins, shoulders) than the more typical members of its breed—and on less feed, yet.

Similar research is under way in beef cattle, and Dr. Everett J. Warwick, chief of USDA's beef cattle research branch, predicts that the waste fat on a beef carcass, typically about 20 per cent, will someday be trimmed to 5 per cent or less.

The same selective breeding already has produced a turkey whose breast now is so meaty that, as one writer put it, the male loses its balance when it tries to mate. "Artificial insemination has come to the consumer's rescue," the writer noted, "if not to the turkey's."

The ultimate research goal, however, is the ability to identify precisely the genetic markers for certain desirable characteristics.

With this weapon, Warwick suggests, man might be able to custom-design the kind of animal he wants—match the markers in a dam and sire that will produce the most desirable type of offspring.

A more fanciful approach, which might someday boost a single cow's milk production, is being studied by other Beltsville scientists.

A hormone, called estrogen, it has been found, will simulate the natural lactation process whereby a cow or heifer must give birth to a calf before the milk-production cycle can begin.

Treatment with estrogen stimulates development of the mammary glands and actually starts the milk-producing cycle, without the animal giving birth to a calf. The implications are important.

If attempts to breed a young heifer fail, a farmer might someday be able to bring her into production anyway.

And he might eliminate the tailing-off of production that normally precedes calving—

in short, keep a cow producing year after year if he wants to, giving her only brief rest periods.

SOYBEAN SAUSAGE? DON'T LAUGH; IT'S A FACT

(Seventh in a series)

(By Dick Youngblood)

Crude oil someday will be putting food in man's stomach.

And soybeans processed to match the taste and texture of almost any kind of food—from sausage to sauerkraut—will be an everyday fact of life.

Together, these curious additions to the human menu promise a rich new source of nourishment for a world in which half the people already are malnourished and which is expected to double its population within the next 30 years.

Unsavory as they are to the human palate, crude oil and soybeans have one extremely crucial quality in common:

Both have the potential of supplying huge quantities of edible protein, the one dietary element in shortest supply in the food-short nations.

Of course, no one will snack on crude oil as it flows from the earth.

But in laboratories around the world, scientists for most of the major oil companies are laboring to perfect the process that produces a cheap, edible protein from petroleum products.

Simply researchers have found that certain micro-organisms—bacteria or yeasts—will feed and grow on crude oil and natural gas hydrocarbons. Specifically, they feed on paraffins in oil and gas, in effect dewaxing the raw product for the refiner.

Placed in a fermentation tank with such hydrocarbons as diesel fuel, kerosene or methane and nurtured with air, water, nitrogen and minerals, these little bugs multiply rapidly overnight.

Ultimately, they yield a bland, edible powder, brimming with vitamins and containing 40 to 70 percent protein. In the lab, scientists have managed to make this powder look and taste like meat, fish, cereals or soups.

The potential for this discovery is enormous, for several reasons:

Crude oil and gas are cheap and abundant—or easily transportable—throughout the world, including those nations where the capacity to produce more familiar forms of protein is limited.

What's more, there already are hundreds of refineries scattered across the globe which one day could double as food production plants.

Alfred Champagnat, a French researcher, in a recent article estimated that 40 million tons of petroleum a year might yield 20 million tons of protein—half of today's total annual output.

Though only about 10 percent of available supplies contain the waxes on which bacteria thrive best, this still would hardly put a dent in the world's ample proven reserves (recently estimated at 390 billion barrels of oil and a million-billion cubic feet of gas).

While competitive consumers food products may one day emerge from this research, the initial aim is a high-protein supplement that could be added to the indigenous foods of the poor nations.

More specifically, the first target is kwashiokor (translated freely, "the sickness the older baby gets when the new baby comes"), a protein deficiency that afflicts millions of small children between weaning and the time they go on a full adult diet.

There are however, many research problems to be overcome that would place this development 10 to 20 years away from implementation.

Their researchers are transforming soybean meal, now a livestock feed, into a edible, high-protein material that can be made to simulate any kind of fibrous food.

The process, rapidly being refined by the scientists, is extremely promising on two counts:

Where animals consume 100 pounds of feed protein to produce 7 to 20 pounds of meat protein, scientists can isolate 70 per cent of the protein in soybean meal and turn it into a product that is nearly 100 per cent pure.

The ability to match the appearance, taste and texture of a wide range of foods means that high-protein products could be made to satisfy the individual, often rigid tastes of any underfed nation.

Edmund Field, assistant director of exploratory research with American Oil Co., says his firm still is searching for a bacteria that will provide the most acceptable protein yield and quality.

And researchers still have much to learn, he explains, about the kind and amount of hydrocarbons and nutrients required for optimum results.

A piece of technology pioneered by General Mills, Inc., however, promises a much earlier contribution to world protein supplies, perhaps within five years.

"The problem with feeding these people, even if they're starving, is getting them to eat something unfamiliar," says Arthur D. Odell, head of the General Mills project.

But with the new protein material, he explains, "We can make it taste like rotten fish, if that's what the West Africans like, or like fermented foods if that's what they eat in Indonesia."

In the project, Odell and his researchers have isolated the protein from the soybean meal, then taken it a step further.

A simple process, akin to textile-spinning methods, was developed to spin the isolated protein into fine, tasteless fibers that serve as the textural base for the simulated foods.

By varying the process to change the texture, then adding proper flavors and colors, Odell can produce a deceptive match for, say, beef, chicken, ham—or sauerkraut, General Mills, in fact, now is test-marketing small bits of what looks and tastes like crisp bacon.

Odell, however, refers to these meat analogs as the Cadillacs of the simulated foods. His aim, he says, is to develop an inexpensive Honda for the people of the undernourished nations.

"When we're through," he explains, "I hope the process is refined to the point where the natives, with a gas engine and some rather simple hardware, can turn out their own high-protein food at a reasonable cost."

They will use, he adds, not only soybeans and other oilseed crops, as Odell now is doing, but any native food surpluses that now are allowed to spoil or be destroyed by weather or rats.

"I expect," Odell says confidently, "that we will have this capability within the next five years."

In a more conventional area, a breakthrough recently announced at Purdue University in Indiana might fill the protein gap for millions of persons in Central and South America who get most of their calories and protein from corn.

Researchers have bred a hybrid corn in which lysine, one of the essential amino acids, is present in exceedingly large amounts.

This gives it a protein value about double that of ordinary corn—and a nutritional value on a par with that of, say, skim milk.

If commercial varieties can be developed, the new strain would be a significant contribution not only to human nutrition, but to livestock nutrition as well. (In Purdue tests, small pigs fed the high-lysine grew 3.6 times faster than on the common hybrid corn.)

The startling discovery now has touched off a widespread search for similar characteristics in wheat, rice, barley and sorghum.

FEMALE MAY BE INSECTS' RUINATION

(Eighth in a series)

(By Dick Youngblood)

Insects have feelings, too, you know. Which is why a sexy female insect someday might be used by farmers to entice the male of the species into a trap.

The female, in fact, may not even be necessary, her "sex appeal" having been duplicated in an artificially produced chemical lure—the insect world's version of Chanel No. 5, if you will.

The use of the female as a lure, and the far more complex task of identifying and synthesizing her sex "attractant," still are in the early research stages, involving a very limited number of pests.

They are, however, two of the promising approaches in a growing arsenal of "biological" methods under study by scientists across the country.

The aim is to augment familiar chemical controls—among other things, by getting the insects to cooperate in destroying themselves.

As a result of this work, predicts Dr. Paul Oman, assistant director of the Agriculture Department's Entomology Research Division, the farmer 30 years from now no longer will consider infestations of insects a major, persistently costly management problem.

Happily, for the urbanite, the pesky mosquito also will be caught up in the clean sweep Oman envisions.

"Insect populations will not be exterminated altogether," he projects, "but many of the major species will be completely under control."

A most promising approach to this biological warfare involves flooding an insect population with sterile males of the same species.

These males, mass-produced in a "factory" and sterilized by chemicals or radiation, compete with their fertile brethren for the attention of the female, rendering her eggs infertile.

The result: A sharp, continuing drop in production of offspring.

A major livestock pest, the screw-worm fly, has been arrested in the South in this manner, and efforts, are under way to refine the techniques for many other insects—including the mosquito.

It won't work universally, though. Some species, notably the legendary boll weevil, tend to drop dead when exposed to radiation, or become sluggish suitors when sprayed with chemical sterilants.

But agricultural researchers are assembling a wide assortment of other likely options in the field of non-chemical control. Among them:

Ultraviolet light traps have given encouraging results in attracting a number of costly pests, including the corn borer, which is very unpopular among the better southern Minnesota corn farmers.

One test indicated, for example, that light traps may control another familiar nemesis—the corn ear worm—as effectively as 10 pesticide treatments. Another, using a suction-type light trap, caught 85 pounds of gnats—a million to the pound—in one night.

Efforts to define precisely which wave lengths are most attractive to individual species are continuing, though researchers admit that this approach won't work on all insects either.

Deadly viruses—deadly to insects, that is—are an "exceedingly promising" approach for at least 25 species, Oman says.

Applied as a dust or spray, these highly selective viruses would spread fatal disease throughout an insect population.

These viruses, now under scrutiny by Food and Drug authorities, appear to be harmless both to humans and animals, Oman says.

Energy waves have been used to rid stored grain of insects. In one test, high-frequency radio waves created enough heat to kill the pests. In another, sound waves simply drove the insects away.

Engineers are working with a variety of energy sources and frequencies to determine the most effective applications.

Insect predators, harmless species that attack damaging typ s, have provided limited, though very exciting results.

A wasp imported from France, for example, promises an effective means of controlling the elm bark beetle—which, in turn is the principal carrier of the destructive Dutch elm disease.

There are, however, literally millions of different species in the world to be inventoried for possible use as control predators. So far, only a handful of helpful species have been uncovered.

Ultimately, many of these approaches will be used in combination, rather than singly, as "the" answer to a problem. For example, a sex attractant or light might lure the males into a trap, there to be sterilized and released to breed with fertile females.

This work is not aimed at replacing pesticides, researchers contend, though one man admitted that Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring" helped "scare up" additional appropriations for nonchemical control research.

Rather, the goal is to go on the offensive with a combination of chemical and nonchemical control methods, to achieve a thing called "total population control"—TPC.

Today, most pesticides are valuable only as defensive weapons, simply because they are economically efficient only up to, say, 90 per cent of an insect population. The remaining 10 per cent, with their fantastic reproductive potential, are capable of keeping an insect problem alive year after year.

Many of the nonchemical methods, on the other hand, are most effective when insect populations are at their lowest ebb.

The application is obvious: Hit a population with the minimum effective amount of pesticide, then stomp those that remain with, say, a massive release of sterile males.

Thereafter, a low-cost, low-risk combination of pesticides and nonchemical methods might keep the insects under control.

Resistant plants, crop varieties with built-in defenses against insects, as well as disease, are another possibility under study by Agriculture Department researchers.

An alfalfa variety resistant to the damaging alfalfa weevil, for example, is in the final development stages.

But widespread application of this method represents an awesome amount of work. There are many different plant enemies for which resistance must be bred into a variety, and the screening process now used in developing new breeds is an 8-to-10 year matter.

Nonchemical methods also are being explored to enhance chemical weed control, with heartening results.

One major success involves a weed-eating beetle from Australia, which is credited with controlling the damaging "klamath weed" and reclaiming a million acres of infested western rangeland.

In fact, grateful cattlemen actually erected a monument to the klamath weed beetle in California.

Another beetle, from Europe, promises to help control the Canada thistle, a serious enough problem in these parts to rate a "Canada Thistle Control Month" every summer.

W. B. Ennis, chief of the Agriculture Department's Corps Protection Research Branch, sees possibilities in a current project aimed at identifying the mechanics of weed dormancy.

Out of this, Ennis feels, will come a means of keeping weeds forever dormant, perhaps by making them susceptible to cold or drought, or of getting all of them to germinate without producing seeds.

SCIENTISTS SEARCH FOR TRIGGERS TO WEATHER SYSTEMS

(Ninth in a series)

(By Dick Youngblood)

Will man one day have the weapons to bend to his will the potent forces of the world's weather systems?

On the eastern flank of the Rockies, high on a slope overlooking the city of Boulder, Colo., scientists at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) are taking the first steps toward an answer.

From the urbanite, who loses his home to the weather, to the farmer who loses a crop, all men have a vital stake in their success.

The obstacles to total weather control are formidable, however, for the energy contained in even the mildest of weather systems looms far beyond man's ability to duplicate.

A sample: The natural energy required to increase rainfall just a tenth of an inch over 100 square miles is equivalent to all the electrical energy produced in the United States in six days.

But is brute force essential to effective global weather control?

The answer lies in the research effort now under way at NCAR and around the world to expand man's rather rudimentary understanding of the forces that shape the weather.

NCAR scientists are intrigued by the suspicion that large weather systems actually may be triggered by relatively small sources of natural energy.

And this, they say, offers the possibility that major changes in the weather may one day be effected with small, strategically placed amounts of man-made energy.

Dr. Walter Orr Roberts, the distinguished director of NCAR, is confident that a clear understanding of what causes weather to change will be achieved, perhaps by the late 1970's.

This may well lead, he says, to accurate, long-range weather forecasts covering three weeks—or possibly a season in advance.

But Roberts is less optimistic that control of even the weather's small "triggering" mechanisms, if they can be identified, ever will be within man's grasp.

Nevertheless, even if global control is impossible, the knowledge amassed in the next decade promises a big assist for scientists now seeking to modify the weather on a small scale.

As a result, Roberts is confident that farmers one day will be suppressing crop-damaging hail, perhaps by blasting chemical-laden cannon shells into the center of a storm cloud.

They will be harvesting higher yields of rainfall— "milking" passing clouds of every available drop of water—using precise cloud-seeding techniques.

And possibly, they may even be protecting their crops and farm buildings against lightning or damaging wind storms.

But these far-out capabilities, all with some encouraging basis in the present, represent mere tinkerings compared with the concept of total global weather control now under study.

Armed with the most potent of computers—which still is too puny for the job—NCAR scientists are beginning to simulate mathematically the vast and complex forces of the world's weather systems.

It is their only hope, Roberts explains, of dealing with the billions of calculations involving air movement, cloud formation, atmospheric radiation—all the processes that govern the weather.

There are tantalizing clues, Roberts says, behind the theory that large-scale weather systems actually are controlled by rather small "triggers."

One example: There is a statistical correlation between the occurrence of the aurora borealis, northern lights, and the intensification of large weather systems moving south out of the Gulf of Alaska.

This is important, for the energy involved in the northern lights is relatively small compared with what seems to result.

And while this possible "trigger" may still be beyond man's control, there is the further hope that an even smaller intervention might be found, in effect, to "trigger the trigger."

Essential to the computer program, however, is a far broader knowledge of what makes the weather tick. Thus, a "world weather watch"—a global observation system—now is being established.

And in the mid-1970's, a global atmospheric research program of the dimensions of the International Geophysical Year is planned.

Meanwhile, scientists will be hedging their bets on total control with continued efforts toward small-scale weather modification.

The most exciting prospect in this area, and an important one for the farmer, is hail suppression.

Russian scientists, in a report recently translated, claim that hail damage to crops was reduced 80 per cent on 1.25 million acres, with radar and cannons as the unlikely means.

The Russians used the radar to locate the "hail-growth zone" in a storm system, then cannonaded this danger zone with projectiles containing silver or lead iodide.

Simply, these chemical particles provided a massive number of nuclei on which water droplets would freeze to form hailstones.

The result: many more, but much smaller hailstones that would melt before hitting the ground or be too small to do any damage.

Dr. Guy Goyer, an NCAR program scientist in cloud physics, is inclined to accept the Russian claims as valid and important contributions to hail-suppression research.

And while much work remains to be done in perfection of an operational system, both Goyer and Roberts predict that hail suppression will be a routine matter within the next 30 years.

Heartening returns also are flowing in from cloud-seeding aimed at boosting rainfall, says Dr. J. Robert Stinson, associate chief of the Federal Office of Atmospheric Water Resources in Denver, Colo.

Here, too, silver iodide is placed in a cloud (by airplane or ground generator) to increase the supply of nuclei on which water vapor rapidly freezen and grows to a size that will fall to earth.

Results to date: under "ideal" conditions, rainfall apparently can be increased 10 to 20 per cent. Stinson's terms are necessarily cautious, simply because evaluation of seeding results (Would it have rained anyway?) is extremely difficult.

But within the next three decades, he says, "we hope to have the capability to enhance rainfall, not just under 'ideal' conditions, but from any cloud with an excess of moisture in it."

Other encouraging—but inconclusive results—have been reported in the area of lightning and hurricane suppression, though scientists have less hope for these than for the rain and hail research.

In a program called Project Stormfury, U.S. Weather Bureau scientists are seeding chemical nuclei into clouds, to get the moisture to freeze on the nuclei and give up its latent heat.

Since temperature is one factor in the makeup of such a storm, a change in the temperature at the right place in the system might set up a chain reaction that would reduce the winds.

In two separate tests, a decrease of about

10 per cent in wind velocity was observed. But researchers quickly point out that this change falls easily within the natural variability of such storms.

A U.S. Forest Service program, Project Skyfire, has indicated similarly encouraging—and equally inconclusive—results for lightning suppression.

Again, the aim is to produce artificial ice crystals from the silver iodide—but this time to drain off the electrical charge in the cloud before it builds to an intensity that would produce a lightning stroke.

An apparent reduction in the number of lightning strokes has been reported—but there also are indications that this may result in greater intensity in the ground strokes that do occur.

SATELLITES TO SCAN FIELDS FOR DISEASES AND WEEDS

(Tenth in a series)

(By Dick Youngblood)

LAFAYETTE, IND.—An orbiting space satellite, outfitted with a powerful lens and sophisticated remote-sensing gear, may be the farmer's most valuable piece of machinery 15 years from now.

It promises, in fact, to save American farmers billions of dollars a year in crop losses.

The key is the equipment it will carry—scientific devices so sensitive they will be capable of warning a farmer in southern Minnesota that:

An isolated part of his corn crop suddenly is being attacked by disease, insects or moisture problems (It's also entirely possible he'll be told which of the three it is).

The soybeans in a remote corner of one of his fields, which he thought were clean, are becoming infested with weeds.

A certain pasture is being overgrazed and underfertilized.

The value of information like this, relayed immediately to the farmer, cannot be overrated.

Laggard response to these and other cropping problems now costs American farmers at least as much annually as the $16 billion net farm income recorded in 1966.

The farmer, however, will not be the sole beneficiary of the farm satellite that the United States plans to have in orbit sometime in the next 15 years.

For example, the satellite will also provide precise acreage counts—and perhaps even accurate yield estimates—on all the major crops in the United States and around the world.

This could eliminate millions of dollars in losses that can be suffered by farmers, traders and processors due to faulty crop estimates.

This would be immensely valuable information for the financial planning of the storage and transportation industries that handle farm production.

It could also help government leaders to assess strengths and weaknesses of China and Russia, by providing the first accurate estimates of their potential food production.

It would allow American agriculture to boost its production to offset an impending crop failure in another part of the world, or cut back in the face of a developing world surplus.

The satellite might even help a backward nation plan its agricultural development by pinpointing a remote area of the country with favorable soil types, high water-holding capacity and high fertility.

Most important, the voluminous data collected worldwide by the satellite would be analyzed and correlated almost overnight by a computer, and presented in an easily interpreted printed form.

The research base for this space-age wizardry is taking shape at Purdue University, in an unpretentious, one-story blockhouse known as the Laboratory for Agricultural Remote Sensing (LARS).

Though less than 2 years old, the government-financed program already has produced, on a limited scale, some of the functions envisioned for an agricultural satellite in the 1980s.

LARS scientists, however, are grappling with two extremely complex problems that are at least a decade away from final solution, says R. B. MacDonald, the program's technical director.

The first is the matter of distinguishing accurately between a multitude of ground targets, and the second involves creation of a computer system for converting this flood of data into usable form in time for it to do any good—which means almost immediately.

A key to the first problem is the fact that all objects reflect, absorb and re-emit energy from the sun in a distinctive fashion.

This radiation, transmitted at a certain frequency (ultraviolet, visible and infrared) on the electromagnetic spectrum, represents on object's unique "signature."

An encouraging and fascinating round of successes in detecting these signatures already has been recorded. For instance:

LARS scientists, using an airborne "scanning spectrometer," have found that one of their simpler tasks is differentiating between soil, water and vegetation.

Various crops, when well along in development, also have been identified accurately by a spectrometer—though techniques are not yet refined enough for the similar signatures that are all green, to be distinguished effectively.

But planting patterns differ between various crops, for instance, corn and soybeans, so that a fairly accurate identification of young plants has been made by "sensing" the relationship of bare soil to vegetation.

Similarly, a change in this relationship from one part of a field to another has been identified correctly as a weed infestation.

Infrared film, in a University of Maine experiment, pinpointed clearly the pronounced change in signature of potato plants under stress from blight. The signature of different corn varieties, or corn planted on different dates, has been identified in the same way.

Taken together, these developments contain the crude elements of an operational agricultural remote sensing system.

The difficult question is, however: Given the wide number of radiation frequencies that could be scanned, which ones should be included in the design of the final sensing instruments?

The research is a paintaking, trial-and-error process—a matter of scanning many frequencies to find a unique response that might help establish the sign nature of a specific type of plant stress, or of a different species of green plants.

There's also the question of how atmosphere and cloud cover might affect a satellite reading, or how signatures might change from region to region or with different soil types and climates.

In tandem with this research, LARS scientists have had some encouraging success with the system that will automatically refine and interpret a huge amount of ground information.

Simply, the radiation data collected by airborne sensors is recorded on magnetic tape and then converted on another tape to the digital language a computer can understand.

Data from a small portion of the flyover area then is compared with ground information collected earlier on the types and conditions of crops planted at several "checkpoints" along the way.

If a certain radiation value has been picked up from a checkpoint that is known to be planted in corn or soybeans, for example, then that value is established as the current "signature" of the crop.

Enough comparisons are made in this manner to establish what MacDonald calls a valid "training sample" for the flyover area.

Finally, the computer applies the radiation values established in the training sample, using them to analyze and identify the targets surveyed.

What results is a printout showing the distinctive patterns of field boundaries, with each crop identified by such symbols as C for corn, W for wheat, S for soybeans or, simply, G for green.

Each character can be made to represent as small an area—for example, 10 square feet or less—as required by the information sought.

Without this "training-sample" approach, MacDonald explains, it would be necessary for researchers to establish an infinite number of signatures, involving many targets under a wide variety of conditions.

FARM TOWNS MAY SOON MOVE OUT TO SEA—THEY'LL SERVE HARVESTERS OF OCEAN

(Last in a series)

(By Dick Youngblood

Athelstan Spilhaus, the intellectual gadfly whose curiosity roams all the way from the sea to the stars, envisions the revival within 30 years of the small family farm and the little town that served it.

This "rural community," however will be floating out on the ocean.

The sea-going city would be supported by a fish-processing plant and equipped with the usual assortment of grocery stores, movie theaters and taverns—not to mention churches and hospitals.

It would be a market center and headquarters for the "Saturday night on the town," long familiar in rural America.

But this time it would serve the fishing fleets—and the "sea farmers"—that have spent the week harvesting the ocean.

"It's perfectly stupid to catch the fish and bring them back to land intact," he declared, "Why not do the processing at sea and bring back only what will be eaten?"

Spilhaus, who resigned recently from the university to become president of the Franklin Institute of Science, Philadelphia, Pa., is known internationally as an expert in oceanography and meteorology.

A penchant for seemingly outrageous crystal ball gazing, however, often has made him a controversial figure in the scientific world.

But as more and more attention is turned to the sea, as a rich source of protein for a mounting world population, Spilhaus' extreme proposals often begin to look like feasible solutions.

An article published in "International Science and Technology" magazine is an example.

"Less than 10 per cent of the world fish catch (more than 50 million tons a year) currently is taken in the southern hemisphere," the magazine reported, "although it has larger areas of high fertility than the North Atlantic and North Pacific."

In fact, all but a dozen of the 20,000 known species of fish now are underexploited or not exploited at all, the magazine reported.

A major reason for this, it explained, is distance to markets.

Its solution, Floating "protein-processing" plants, fed by several harvesting units and operated much like whaling fleets, would reduce waste, weight, spoilage—and costs.

Spilhaus' floating city—"to make life more attractive on the sea"—is merely a logical extension of this.

"Fishing today is utterly primitive compared to land farming," he says. "We hunt fish rather than husbanding them."

In 30 years, Spilhaus predicts, acres of bottom-feeding marine life will be raised like livestock on the continental shelves, fenced

in by columns of air bubbles and herded by dolphins—"the sheep dogs of the future."

Harvesting would be done by men residing under the sea, selecting the "produce" that's ready for market much as a cattleman does today.

In fact, prototypes of manned underwater vehicles and robot manipulators for underwater farming already are being developed, International Science and Technology magazine reports.

Another idea he long has expounded—lining coastal areas with old automobiles, which attract large fish populations—already is being tried successfully in California.

The question remains, however: How much of an annual fish harvest can the ocean sustain without, as Spilhaus puts it, "robbing nature, rather than borrowing from her." Estimates of the experts range from three times all the way up to 40 times the current level.

But the limits simply cannot be established until far more is known about the sea and its inhabitants, says Louis D. Stringer, an assistant branch chief in the Federal Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

Victor L. Loosanoff, former senior scientist with the Bureau, points out, however, that "reliable evidence shows that populations of oceanic fishes are not so great they cannot be quickly and drastically reduced by man's fishing efforts."

A promising answer may lie in the work of Lauren Donaldson, a University of Washington researcher who has bred a species of rainbow trout that weighs nearly 20 pounds at three years of age.

Now he is attempting to crossbreed these giants with steelhead trout, which migrate to sea before returning unerringly to its birthplace to spawn. The potential is obvious:

Raise the fish in coastal "ranches." Ship them out to sea to "graze." Then "round 'em up" when the sexual urge brings them back to spawn.

To conserve fish food, Spilhaus predicts, ways will be found to rid the seas of undesirable species—in effect, to "weed the ocean."

Ultimately, he sees sections of the continental shelf fenced off to hold in fish, with waste heat from nuclear power plants used to warm northern waters and help create the natural updrafts that lift nutrients from the ocean floor into the feeding areas.

A more imminent development, experts agree, will be hatcheries and "feed-lots" for raising shellfish and crustaceans, built in an estimated 30 million acres of lagoons and inlets along the world's seacoasts.

Important progress already has been made in the difficult task of inducing spawning oysters and raising them in captivity, Stringer points out. And Loosanoff notes that lobsters also can now be hatched in large numbers, using special equipment.

Both of these developments point toward true "sea farming" in the future, including selective breeding for improved species and controlled environment "feedlots" for optimum production.

Other research leads in the same direction.

An experiment with mussel culture in Italy actually produced more than 100,000 of the little critters per acre annually.

In South Carolina, scientists have found that highly productive shrimp farms can be operated in artificially constructed marsh ponds, built for as little as $35 to $50 an acre.

Construction, maintenance and operation of a modern shrimp trawler is so expensive, the scientists concluded, that a large acreage of marsh ponds could be built and operated for several years for the same money.

Not to be outdone, Spilhaus takes even this far-reaching research a step further. As these techniques are refined, he predicts, it will be only a short hop to "high-rise" shrimp and oyster farms right in downtown Minneapolis.

IMPORTANCE OF LABOR EDUCATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, so that this may be a more progressive democracy, education must continue beyond the primary, secondary, and college classroom. Labor education is one of the means of training better union leaders at all levels, better able to serve their colleagues and their communities.

Walter G. Davis, director of the AFL-CIO Department of Education, recently discussed the American approach to labor education as he addressed the first World Conference on Education in the Trade Union Movement, conducted by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, in Montreal, Canada.

Mr. Davis' address was printed in the current issue the American Federationist, the AFL-CIO official monthly magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Labor Education and Effective Unions," be printed in the RECORD.

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

LABOR EDUCATION AND EFFECTIVE UNIONS

(By Walter G. Davis)

If one begins with the simple hypothesis that the vast majority of citizens of all countries are workers and that workers organized into trade unions represent a significant force for social, political and economic good, then it will logically follow that the effectiveness of the trade union movement will determine the degree to which workers have or will achieve their objectives of social, political and economic justice.

This I consider to be a universal truth. The road to justice for workers is a winding road. Its length, shape and width does adjust to individual countries but, like most everything else in the world community, there is more similarity of purpose today, there is more understanding of world problems because of better communications between nations, at least in a technological sense. Likewise, better communications between trade unionists permit us to share our experiences and to assist each other with our problems.

Workers are experiencing similar problems with their employers and internally the trade union movements can readily identify the problems of members which need immediate attention.

I would like to set forth what I believe to be the important areas for training within the labor movement if it is to play its proper and effective role in a free society.

The role of the AFL-CIO Department of Education has been developed within the broad mandate set forth in Article III(f) of the AFL-CIO Constitution. The Department operates as the staff arm of the Standing Committee on Education.

Its work involves the promotion of "the widest possible understanding among union members of the aims of the Federation." It "shall assist affiliated unions in developing their own educational programs and shall implement the Federation's interest in providing the nation with the highest standard of education at all levels."

In response to this mandate, the Department has engaged in a variety of activities to promote trade union training in two basic areas. One is concerned with strengthening the union while the other is designed to strengthen the movement.

Let us look at the first area. In the United States, a profile of a strong, effective union has several elements:

There must be a stable political government at the top. This means that national leadership is attuned to all of the important social, political and economic matters affecting the union and the industry to which it is related. Unions with multi-industry relations are also included. The leaders in this case must be even better informed on the history of the various industries.

The union must have an aggressive organizing program, for in most cases program development in the union depends on its resources, which in turn relates to its size. A possible exception, of course, would be in the case of highly skilled workers normally considered in the professional class, i.e., airline pilots or the performing arts.

Connected to this effort must be an effective new member program, for once the workers become organized they must become unionized.

The union must have an imaginative ongoing staff training program for its national and/or district staffmembers.

It must have an education division with adequately trained staff. It should develop its own research division related to its needs.

There must be effective two-way communication between the national body and the local union and between itself and the national federation.

It must participate fully in the shaping of policy at the national, state and local trade union levels.

Of its many objectives, it must develop program review functions designed to keep always in forward motion toward its goals.

In general, it must address itself to all of the matters affecting its members and the total movement of which it is a part.

Trade union training programs, therefore, depend upon the needs of the union in the categories mentioned above. I have by no means exhausted the list in my profile. I am merely asserting that unions structured as outlined above tend to have strength, stability and growth potential.

Before discussing actual programs, let me underscore the point that trade union training affects all of the forgoing elements and, therefore, is vital to the union in every imaginable way.

The union profile notion can serve as a master plan for action for those organizations planning administrative reorganization. This concept is encouraged by the AFL-CIO Department of Education and receives active response from affiliated national unions and state and local central bodies.

To the extent that union officials carry out the objectives of the master plan, I submit that the union will successfully meet the everyday challenge that it faces. It will be strong and effective and it will attract new members.

The literature from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the International Labor Organization and eminent scholars from the universities in the field of union education has more than adequately defined the term "trade union training" as distinguished from workers' education. I, therefore, wish to borrow what seems to me an accurate definition which appeared in "Education News No. 1" entitled "Trade Union Training," published by the ICFTU in October 1960.

The aim of trade union training is to "make trade unionists." "In addition to the lessons of workers' education, trade union training aims to impart to those who benefit from it a more systematic knowledge of the economic, social and political problems involved in the running of public affairs. Furthermore, it should develop, amongst those who accept the responsibility for trade union affairs, qualities of combativity, tenacity and perseverance in action, honesty in the running of an organization and psychology and knowledge of human nature.

"In a nutshell, the main task of trade

union training is to make leaders determined to defend the interests of the workers who, by democratic procedures, have placed their trust in them."

It is important, therefore, who does the training. Should such programs remain within the structure of the trade union movement? Should they be carried on at the university labor education center? If so, should the university have the responsibility of determining the extent of the union's requirements?

In the United States, unions engage in programs which are developed and carried out by and within the union and also programs jointly planned with university labor education centers. The union spells out the need in the latter case—quite often in consultation with the Education Department of the AFL–CIO.

Many other countries have their own labor colleges to meet the need. This is currently under consideration in the AFL–CIO. But, may I hasten to add, however, it is not our intent to replace the university with our own, for American universities which have concerned themselves with the training of workers and their representatives are making a valuable contribution to the trade union movement and to our nation.

Our present interest is to promote the expansion of university labor education centers, particularly among the southern tier of states in the United States. It is ironic for us to find state universities, supported by the workers' tax dollars, providing services for business and management while refusing to provide comparable services for the labor movement.

Of the various possible forms of trade union training, we offer a variety, depending upon the size of the union and its resources.

For members, local officers and staff who demonstrate outstanding qualities in terms of their union commitment, educational background and understanding of human nature, there is the long-term residential labor program at Harvard University. Originally a 9-month program, it now provides 13 weeks of intensive training. This type of program represents a worthwhile investment in union training. It is comprehensive in its curricula and has produced a significant number of union officers who have maintained their interest in training and workers' education.

The weekend conference or institute has by far been the most popular because it avoids the reimbursement of lost time to workers not serving as full-time union staff representatives.

National unions offer the majority of training opportunities during the summer months in summer schools which run from 3 to 5 days.

There are state federation-sponsored schools which generally run one week and which are planned and carried out jointly with the sponsoring organization, the AFL–CIO Department of Education and the state university with which it maintains close liaison. Where there is no university with a labor program, the AFL–CIO conducts regional one-week schools covering several states. This year, 150 summer schools have been scheduled. Of these, 122 are sponsored by national unions.

Many of the larger international unions operate their own staff training centers on a year-round basis. These vary in length but are comprehensive and oriented to the needs of the individual unions. Worthy of mention is a recent innovative staff intern program developed by the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employes, an affiliate of the AFL–CIO now enjoying rapid growth among state and local government workers. The union opened a three-month pilot program at its international headquarters for rank-and-file members, leading to possible staff intern position with the union. After the screening of applicants, 15 were selected and brought to Washington, D.C., for general orientation. This was followed by three weeks of strenuous class sessions covering a variety of subjects, from political action and labor history to collective bargaining, community organization and other subjects. Important labor and government officials were brought in during the period to discuss the subjects in the courses. Each was then assigned to a field supervisor after the first month to observe firsthand what problems union organizers and staff representatives face. The final week was assigned to the evaluation of each student and graduation. Of the 15 starters, two were dropped and staff assignments were provided the remainder.

Trade union staff and officer training is developing in a significant way in the U.S. Almost all of the 129 national affiliates conduct some programs for full-time staff. Such programs vary in approach and level of leadership coverage. Here are some basic features:

Training programs generally presuppose that the student has already been exposed to the basic courses offered in the regular workers' education programs.

The larger unions schedule long-range programs to assure that every union staff representative participates in the program.

Unions tend to select seminar topics relevant to the problems in their industry. Thus automation and time-study programs are included in virtually all staff training programs since these are considered a national problem for unions in the United States.

In training union organizers, great emphasis has been placed upon communication skills and recently on the general principles of sociology. In-plant committees are now exposed to some basic training about the trade union movement to facilitate the work of the organizers. The effectiveness of the in-plant committee in organizing a hostile company quite often makes the difference between success and failure in the campaign.

Looking to the future, teacher training programs offer great hope for the achievement of total union involvement in labor education and trade union training. International unions, AFL-CIO state councils and the AFL–CIO Education Department are presently making plans for the development of such programs. Many of the smaller union organizations with little budget and small staffs can benefit from these programs, particularly where teachers are trained to teach shop stewards at the local level. The expense of travel and time for international officers and staff representatives to handle minor grievances is grossly inefficient and costly to the union.

This matter will be on the agenda of future meetings between AFL–CIO representatives and representatives of university labor education centers.

Of the unions reporting about the features of their long-term staff training programs, the seminar approach appears to be most popular. Topics vary but collective bargaining, social insurance and new legislation appear high on the list.

In most longterm programs (three weeks or more), theory courses involving a variety of subjects are offered. This is generally followed by traditional union courses such as labor law, contracts, etc.

Time is reserved for a how-to-do-it section of instruction. The "how" method is often made an integral part of the curriculum.

The list of unions engaged in longterm staff training is beginning to grow as of 1967. Pioneers in this field have been the Communications Workers of America, the United Auto Workers, International Ladies' Garment Workers and United Steelworkers of America. This year, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employes and the Laborers' International Union, among others, have significantly contributed to this effort.

Programmed learning as a teaching technique has been reported to be successful by those unions venturing into this new field. The UAW develops its own programs using this technique while others utilize the services of specialized organizations in the field.

This technique forces the student to think about a problem. Advocates of this technique claim that, when confronted with a series of questions presented in logical sequence, the student learns more. Questions are formulated around some of the situations the students may be called on to handle in carrying out his everyday responsibilities. The correct answers are provided the student but only after he has attempted to provide his own answer.

The UAW also reports a need for introducing courses designed to speed up the reading and comprehension of its staff. This need appears universal within the labor movement as a voluminous amount of material crosses the desks of union leaders.

One of the most interesting new programs in trade union training is the series of top-level conferences for elected union officers run by the Advanced Study Program of Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C.

More than 75 of our nation's influential labor leaders have participated so far. Seventeen of these were principal officers of international unions.

Fred Hoehler of the United Steelworkers of America, a long-time expert in the field of labor education, planned these conferences in cooperation with an advisory committee selected from the AFL–CIO Executive Council.

One major effect of these conferences was to stimulate additional interest in labor education among those leaders who had not pressed such programs in the past.

The second areas of union training which American unions promote can be best described as courses to strengthen the labor movement.

American unions are now issue-minded in the sense that where there are defeats of labor candidates in local or national elections, it is directly felt by the workers.

It is felt in administrative policies of government agencies, in legislation and in the general economic philosophy of the country or region.

Where an anti-labor candidate is elected to high public office, it is sometimes interpreted by those outside the movement to mean the time has come to stop labor's progress or, even worse, to further restrict labor's rights.

Staff representatives are expected to provide leadership in their dealings with rank-and-file members to head off this possibility and, therefore, must be as well informed about the issues involved as possible.

Such matters as government spending, taxation, housing legislation, civil rights and the political process are considered important subjects for any summer school, weekend institute or conference.

Guest lecturers are generally high ranking public officials or experts from the trade union movement or the university. The utilitarian value of these courses is significant in that they strengthen and implement the objectives of the national union and the AFL–CIO.

In most cases, special recruiting efforts are made to assure participation by the level of leadership contemplated in program planning.

National unions generally use AFL–CIO manuals, films and materials in this phase of their program although some unions produce their own.

Programs in this phase are not always politically related in the direct sense. Sometimes the nation is divided on an important controversial issue as was the case on civil

rights and the Negro's struggle for social, political and economic justice.

Since union members reflect the attitudes of their communities, it was necessary for workers, officers and staff members to develop an understanding of the merits of the civil rights cause and its implications to the labor movement. Techniques such as boycotts and picketing employed in civil rights were borrowed from the earlier union struggles of the 1930s.

The effect of union education programs in civil rights facilitated formation of a coalition of the religious, labor, liberal and Negro communities which was responsible for passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The development of local union education committees in the United States has increased during the past five years. Of the active national unions in this field, an excellent example would be the Communications Workers of America. CWA locals, under the direction of their national Education Department, have organized local union programs which included film showings at local meetings, special conferences on current topics, both local and national, and participation in labor discussions in high schools in their areas. Local education committees also work closely with university extension services which are helpful in providing expert advice and counsel in the planning of programs.

To give an example of recent trends, I would like to single out the growing interest in the training of local and national full-time staff in the Steelworkers, Operating Engineers, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Painters, Carpenters and Laborers' Union.

The Ladies' Garment Workers' training program, although somewhat geared to the problems of the industry, does go significantly beyond this. The underlying philosophy of their program rests on the rational proposition that "the complexities of industry and society dictate that the union representative be trained in many areas beyond the basic elements of the union-management contract. . . . The modern union representative must also know politics, law and administration." With its membership, the majority of which are women, this union has developed trade union training with a spirit of innovation.

Over 500 staff members of the United Auto Workers have completed at least one 3-week seminar of staff training—some more than once. This program has been conducted at their national center. In addition, 4-day seminars relating to one subject important to the union has been conducted on a regional basis. For example, this year's program dealt with the Report of the President's Commission on Automation. Another of the UAW series of 4-day seminars is oriented around the economic problems of the auto, areospace and agricultural industries. Short-term specialty seminars deal with such subjects as arbitration, current developments in time-study and production problems.

The union has developed a series of discussions of current union political and social problems which is organized around a publication called "The Simulated Union." In this publication, a mythical but realistic union with its community and its leadership, contract and constitution are described, and a series of problems based on the simulation is posed for discussion. The discussions range from civil rights and political action to union administration and arbitration.

The union also plans a series of seminars in international affairs at Harvard University in the near future.

The AFL–CIO has been operating residential seimnars to train staff and officers of Latin-American unions through the American Institute for Free Labor Development. In cooperation with the AFL–CIO Department of Education, programs were planned to acquaint these union leaders with the American union experience. Special training in economics was offered at Loyola University in New Orleans for those qualified, a program since moved to Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. The mushrooming effect of the AIFLD program is evidenced by the follow-up programming in labor education when the students return to their countries. Over 60,000 Latin-American unionists have been exposed to some training over the past four years as a result.

Another important development in our education efforts is our work with the government unions. For the past four years, the AFL–CIO Department of Education has been involved in education programs that have had great impact on federal government unions. These educational activities have been carried on in cooperation with the postal unions, the unions representing the skilled crafts in the federal government (Metal Trades Department and its affiliated unions), the American Federation of Government Employees, the Government Employees Council, as well as several university workers' education centers.

These programs were developed immediately after collective bargaining rights were extended to the federal government employees in 1962. These activities centered around three objectives: to acquaint local and national union officers with the problems of collective bargaining, to train negotiating committees and to build an effective shop steward system.

Varied types of training, special curricula and study materials had to be prepared to effectively serve the various levels in the structure of the federal unions—the local union officers and stewards, the full-time national staff representatives and the training of new instructors.

The role of the university in American trade union training has been a significant one.

The activities of the 25 workers' education centers at universities relate to all phases of workers' education in the United States. Universities may offer their own programs or they may develop programs upon request and in cooperation with local and national unions and the AFL–CIO Department of Education.

The spectrum of university activities includes long-term and short-term, resident and non-resident programs; courses for all levels of union officers and for full-time staff; general workers' education and specialized training programs. Some universities have specialized in full-time staff training (including programs for education staff), collective bargaining, time and motion study and similar technical courses. Many programs are sponsored in cooperation with the AFL–CIO Department of Education, particularly in the field of staff training.

There are signs that the traditional controversy involving union suspicion of the "pro-business" orientation of university programs appears to be dissipating mainly because of the increased needs of unions and because of increased effectiveness of labor advisory committees in program planning.

The AFL–CIO Department of Education plans a series of conferences for labor advisory committees in the near future, hopefully to discern the present characteristics of these relationships and hopefully to find ways to strengthen union-university relations.

There is more than enough experience in method and in the development of course material to now provide for American workers and their union leaders coherent ongoing union training programs which will accrue to the benefit of the trade union movement in the United States and to free trade unions everywhere.

VIETNAM'S PROSPEROUS LOTTERY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Embassy of Vietnam here in Washington issues a monthly publication entitled Vietnam Bulletin, sponsored by its Office of Cultural Affairs and Information. In a recent issue there appeared an item describing with pride an aspect of current Vietnamese culture which I found most interesting. It is captioned "Instant Wealth Through Vietnam's Lottery."

The article asserts that in 1966 the Vietnamese people spent 2,100 million piastres—$357,000,000—on the national lottery. This works out to some $23 per person—man, woman, and child—on the basis of a 15 million population. But with about half the country under the control of the Vietcong, the truer rate must run closer to $50 per person.

It is interesting to know, too, that distribution of the tickets is one of the prerogatives of the Province chiefs. One can only conjecture as to whether they, or others dealing with the ticket distribution, find this an onerous task or a desirable fringe benefit of office.

The article places the operating costs at 10 percent, which means that the state is paying more than $35,000,000 for the privilege of offering its people a chance at "instant wealth." Income to the government is stated to be 850 million piastres in a year, which is $144,500,000. Since these figures—the government revenue and the operating costs—add up to $180 million out of the $357 million taken in, one is left wondering what happened to the other $177 million. The article does not deal with this question.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

INSTANT WEALTH THROUGH VIETNAM'S LOTTERY

Each week, three million Vietnamese purchase lottery tickets for twenty piastres—about seventeen cents U.S.—in the hope of becoming a millionaire on Tuesday afternoon.

The chances are one in a million of becoming one of the three lucky top winners, but hundreds win lesser amounts ranging from two hundred piastres to 200,000-piastre boons. For the government of the Republic of Vietnam, the National Reconstruction Lottery brings in 850 million piastres a year to the country's hard pressed budget. The three top winners of the weekly drawings each get two million piastres.

Vietnam, like Mexico, Thailand, Italy and France and other countries that have utilized lotteries as an additional source of national income, carefully control each step of the lottery to insure honesty and to maximize the profit.

In 1966 the Vietnamese people spent 2,100 million piastres on the lottery. Sixty percent of the take was distributed in prizes, 10 percent was earmarked for operating costs, and 30 percent was left for the Vietnamese treasury. Operating costs include administrative expenses (4%) and commissions to wholesalers and retailers (6%).

There are 36,708 winning tickets each week out of the 3 million, which is better than one winning ticket in one hundred. The cream of the prizes are the three "doc-dac", a tier of fifteen awards of 200,000 piastres

each, and a tier of fifteen 100,000 piastre prizes.

The rest of the winners consist of one hundred and eighty 20,000-piastre prizes, and lesser prizes of 10,000, 2,000, 1,000, and 200 piastres. A ticket which differs from the top winning ticket by only one digit wins a consolation prize of 4,000 piastres. Thus as opposed to three lucky new millionaires there are 162 persons in Vietnam each week who "almost" make it.

The brightly colored tickets are sold in Government offices and at hundreds of sheet booths or newsstands in the larger cities. Designed by painter Van Thanh, they are issued in three series of a million each. They bear identical numbers from 000,000 to 999,-999, but with different letter prefixes—A, AA and AAA, for instance. For each series, the grand prize 2 million piastres, and 12,235 lesser prizes are awarded.

An inter-ministerial commission with representatives of the Departments of Finance, Labor, Economy, Social Welfare, Information and Justice controls the circulation of the tickets. In Saigon, sales are managed through the Department of Finance and other government agencies. The office of the Province Chief handles distribution in each of the country's forty-four rural provinces.

According to Mr. Nguyen Van Son, a member of the Lottery Commission, the government tries to discourage attempts to convert losing tickets into winners by changing the numbers. The tickets are printed on a special kind of safe paper imported from England. The Commission has its own presses and uses many secret marks and engravings that would make counterfeiting difficult. The penalty for counterfeiting a lottery ticket is 20 years in prison.

Lottery drawings are held in the 900 seat Thong-Nhut (Unity) Theatre, to which the public is lured by the promise of a free stage show, featuring Radio Saigon artists.

On the stage stand six steel spherical cages. Each cage contains 10 balls, on which the numbers from zero to nine are marked. The balls are set whirling when the teenagers spin the bird cages simultaneously. When the cages stop the winning digit from each of them drops in the cup below. Then the teenagers pick the balls and hold them up at arm's length for the audience to see.

The first cage provides the first digit of the winning number, the second cage the second, and so forth.

Some ticket holders go to the theatre to witness the drawing in person, but usually most of the seats are filled by teenagers. People who follow the event directly over the radio share with them the suspense and the free entertainment presented between the drawings. The results are published in official Vietnam Press bulletins (in Vietnamese, English and French) and all daily newspapers the next day.

Prior to 1955, only 600,000 tickets valued at ten piastres each were printed every week. Sales were low, even though the top prize was one million piastres.

In 1956, however, the government set a firm drawing date and began announcing results by radio. The official price remained at ten piasters per unit but the demand was so great that hawkers sold the tickets for twelve or thirteen piastres. By October 1965, the black-market became so vicious that the government enacted stern decrees to punish illegal sales, including nullification of bidders' contracts if the bidders violated the Lottery regulations.

During the first nine months of 1966, circulation rose to three million tickets a week. Unable to print more tickets, the government raised the price in September 1966 to twenty piastres, hoping to hold down volume. Each week there are now three winners, each getting two million piastres, instead of one million.

Many Vietnamese, enjoying unprecedented wages and desiring more of the good life, have sought through the lottery to make the big leap to wealth. During 1967, the lottery will make 156 Vietnamese millionaires—and many feel it is worth the odds. Of course, thousands more will earn from ten times to twenty-five thousand times the cost of their tickets.

On the streets of Saigon, in the smallest village market, and at many government offices, one can toss a 20-piastre note to a smiling ticket vendor and dream of two millions piastres. Who wouldn't?

THE NATION'S CAPITAL CITY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, earlier this year I addressed a Kiwanis Club gathering in Charleston, W. Va. For the occasion, the host club had as its guests other Kiwanis groups in the area as well as other outside guests. I was asked to speak on the role of the District of Columbia as the Nation's Capital City.

I ask unanimous consent that my address be placed in the RECORD.

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

THE ROLE OF THE DISTRICT AS THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Washington belongs to the Nation!

When the Congress was sitting in Philadelphia near the end of the Revolutionary War, a mob of disgruntled soldiers marched upon the Congress, surrounded the meeting hall, and threatened and interrupted the business of the National Legislature. Appeals by the Congress to the officials of the City of Philadelphia and to the officials of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania brought no assistance to the Congress. Lacking the power of control, the Congress removed to Princeton, New Jersey, to reconvene and get on with the execution of the Revolutionary War.

The genius of the framers of the Constitution found a solution to such a problem by providing for the establishment of the seat of the National Government at some location which was not a part of a City nor a part of a State, but an area ceded to the Federal Government and completely under the control of the Federal Government to serve for the sole purpose of becoming the seat of the National Government.

This concept was put into language by the framers of the Constitution, which provision was part of the Constitution ratified by the people of the States in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution which provided, among other powers of the Congress, that it ". . . exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States. . . ."

The Founding Fathers gave the District a unique role in that they did not ordain it as a seat of the Government, but, rather, as *the* seat of the Government—the one and only seat of the Government of the United States.

The District of Columbia was established solely, therefore, for the purpose of being the seat of the government of the United States, and it is first and foremost the Federal City. It belongs to every American citizen no matter where he lives. This is a city *sui generis*, and I want the District of Columbia to remain the unique city that it is.

Granted that there are many features of the present running of the District of Columbia which can be improved—as is the case with any city—there is no ground for assuming that the governmental purposes and functions would be better, or as well, served if the United States abrogated to the residents its duty of providing a safe center of government. I do believe, however, that they should have a voting delegate in the House of Representatives.

As the home of the Federal Government, the District stands in a profoundly and magnificently unique role. As the Federal City, of course, the District commands a prestigious position unequalled by any other American city and in many respects, by any other city in the world.

Here it is that the three great coordinate branches of Government of this Republic have their seats. Congress meets annually in Washington; The President and the Executive family live and function there; the Judiciary, represented by the highest court in the land, holds its sessions there. The eyes of the nation look toward Washington, so named for the first President of our country.

No other American city is so richly endowed by history, so favored with Federal largesse and payroll, so courted by student and diplomat, so blessed with memorials and museums—in truth, it is the Constantinople of the modern world—a city like him for whom it was named: first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen. Homer, of old, wrote of Mt. Olympus in northern Thessaly, where Zeus, king of the Gods and arbiter of human destiny, sat upon its topmost ridges and made or marred the fortunes of human beings.

Washington, like Mt. Olympus, often decides the interests of the State and determines the destinies of men. It marks their futures, for war or for peace, and its influence upon the fortunes of old and young, rich and poor, rustic and urbane, is felt from the cradle to the grave. President, Shah, and King; Senator and Governor; scientist, inventor and astronaut; lawyer, merchant and priest—the paths of all cross here—the Capital of the Nation.

Viewed historically, the role of home rule for the District of Columbia is divided into two periods of almost equal length. throughout the first period, beginning in 1802 and continuing for almost three quarters of a century, District residents lived under varying degrees of self-government. Then came the political and financial crisis of the 1870's and this privilege was taken away by Congress. The Commission form, now in effect and substantially unchanged through the years, was installed during that period.

So, for the first 70-odd years of its history, the District of Columbia experienced some measure of home rule. For a decade, from 1802 to 1812, it was governed by a city council and Mayor. The City Council, of 12 members, was elected by the eligible voters. The twelve members chose from their own ranks five persons to serve in the second Chamber, while the remaining seven made up the first chamber.

The mayor was appointed by the President.

Over the next eight years the original two-chamber council was replaced by an eight-member Board of Aldermen elected for two years and a twelve-member Board of Common Council elected for one year. The Mayor was elected annually by a majority vote of the Aldermen and Common Council Members.

Legislation was enacted in 1820 providing for election of a mayor for a two year term by the vote of the people, who continued to elect the Board of Aldermen and the Common Council. This basic form of government remained in effect without important change for more than 50 years, until the 1870's.

In 1871, Congress established a territorial form of government, and abolished the office of mayor, and provided for a Governor to be appointed by the President for a four year term with senatorial consent. A four-member Board of Public Works was created, its members to be appointed by the President.

A two-chamber legislative assembly was made up of an eleven member Council and a 22-member House of Delegates, the former appointed by the President, and the latter elected by the people. The voters also chose a delegate to the House of Representatives who served on the District of Columbia Committee, but who could not vote. This government lasted three years. In 1874, legislation was passed placing the government in the hands of three commissioners, appointed by the President and all elective offices were abolished. This was avowedly a temporary government. A joint Congressional Committee was to study and consider a permanent form of Government of the District.

This permanent government was created by an 1878 act, the organic law under which the District is governed today.

The District was made a municipal corporation, and the administration of its officers was the responsibility of three Commissioners, appointed by the President and approved by the Senate.

One may ask why the Congress acted as it did almost a century ago with regard to the District of Columbia government.

There were several factors among which were the rapid population growth of the city after the Civil War; the desire to transform Washington into a city of beauty, dignity, and attractiveness befitting the Nation's Capital; a serious and immediate need for greatly improved and expanded public works and services; racial problems; political differences; and financial difficulties.

The acute stage of the crisis leading to the loss of home rule began under the administration of Mayor Sayles J. Bowen. Money was lacking for basic and essential improvements which would have been possible only through the assistance of Congress.

Local politicians competed among themselves for favors, and finally it was revealed that the mayor had made payments to contractors in anticipation of tax collections.

Teachers, laborers and other city employees had not been paid for months. The city treasury was so empty that on one occasion the furniture in the mayor's office was seized because of the corporation's failure to pay a small bill.

The ultimate decision, therefore, to deprive the District of Columbia of home rule and establish the commission form of government was based, among other things, on the necessity of keeping the District on a sound financial basis, and the experience of the 1870's is not without relevance to the home rule question today.

The overriding Federal interest in the District is everywhere conceded, and this interest would be compromised and diluted by home rule.

The seat of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia are one and the same and inseparable, and to superimpose a home rule government on Washington would be artificial and a continuing source of friction.

Were this not the Federal capital, the situation would be otherwise, and we would all join in supporting the principle of self-government.

But the District of Columbia is impacted with Federal Government.

The Federal Government asserts pressures and *responsibilities* on the District of Columbia that no other United States city has experienced.

For example, about 43% of the city, by area, is in Federal title, and about 37% by value.

It is almost as if every other building in the city were owned by the United States government. A landlord of that size asserts quite a bit of influence whether or not he consciously exercises it.

Moreover, the Federal Government is the city's chief industry.

The people employed in Washington by the Federal Government equal ⅓ of the city's population.

Federal grant-in-aid moneys poured into the District at the rate of $128 million in FY 1967 and the total is estimated at $167 million in FY 1968.

The Federal Government provides most of the city's celebrities and stimulates most of the area's social life, conversation, and news. The historical sites, museums, memorials, and Federal governmental activities attract over 9 million tourists to the District annually, and these tourists spend on an average of approximately $50 each.

They not only bring good business to the District of Columbia, but they also contribute several million dollars in tax revenues. Hence Washington has closer financial ties to the Federal Government than has any other city.

It seems to me that the facts I have already stated would constitute convincing reasons why Home Rule would not be in the best interests of the District of Columbia, the Federal Government, or the Nation.

Moreover, machine politics, which thrives on the problems of cities, would probably introduce its handmaiden, graft, which is also a stranger, by and large, to the commission form of government in Washington.

Having served 7 years as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I know, as perhaps no other member of the Senate knows, the ineffable pressures which can be brought to bear in behalf of programs, various and sundry, sound and unsound, by groups which appear to be oblivious to the important question as to how the money will be raised or from where it will come. The City of Washington has no industry and, because of its geographical limitations, no prospects for future development of an industrial tax base.

Often those who clamor loudest for expensive programs are those who pay little or no taxes to support the present governmental functions and who would pay little or no taxes in support of the programs espoused.

Yet these same individuals would vote for the city officials under Home Rule.

Many individual taxpayers have fled the city and the exodus is continuing, the vacuum being filled by illiterate, nontaxpaying people. Control of the Police Department by elected city officials in the District of Columbia would result in a complete demoralization of the Police Department and diminish protection for the citizens, both white and Negro, of the District, and for the millions of Americans who annually visit the city as sightseers and tourists.

If we are to provide police protection—uncontrolled by machine politics and uninfluenced by pressure groups—to the millions of Americans and to people from other countries who come to this city, the Police Department in the District of Columbia must not be placed under the control of elected city officials as would be the case if Home Rule should be given back to the District of Columbia.

One has only to recall the recent and continuing attacks on the track system to fully understand that District of Columbia Home Rule would inevitably result in the domination of the educational programs in the District of Columbia by pressure groups which, in many instances, appear to be guided by emotions rather than reason, experience, and a full consideration and knowledge of all the sociological facts involved.

FEDERAL-STATE EDUCATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Commissioner of Education has invited my attention to a significant article entitled "Federal-State Educational Relations," published in the September 1967 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan. The author of the article is Dean Roald F. Campbell, of the Graduate School of Education of the University of Chicago.

The paper was originally presented at a May 1967 meeting of the Education Commission of the States at Denver, Colo.

I bring the article to the attention of Senators at this time so that they may have an opportunity to review the points made by this distinguished educator, since the subject of his article can inform the Senate debate upon educational legislation in this session.

I commend the article to the Senate for review and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL-STATE EDUCATIONAL RELATIONS

(NOTE.—Planners of the May, 1967, meeting of the Education Commission of the States suggested that the federal government may be making a power play for educational control. Here is a thoughtful analysis of the present status of federal-state relations, with suggestions for reducing power aspects and emphasizing the interdependent, creative relationship.)

(By Roald F. Campbell)

The announcement of this conference carried the theme, "power-play for control of education." This theme seems to imply that state and federal governments are locked in conflict in an attempt to seize control of our schools and colleges. Despite the differences state and federal governments may have regarding the control of our educational institutions, I cannot ascribe sinister motives to either level of government as they strive to integrate their efforts toward achieving the best possible educational system for our nation and for each of its subdivisions.

With World War II, federal participation in education, always present in a minor way, took a quantum jump. The GI bill of rights represented the largest fellowship program ever attempted. This was followed by the creation of the National Science Foundation, the National Defense Education Act, and the great quantity of more recent legislation. Two of our presidents have made education an important cornerstone in the American dream. Legislation devised to create the Great Society has placed great strain upon American federalism.

All of us find ourselves in a new world of education. Expectations held for schools and colleges have multiplied, our social and economic objectives are increasingly thought to be tied to our educational efforts, costs have risen even faster than enrollments, more and more our political leaders must take stands on educational issues. In this educational ferment the chief initiative for the improvement of education has passed from local and state agencies to the federal government. The federal government, including its legislative and executive branches, seeks advice as it attempts to formulate and pass legislation and to administer programs designed to bring greater quality to our educational endeavors.

This advice comes from a wide spectrum of spokesmen—the establishment and the non-establishment or, if you wish, the old establishment and the new establishment. In this process schoolmen at local and state levels often feel left out. They note the prominent role played by university scholars, foundation officers, and political leaders. Advice from a variety of sources has led to many federal programs, often with little coordination at the national level but frequently

requiring much collaboration at the local level. My purpose today is to analyze some of the relationships between and among federal and state agencies, to note some of the problems and issues that arise out of these interactions, and to suggest that these relations may best be understood when seen as part of a national social system for education.

Let us turn first to some of the problems I shall mention only two. The first has to do with the programs of the Office of Education itself. Programs appear to be too numerous and too frequently revised. I recognized that the Office must implement each of the titles mandated to it by the Congress. Moreover, I suspect that the USOE has been subjected to considerable pressure from the Executive Office of the President and the Bureau of the Budget. Even so, it seems to me that the Office must insist on some additional integrity for itself.

I have the impression that the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health have more control over their own procedures and programs than does the U.S. Office of Education. If this be the case, the more tenuous position of the Office may be due, in part, to a more diverse mission and possibly to lack of the kind of support other agencies have in the scientific community. But part of the problem seems to reside within the Office itself. The decision to establish a major research training program in 1966 and to cut it back in 1967 seems to have been, at least in part, an allocation decision within the Office. The decision to decentralize postdoctoral fellowship admissions procedures in 1966 and to centralize them in 1967 seems to be another example of uncertainty. Also, some would suggest that the Office has had a vacillating policy with respect to the purpose and financing of regional laboratories.

In any case, it seems that the Office ought to settle down a bit, decide what programs it must offer, develop the necessary guidelines and let them stand a few years, and put its energies into making such programs work. Undoubtedly there was a time for change and effervescence in the Office. The time for stability and accomplishment now seems to be at hand.

The second problem is a related one: the administration of federal programs. Again, much of the problem grows out of the unprecedented growth of federal programs, the rapid expansion of personnel in the Office of Education, and the time limits imposed by congressional action. Even so, lack of lead time, relative instability of programs, and specificity of budgets and reporting procedures have imposed great difficulties on local and state educational agencies. We must all help the Congress understand that a program can hardly begin in July when appropriations are not made until the following December. Moreover, the personnel demands for many of the new programs require careful search, sometimes even the establishment of new programs for training, before people can be put on the job.

The short-run nature of some federal programs creates other staffing problems. Efforts to secure additional, specialized personnel are not encouraged unless there are fair indications that such people can be assured of reasonable employment conditions. Moreover, few states and local agencies are in a position to run all of the budget risks for the continuation of such people on the payroll with uncertain federal assistance.

While the problems of federal aid are essentially those of mission orientation and inadequate administration, the issues in federal-state relations appear to have even greater consequence. The first of these issues is as old as the nation itself: should the federal government play a role in education? Most of us have long since answered this question in the affirmative, but a few politicians find it useful to keep raising the issue. I suggest that education is too closely linked to the national well-being, particularly in terms of trained manpower and economic growth, for any answer other than federal participation.

It should be noted in passing that with the adoption of our Constitution in 1787 we not only created a federal system but also a national government. The welfare clause and the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments have provided ample constitutional authority for federal entry into educational endeavors, as congressional legislation and a number of our U.S. Supreme Court decisions attest. In a very real sense, then, we have had an incipient national system of education from the beginning. Only within the last two decades, however, have we begun to sense the full implications of the federal role.[1]

A second issue has also been about for a long time: Should federal aid be categorical or general in nature? As can be readily understood, most schoolmen and college administrators prefer general aid. A formula for the distribution of general aid to the several states and universities could be developed. The Congress is currently giving attention to "block grant" amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), presumably as a way of at least reducing the categorical aid proposed by H.R. 7819. One wonders about the motives behind such a proposal. Is it a well-conceived shift away from categorical aid or merely a plan to discredit the administration?[2]

While the arguments for general aid are persuasive, I doubt that the Congress will permit a substantial part of federal assistance to be general in nature. General aid means that any state, even any community, can be as bad as it wants to be. Measures designed to desegregate the schools, to provide compensatory education for the culturally disadvantaged, and to insure that library materials are made available to nonpublic school pupils are illustrations of national needs, as perceived by the Congress, and either through legal mandate or financial inducements no state or locality is permitted to ignore such national needs.

Still another condition suggests that general aid alone is a doubtful solution. By its very nature, general aid provides little political visibility for the congressman. Categorical aid, on the other hand, permits a congressman to stand for something: the education of the poor, vocational and technical training, teaching fellowships, assistance for federally impacted districts, new research and development institutions, and other specific programs. While a combination of general and categorical aid may be feasible, I take the position that the Congress has an obligation to support some specific programs aimed at meeting national needs.

Let us turn to a third issue. Should federal programs make use of established institutions or must alternative arrangements be set up? NDEA assistance in the purchase of science equipment and the provisions of Title I of ESEA are examples of channeling assistance through existing school systems. On the other hand, the Head Start program of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) resulted, in many instances, in the creation of new institutional arrangements. Contracts with business firms to operate Job Corps and other programs is another example of new arrangements. Recently, some have advocated that a new federal school system be established to compete with the existing school systems.[3]

Local and state school systems, like other organizations, public and private, do develop certain inflexibilities over time. Some of these local systems, particularly in the large cities, have become hemmed in with tradition, tradition imposed by bureaucratic administrators and by teachers' organizations. Achieving change in curriculum programs or in teaching practices at times seems well-nigh impossible. When urgent problems such as desegregation of the schools and improved instruction for the culturally handicapped appear to be largely ignored in favor of business as usual, discouragement with the "establishment" is intensified. Little wonder that some members of Congress and representatives of federal agencies seriously consider alternative organizational arrangements.

Without doubt, existing school organizations need, or did need, a shake-up. Titles I, II, and III of ESEA and many provisions of the OEO program have provided some of that shock. Public schools have new partners in nonpublic school officials, art curators, orchestra directors, and university professors. Community action groups are ready to set up Head Start programs if the school is not. If board members and administrators have been loath to identify the educationally handicapped, they are now required to do so in order to qualify for Title I money. If one school district cannot or will not set up vocational and technical programs, a combination of school districts may be formed into a regional vocational district.

Should we persist with these interventions in existing local schools, improving them where need be? Or should we conclude, after our short experience with the new programs, that existing schools and colleges are bankrupt and then set up new structures under federal operation? Clearly, some expectations for school reform have been unrealistic; moreover, schools alone cannot solve all of our social problems. We need to formulate our expectations and our programs in much more realistic terms. But I think the time is here to make what we have already begun work, not to start all over with a new set of institutions. Even new institutions will soon take on their own inflexibilities, and if we give up on local and state participation we may find that the federal bureaucrats soon become even worse than the local variety.

Still another issue has to do with church-state relations. Should federal aid force new arrangements in our historic struggle to keep church and state separate? Nearly all of our state constitutions forbid the use of public money for nonpublic schools, particularly church schools. Moreover, the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution contains the ringing words, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . ." Despite these seemingly clear legal demarcations, the doctrine of "child benefit" was evolved by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Cochran case in 1930. The Louisiana practice of providing textbooks at state expense to pupils in church schools as well as in public schools was allowed to stand.

Titles I, II, and III of ESEA have made full use of the child benefit principle. In each of the acts, programs are to be made available to nonpublic as well as to public school pupils. The public library has been used as the model. But the line between benefiting the child and supporting the school is sometimes very hard to determine. When programs for the culturally deprived are provided in church schools as well as in public schools, one wonders if the distinction has not been ignored. Or when books are sup-

---

[1] Roald F. Campbell and Gerald Sroufe, "Toward a Rationale for Federal-State-Local Relations in Education," PHI DELTA KAPPAN, September, 1965, pp. 2–7.

[2] For another view on the Quie amendment see "Kicking Civil Rights Upstairs," *Saturday Review*, June 17, 1967, pp. 49–50.

[3] "Educator Says U.S. Should Start Schools To Challenge Local Systems," *The Washington Post*, April 5, 1967. (See p. 2 this KAPPAN.)

plied to nonpublic schools, albeit on a loan basis, one suspects that the loan will never be repaid. Without doubt some of these practices are still to be tested in the courts.

In the meantime one can take any one of three positions. The "separationists" on one end would make no overture at all toward aiding nonpublic schools and probably not even the pupils who attend them. At the other end the "collaborationists" advocate that public money should be allocated to church schools as well as to public schools. I subscribe to neither position; rather, I think we must find some accommodation between these two positions. While nonpublic schools, particularly church schools, do serve some public purposes, I contend that public money cannot be used to support them unless public agencies also supervise their curricula and teaching practices. At the same time, this need not rule out public provisions for books, transportation, health services, shared time, and other arrangements for nonpublic school pupils. Constantly, we need to ask whether or not the practice seems to be helpful to our future citizens and whether or not it does any damage to our public institutions. Such queries may help us formulate necessary adjustments in this difficult area.

Let me suggest one additional issue. Should federal aid require restructuring of educational government? Federal programs appear to accentuate the conflict between special government and general government. At the local level, educational government is essentially special government—special boards, special taxing procedures, and, for the most part, fiscal independence for school districts. At the state level, the education agency represents special government. To some extent, so do the special provisions for the state financing of education. At the same time, the state legislature is the plenary body for education, hence education is inevitably thrown into the arena of general government. At the federal level, with the important roles played by the Congress, the courts, and the Executive Office of the President, all policy questions regarding education seem to be shaped even more within the context of general government.

The USOE and other federal agencies operate within the context of general government or, if you wish, much more as a part of the total political system than do local school districts. The general government context at the federal level suggests that congressmen deal with mayors, not school officials, even on local educational matters. Such approaches, however, ignore the special government context of most school districts. This problem is accentuated when other social measures, such as many OEO programs and possibly the model cities program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, include educational provisions, some of which affect local school districts directly, but whose administration is tied much more closely to the mayor's office than to the school office.

I have no doubt that some restructuring of educational government is called for. While I am not yet ready to transfer school affairs from boards of education to city councils, at the same time better ways of coordinating efforts in education, planning, housing, welfare, and other social programs, particularly in our large cities, must be found. But the need for coordination and unified effort at the local level is no greater than at the federal level. Some consolidation and reorganization of federal agencies is called for. Moreover, additional stability should be built into the federal agencies which are evolved.

Let me now turn to another consideration. A mind-set or way of looking at the world is a powerful force. If we view federal-state relations within the mind-set of "power-play for the control of education," we shall find some evidence for our position. We all see what we are looking for. We are dealing here with the well-known psychological phenomenon of perception, and there is abundant evidence that much of what a person sees is in his own eyes. Mind-sets or analytical constructs can be useful or harmful. They are useful if they suggest additional insights regarding the real world, harmful if they limit or thwart our understanding of the real world. I believe the power-play concept limits and misrepresents our understanding of federal-state relationships.

I suggest another mind-set or way of viewing these phenomena, namely, an interdependent social system. As a way of provoking our thinking and not as a precise description of all of these relationships, we may think of the nation as a total social system, social in the sense that we are concerned with interactions among persons. Within such a social system we have many subsystems—cultural, religious, economic, political, and others. In federal-state relations we are concerned chiefly with the political subsystem, particularly as it applies to education. In the political subsystem we may envision the states and localities as additional subsystems.

If these subsystems are to function as part of the larger social system, there must be communication between and among the parts and the whole. The subsystems must be strong enough, articulate enough, and wise enough to provide useful feedback to the larger system. The larger system, on the other hand, must be alert to its dependence upon its subsystems, to the need to nurture them, and to the importance of the feedback provided through them.

Within this kind of framework we can understand that during the last two decades the larger social system (representing all of us, I may add) has become more concerned and more aggressive. The equilibrium within the total system seems to have been altered: more influence at the national level, less at state and local levels. Actually, national activity, such as Title V provisions of ESEA for strengthening state departments, may help state and local levels acquire even greater influence. This thrust toward a national system is not well understood, has created apprehensions, and in some instances produces downright resistance. In view of the growing importance of an educated citizenry to the national well-being, I think this shift is inevitable. At the same time, we need to recognize the interdependence of the total system and its subsystems. The nation must depend upon states and localities to operate schools and colleges and to collaborate with other operating agencies in advancing the general good. Vigorous and constructive interaction between state and federal agencies, not recrimination, seems to be the road ahead.

The concept of interdependence provides challenges to both the states and the federal government. States need to become less concerned with structure and legal jurisdiction and more concerned with giving leadership to local agencies and to helping in the formulation of federal polices. Very few of our states are currently staffed to do this; most state boards of education, most chief state school officers, and most state department staffs must be strengthened if they are to meet this challenge. Governors can make a major contribution here particularly in the selection of able, not merely deserving, citizens for membership on state boards of education. No governor should be content until he can say honestly that the state board of education contains as many dedicated and illustrious citizens as does the board for the state university.

The federal government, too, needs to recognize more fully what is involved in interdependence. Federal programs need some consolidation, the missions of federal agencies need further classification, and additional stability in terms of programs and personnel, particularly in the U.S. Office of Education, needs to be achieved. Communication between federal and state agencies should be extended. Hopefully, over a period of time feedback from the state agencies will be improved in quality and in turn influence federal programs more significantly. The federal government has the very difficult task of initiating and implementing programs which support our basic value positions as a nation even though we have some dragging of feet in certain quarters. Such a task requires the utmost in courage, discernment, and tact.

THE SECURITY OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. RIBICOFF. I join with Chairman MILLS in my deep concern over the statements made against the social security program in the article written by Mr. Charles Stevenson and published in the October 1967 issue of Reader's Digest.

Social security should not be made a political football or partisan issue. Social security is vitally important to millions of aged citizens, widows, orphans, and the disabled. These people depend upon their monthly social security benefits. Many of them have very little other income to depend on. They must have faith in the continuity and financial integrity of social security.

As a member of the Committee on Finance and a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I join Chairman MILLS in reaffirming the actuarial and financial soundness of the social security system.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Chairman MILLS, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 27, be reprinted in the RECORD, together with the Stevenson article and a statement by the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen.

There being no objection, the remarks, article, and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW SECURE IS YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY?

(Mr. MILLS (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest has published an article by Mr. Charles Stevenson in its October issue which casts doubts on the financial soundness of the social security program. I have read the article very carefully and find that it contains a number of half-truths that lead to misleading conclusions.

The Committee on Ways and Means has recently completed a most exhaustive reexamination of the contributory wage-related social security program. The program is actuarially and financially sound. Moreover, the revisions incorporated in the House-passed bill not only increase the present benefits for both older retired persons and the future benefits of younger persons now contributing to the program but it strengthens both the wage-related and contributory features of the program.

Because of the importance in rebutting the erroneous implications contained in the Stevenson article I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen, replying to this article and a reprint of the article itself.

[From the Reader's Digest, October 1967]

HOW SECURE IS YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY?

(By Charles Stevenson)

Our Social Security insurance is in trouble. Ever since 1937 Americans have been will-

ingly kicking back, an ever-increasing portion of their paychecks to the government, confident that these Social Security taxes, along with matching payments by their employers, were buying them insurance guaranteed to provide a floor of security in old age. Nevertheless, now, even as President Johnson pressures Congress to increase benefits still more, the curtain of government-controlled publicity which has shielded the program is coming apart and letting some grim facts show through.

"Social Security is facing a crisis; it is at the crossroads," warns Rep. John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin, ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

"It has been seriously compromised," says a staff study of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress.

"The time has come for every American to ask, 'How secure is my Social Security?' and demand the truth," adds Rep. Tom Curtis (R., Mo.), one of the country's most astute students of the subject. "If we don't do something fundamental to reform the system, I'm afraid it's going to hit the rocks in another ten years."

Such alarming statements must seem preposterous to Americans whose knowledge of Social Security comes from government publicity. The official booklet, "Your Social Security," declares that all Social Security taxes *"go into special funds"*; that when earnings stop or are reduced because the worker retires, dies or becomes disabled, *"monthly cash benefits are paid from the funds"*; that nine out of ten working people *"are now building protection for themselves and their families under the Social Security program"*; that *"the amount will depend on your average earnings."* The Under Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen, an early architect of Social Security, additionally stresses that "individual rights to benefits are enforceable in the courts" and that "payment through a separate trust fund is essential to giving people a sense of security about the receipt of their benefits."

Such talk implies a genuine insurance setup with guaranteed payment—but there isn't any. "The Cost and Financing of Social Security," published by the scholarly Brookings Institution, refers to the "adoption of term 'insurance' by the proponents of Social Security," as "a stroke of promotional genius which has capitalized on the good will of private insurance and, through the establishment of a reserve fund, has clothed itself with an aura of financial soundness."

By the record, the Social Security taxes which *you* pay for *your* protection go into the Treasury's general fund, and are used at once to pay *current* Social Security benefits and administrative expenses. The small percentage left over goes to finance foreign aid, the moon race or any other government activity, and the sum shows up in the so-called Social Security trust funds as government I.O.U.s which can be liquidated only by further government borrowing or another hike in taxation. If thus transformed into cash, these I.O.U.s—accumulated since 1937—would now total around $23 billion, theoretically enough to continue paying benefits for 14 months.

Actually, the Social Security Administration's cash income is so close to outgo, and what's left over so quickly converted into government I.O.U.s that the system is dependent on further government borrowing to provide cash. Indeed, Secretary of Treasury Henry H. Fowler testified last January that unless Congress at once raised the national-debt limit by $7 billion, the government could cover only half of the Social Security checks it was obligated to send out in early March—a month in which it needed $2 billion for 22,930,000 beneficiaries.

"Considered as an actuarial account, the Social Security Administration is bankrupt," declared Prof. James M. Buchanan, director of the Thomas Jefferson Center at the University of Virginia, and Dartmouth economics Prof. Colin D. Campbell in a recent *Wall Street Journal* article.

THE NESTOR CASE

There is no room for even official denial. Despite all the reassuring statements which the government puts out for public consumption, here is its unpublicized policy as it was successfully argued before the Supreme Court in 1960 in the case of Ephram Nestor, an alien deported in 1956 whom the government didn't want to compensate.

"A belief has developed," went the argument, "that Title II benefits are paid as the result of a contractual obligation on the part of the U.S. government. This belief has been fostered to a considerable extent by statements of responsible officials of the Social Security Administration, [but] there is no contract. Heretofore these facts and their implications have not, for some reason, been conveyed to the public."

Consider that a moment. Then this too:

"The Old Age and Survivors Insurance program is in no sense a federally administered 'insurance program' under which each worker pays 'premiums' over the years and acquires at retirement an indefeasible right to receive for life a fixed monthly benefit. Social Security must be viewed as a welfare instrument to which legal concepts of 'insurance,' 'property,' 'vested rights,' 'annuities,' etc., can be applied only at the risk of serious distortion of language. We are dealing with a social instrument by which public action, involving compulsion [taxation], is invoked to deal with a social problem—the lack of basic economic security of large segments of our society . . ."

And this:

"The Social Security concept is of a program under which those with jobs are taxed chiefly to provide the funds for current benefits to aged beneficiaries and other eligible survivors. No beneficiary or prospective beneficiary acquires any interest in the fund itself—monthly benefit payments are voluntary payments to the recipient, property acquired by gift. There is no correlation between the taxes paid and amount of benefits which may become payable. The benefits conferred may be redistributed or withdrawn at any time in the discretion of Congress."[1]

That doesn't jibe with the government's assurances that people who invest in Social Security are "building protection for themselves." It *did* start out to be such security insurance back in 1935, and it made sense to most Americans. The myth that this still is the system is officially perpetuated for one reason alone. Under the cover of the mythology, the government has been able to shift the skyrocketing expense of increasingly unpopular relief expenditures to the popular Social Security system—in a way not known or understood by the country's workers, and in a way that doesn't show up noticeably in the Administration's budget.

SQUEEZE ON THE YOUNG

In addition, the government has blanketed literally millions of additional persons into the system—millions who by no stretch of the imagination have paid enough into it to compensate for their benefits. Some have paid nothing at all. These beneficiaries include everybody 72 or older who doesn't get a check from another government source; contributing wage earners and their wives who elect to retire at 62; the younger disabled, along with their families; entitled divorced wives; 60-61-year-old widows; beneficiaries' children up to age 22 if still in school. These people may be either rich or eligible for relief. Nevertheless, most of their monthly Social Security benefits come out of the special tax that Americans have been led to believe is buying insurance just for themselves.[2]

As a result, the top $189 annual Social Security tax which was paid in to the government in behalf of a "covered" worker ten years ago has soared to $580.80 this year; and that tax is officially scheduled to climb to $745.80 in another 20 years. This last figure represents 11.3 percent of the first $6600 in wages that a man takes in!

Already there are young people protesting the squeeze. "With inflation and income taxes taking everything else, our family can't meet our mortgage payments if our Social Security contributions go any higher, a young man writes his Congressman. "All that makes them bearable now is knowing the government is saving our money for us."

Innocent young man! If his own government had been honest with him he would know that:

Current Social Security recipients have paid in an average of only one-tenth the value of their annuities; the remaining 90 percent of their benefits is paid by the taxes levied on the payrolls of the younger workers

Because of this extra bill, Robert J. Myers, chief actuary of the Social Security Administration, explains, "The benefits that a new entrant gets are not equal in value, over the long run, to the contributions that he and his employer pay." Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball similarly admits that "young employes do not, in those terms, get their money's worth."

Thus the maximum tax put into the Treasury in behalf of a now 25-year-old worker (under current law) *for annuity payments alone* will total $19,392 during his working years, and for this—if Congress doesn't change its mind—the Social Security Administration says that he will be entitled to a "gratuity" of $168 a month at age 65 if single and $252 if married, with his elderly widow to get $138.60 if he dies first.

According to calculations worked up for the National Association of Life Underwriters, the same contributions schedule could buy the same worker a private insurance policy designed to pay $312 a month if he remained single and $263 if he married, with either survivor to continue receiving $175.83 a month until death. Or if the young worker banked the amount of the $19,392 tax payments at four percent compound interest over his working years, he would end up with $47,074 at age 65—minus income taxes, of course—to spend as he saw fit, or collect interest on. And he could will the principal to his heirs.

Nevertheless, whether Social Security can pay our friend back *anything at all* for what he puts into it will depend entirely on the mood of the taxpayers of that later day. The unfunded outstanding obligations of the Social Security system—that is, the amount by which its promised benefits exceed what the "insured" persons are supposed to eventually pay toward meeting these costs—are $350 billion. That is a sum which exceeds the current national debt.

Can the government collect enough Social Security taxes to keep the program going indefinitely? Officially it anticipates taking in up to $37 billion in 1980, even if the law isn't changed. With anticipated changes in the law, collections may soar as high as $58 billion.

Today President Johnson is trying to force through Congress a scheme to bend what's left of legitimate Social Security purposes into a vast relief giveaway which would complicate the already excruciating problem of poverty among persons over 65. Even now these people are discouraged from augmenting their incomes. If they earn small sums at odd jobs, they must continue to pay Social Security taxes with no comparable in-

[1] *Flemming (U.S.) v. Nestor*, 363 U.S. 603.

[2] The only exceptions are the special payments to persons 72 or older not otherwise receiving a government check. These are subsidized out of general taxes.

crease in benefits. And if they contribute enough to the economy through their labor to take in more than $1500 a year, the Social Security Administration penalizes them; it withholds benefits to which they're otherwise entitled. The Administration's cure is to let those who insist on working earn a bare $180 more a year than the present law allows. Yet simultaneously it would increase Social Security benefits to both workers and *non-workers* from 15 to 59 percent!

The Johnson program proposes to "take 1.4 million Americans out of poverty this year" partly by raising the federal income taxes of another 1,400,000 persons over 65 who have been able to save enough, somehow, so that with Social Security they have incomes of $6000 or more, and by shifting the expense of caring for some hundreds of thousands now on the relief rolls to Social Security. Then the country's wage earners will pay these people through their still higher Social Security taxes, and the Administration will be able to boast that prosperity is saving the cash that formerly went into state and federally financed public-assistance payments.

To finance this, the President would raise your Social Security taxes yet again—to an eventual $1252.80 squeeze on a single job. And this would be just the beginning. Chief actuary Myers estimates the unfunded "accrued liability" of the system would soar again, too—this time to $417 billion. "It staggers my imagination," declared House Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur D. Mills when the payments pattern was unfolded by Under Secretary Cohen.

TIME TO TAKE STOCK

No matter what temporary tinkering the House and Senate may do regarding the President's program, now or later, the basic question still remains: Just how much more can the economy afford? Will the young people now keeping the system afloat be willing to pay ever more out of their paychecks when they learn that they're scheduled to get back less than they contribute? If they are pinched now, how can they continue to take on an ever more expensive burden of the elderly? Won't they insist on caring for their children first?

Already, the Social Security take is beginning to encroach on funds needed to keep private pension plans afloat—plans which through invested reserves create new wealth rather than devour it. Already the Social Security taxes are so high that a Treasury memorandum warns "it is doubtful" that many professional people earning even $10,000 a year "can afford to devote appreciably more to their retirement." So how high can these taxes go without seriously undermining the economy?

What if the government *can't* squeeze out the still higher taxes it needs from tomorrow's payrolls? Well, then, as the government told the Supreme Court, "If a statutory program offers more now than the economy can afford to furnish later, Congress has only to revise the statutory program."

As a matter of fiscal sanity, now would seem the time to take stock and find out if we can make Social Security function as it was originally intended. Some students in and out of government are suggesting putting all welfare back where it belongs—in the regular welfare budget, supported by general revenues, which everybody can see. Through such appropriations we can and must find ways to assist, with dignity, the disabled and the elderly who have no way to provide for themselves.

As for the rest, a blue-ribbon commission could explore the possibility of requiring workers to buy annuity insurance from government-regulated private insurance-investment funds just as some states require motorists to buy liability insurance. Whatever the means, Social Security must be restored to its legitimate purposes before it is too late.

STATEMENT BY WILBUR J. COHEN, UNDER SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. Charles Stevenson's article on "How Secure is Your Social Security?" in the October issue of the *Reader's Digest* is misleading, and, in my opinion, creates anxiety and fear about the financing of our social security system that are groundless.

I state categorically that:

The social security system is soundly financed.

Present and potential future beneficiaries of social security will get the benefits provided by the social security law.

I

Mr. Stevenson begins his article by saying our "social security insurance is in trouble." This is not so.

The subtitle of Mr. Stevenson's article says that "Recent disclosures are raising grave doubts as to how much—if anything—today's taxpayer will get back when his time for retirement comes." Use of the words "disclosures," "grave doubts" and "if anything" can only result in worry to millions of people who are now drawing social security benefits or expect to draw them in the future. This worry is wholly without factual basis.

The article seeks to depict Chairman Wilbur D. Mills and the ranking minority member, Representative John W. Byrnes, of the House Committee on Ways and Means as profoundly alarmed about the basic design and fiscal integrity of the social security program and about the course that the program is taking. The facts, however, are that as recently as 5 weeks ago these men jointly supported legislation in the House of Representatives, the Social Security Amendments of 1967 (H.R. 12080), which builds upon the present social security program and, with careful attention to actuarial soundness, makes needed improvements in the benefits of the program.

The implication that Representative Byrnes, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, agrees with the charges made by Mr. Stevenson flies in the face of the fact that Mr. Byrnes was a co-sponsor of the social security bill now before Congress and is contradicted by his remarks on the floor of the House of Representatives during the debate on the bill. At that time he stated:

"I personally do not feel that the burdens imposed by this bill are greater than the taxpayers will be willing to pay. After all, today's taxpayer is tomorrow's beneficiary. I was very glad to join the chairman of our committee in sponsoring the social security bill—a bill which gives due consideration to the needs of our elderly citizens as well as those who are called upon to pay the taxes."

Representative Byrnes went on to say that: "Everyone paying taxes today can do so with the knowledge that he is participating in a sound program of social insurance which will provide commensurate benefits in the event of his death or disability."

The House Committee report on H.R. 12080, which was signed by 24 out of 25 members of the Committee on Ways and Means, bears ample witness to the care and thoroughness which the Committee has devoted to assuring the continued soundness of the social security program.

The proposals contained in H.R. 12080 were considered during 18 days of public hearings over a period of 6 weeks, and during 64 executive sessions over a period of 16 weeks. Following debate, the House approved the bill by the overwhelming non-partisan vote of 415 to 3. The bill reaffirms the soundness of the contributory, wage-related social security program.

The soundness of the social security system has been examined a number of times by groups of independent, nongovernmental representatives of business, insurance, labor, and the public.

In 1957, under the Eisenhower Administration, an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing was appointed by Secretary Flemming. It reported as follows:

"The Council finds that the present method of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is sound, practical, and appropriate for this program. It is our judgment, based on the best available cost estimates, that the contribution schedule enacted into law in the last session of Congress makes adequate provision for financing the program on a sound actuarial basis."

Among the members of the Council who made this statement were the President of a Federal Reserve bank, two actuaries—one from a private insurance company and one from a university—and representatives of business, labor and professional groups.

The most recent Advisory Council on Social Security, again made up of outstanding experts in the field, examined thoroughly all of the issues connected with the "security" of social security. Like the preceding council they concluded, in their report of January 1965, that the social security program is soundly financed and that its income—out into the long range future—will be sufficient to meet its obligations.

Both Advisory Councils took note of such charges as those made in the article to the effect that social security taxes are used for purposes other than social security, that the trust funds contain only IOU's, and that the system is "in the red" by hundreds of billions of dollars. Both Councils found these charges to be without foundation.

II

The article says that the social security program puts a "squeeze on the young." This is not so. The fact is that even without taking into account that social security benefits have been and will continue to be increased from time to time as changes occur in wage levels and cost of living, young workers as a group will get social security protection worth 20 to 25 percent more than they will pay in social security contributions. This is the case under present law and would be the case under the House-passed bill and under the Administration's proposal.

Young workers could not buy comparable insurance protection from private insurance companies at anywhere near the amount they pay for their social security protection.

The article takes no account of the fact that the benefits provided by the present social security law are very much lower than the benefits that will actually be paid when today's young workers reach retirement age. As wages rise—as they have throughout the history of the country—benefits can be increased *without increasing the contribution rates*. This is because the contributions are a percentage of covered payroll and because, as wages go up, income to the system increases more than the corresponding liabilities.

As a matter of fact, if benefits were not increased as wage levels rise over the years, the contribution rates scheduled in present law would be too high, and they could be reduced. Whether benefits are increased or contribution rates are reduced the result would be the same, namely, more protection in relation to contributions than is shown by analyses that assume no change in wage levels and in benefits.

The calculations referred to in the article assume that the covered employee would have within his control an amount of contributions paid by his employers equal to the amount of his own social security contribution. This assumption rests on a misconception of the nature of the social insurance program and indeed the nature of private group insurance. If such an assumption were used, the whole fabric of private group life insurance, annuity insurance, and other forms of group insurance in this country would have to be regarded as inequitable.

As a general rule, under private group in-

surance plans the employer contribution is not allocated to each employee in an amount related to the employee's own contribution. On the contrary the employer contribution, as in the case of social security, is what makes it possible to pay larger benefits to workers and their survivors who are in the upper age brackets when the group insurance plan goes into effect than could be paid only on the basis of the worker's own contributions.

I believe it bears repeating that even without taking into account the fact that benefits will be increased in future years, even young workers covered under social security will get insurance protection worth 20 to 25 percent more than the value of their contributions, and moreover, they will actually do much better than that when account is taken of the fact that social security benefits can and will be increased as wage levels go up without any need to increase the contribution rate.

In deciding whether young people get their money's worth it must be kept in mind that social security provides not only retirement protection but also survivors and disability insurance protection. While Mr. Stevenson's figures do take into consideration the fact that social security provides protection against loss of income due to death and disability and also provides hospital insurance protection at age 65, most of his discussion ignores the importance of these parts of the program. That importance may be illustrated by an example: The value of the social security survivors insurance protection provided under the House-passed bill in the case of the worker whose earnings are about the median earnings of regularly employed men ($550 per month) who dies at age 35 leaving a wife aged 32 and two small children is about $56,000. Were this worker to become disabled at 35, the value of the disability insurance protection to him and his family would be about $59,000.

Social security is a sound and equitable program for the young and the old.

III

Mr. Stevenson's article contains nearly two columns on the so-called *Nestor case*, decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1960 (pp. 76–77). Mr. Stevenson distorts the legal issues. He has several quotes which to a lawyer and a general reader would appear to be from the Court's decision. But they are *not*. He not only does not quote from the Court's decision but fails to mention that the Court decision reversed the contention of the Justice Department brief (prepared in the Eisenhower Administration) that the program is not an insurance program. What the U.S. Supreme Court actually said was:

"The Social Security system may be accurately described as a form of social insurance, enacted pursuant to Congress' power to 'spend money in aid of the general welfare,' whereby persons gainfully employed, and those who employ them, are taxed to permit the payment of benefits to the retired and disabled, and their dependents."

The fact is that the Supreme Court decision rejected many of the contentions made in the brief and stated that: "The interest of a covered employee under the [Social Security] Act is of sufficient substance to fall within the protection from arbitrary governmental action afforded by the due process clause."

Thus, as the Supreme Court stated, although the Congress can modify rights granted under the statute, it cannot do so in an arbitrary way. The right to benefits under social security, as the Court has said, is protected under the due process clause of the United States Constitution against denial or diminution by arbitrary Government action.

IV

The article attempts to show that social security is unsound by referring to "unfunded outstanding obligations" of $350 billion and stating that under the Administration bill this amount will rise to $417 billion (pp. 79–80). The $350 billion referred to is the amount that would be needed—if social security were a private, voluntary insurance program—to pay off all obligations on the assumption that there would be no new entrants into the system. The idea of there being a huge unfunded liability in the social security system is wholly meaningless and irrelevant for any practical purposes. There is no need in a Government program such as social security for funding on the basis referred to in the article. It would not only be unnecessary but also unwise to build up such a huge accumulation of social security funds. No life insurance expert nor social security expert, nor business nor labor organization, and no Advisory Council or Committee of the Congress has ever recommended such funding.

The most recent Advisory Council on Social Security—an independent group of experts in the field which reviewed all aspects of the social security program over a period of 18 months—stated in its 1965 report:

"The Council is in agreement with the previous groups that have studied the financing of the program that it is unnecessary and would be unwise to keep on hand a huge accumulation of funds sufficient, without regard to income from new entrants, to pay all future benefits to past and present contributors. A compulsory social insurance program is correctly considered soundly financed if, on the basis of actuarial estimates, current assets plus future income are expected to be sufficient to cover all the obligations of the program; the present system meets this test. The claim sometimes made that the system is financially unsound, with an unfunded liability of some $300 billion, grows out of a false analogy with private insurance, which because of its voluntary character cannot count on income from new entrants to meet a part of future obligations for the present covered group."

V

The article is in error in saying that the social security changes recommended by President Johnson would take persons out of poverty "partly by raising the Federal income taxes" of other people over 65 (p. 79). Under the President's proposal, over 2 million persons would be removed from poverty (1.6 million aged 65 and over and 0.5 million under age 65) by the increase in the amount of the social security benefits—especially the increase in the minimum benefit from the present $44 a month to $70. There is no truth in the statement in the article that the method of removing these people from poverty would be through raising income taxes.

The article speaks disparagingly of the improvement of social security benefits for the purpose of reducing the number of persons on assistance or relief. But this has been the objective of the social security program since it was enacted in 1935! This was the original congressional intent. In fact, the carrying out of this intent has been one of social security's great achievements. The proportion of the aged on welfare has decreased from about 22 percent in 1950 to about 10 percent today. We hope to decrease the proportion to 5 percent. Increasing the level of social security benefits will aid in this objective.

VI

One more of the many inaccuracies contained in the article is the allegation in the article that social security contributions are put into the "Treasury's general fund" (p. 76). The fact is that the contributions are automatically appropriated by law to the social security trust funds, which are kept separate from one another and from the general funds of the Treasury and can be used only for the payment of the benefits and administrative expenses under the social security program.

VII

Mr. Stevenson says that the Government is discouraging beneficiaries from augmenting their incomes by collecting social security contributions with no comparable increase in benefits and by withholding benefits from those beneficiaries who earn over $1500 a year (p. 79).

The purpose of the social security program as determined by the Congress is to pay benefits when there is a loss of earnings because of death, disability, or retirement. The law prescribes a test—generally referred to as the retirement test—for determining whether such loss of earnings has occurred. The amount of the retirement test and whether there should be any retirement test is certainly a question which warrants discussion.

What Mr. Stevenson didn't say in his article is that eliminating the retirement test would increase the cost of the program by $2 billion a year. The additional cost would be incurred to pay benefits to about 2 million people, many of whom are fully employed and earning as much as they ever did. The vast majority of social security beneficiaries—some 20 million other persons—either are unable to work or cannot find a job and therefore would not be helped one iota by the elimination of the retirement test. Would this be an intelligent and equitable way to spend $2 billion a year additional?

The author's statement that beneficiaries who work and pay social security contributions get "no comparable increase" in benefits may give the impression that this work cannot increase their benefits or that, if it can, the benefit increases are insignificant. The fact is that the beneficiary who works can get a benefit increase if he has even just a single year in which his earnings are more than his earnings in any one of the past years that were used in computing his benefits.

In short, Mr. Stevenson didn't tell a full or fair story on the retirement test.

VIII

The article concludes that further study of and basic changes in social security are called for. Some of the concluding remarks are repetitions of misleading assertions made earlier and some go further.

The article raises a number of questions about what will happen to the social security program in the future after whatever "temporary tinkering the House and Senate may do regarding the President's program"—as if the House and Senate are not comprised of the elected representatives of the American people and as if the President is not responsible to the American people. It is through such processes as the article calls congressional deliberation and debates—that this Nation builds its public programs, orders its economy, and carries on the affairs of Government, and this will doubtless be true in the future.

The article goes on to suggest, on the basis of the increases in social security contribution rates that have been enacted over the years, that private pensions may not be able to remain "afloat." Such scaremongering ignores the fact that social security has not prevented the rapid growth of private pensions. Private pensions have made tremendous strides since the 1930's, when social security began. There were only about 400 private pension plans in 1935 when social security was enacted. Today there are over 60,000!

With regard to Mr. Stevenson's proposal to establish a "blue ribbon commission," over the years since the Committee on Economic Security submitted its report to President Roosevelt and the original Social Security Act was enacted in 1935, there have been numerous independent studies of social security by advisory councils composed of highly respected and knowledgeable citizens. For instance there was an Advisory Council Report in 1939, 1948, 1959, and 1965. Since 1956, studies by advisory councils have been

provided for in the social security law itself, and there have been periodic studies by these councils. Through the councils, consisting of representatives of employees, employers, the self-employed, and the general public, the social security program has had the benefit of a great deal of intelligent and thoughtful examination. Under the law, the next advisory council, scheduled to be appointed in 1968 (under the bill recently passed by the House, it would be appointed in 1969), will review all aspects of the social security program, including the status of the social security trust funds in relation to the long-range commitments of the program and will make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Board of Trustees of each of the social secuirty trust funds and to the Congress.

IX

Mr. Stevenson has not clarified any fundamental issues. He has not pointed out the great unmet social needs. What he has done has been a great disservice to the millions of social security beneficiaries and the millions who are counting on social security benefits in the future. He has obfuscated and confused the major policy issues in social security. A critical and constructive review of social security would be welcome. A glib and superficial attack on a program so important to millions of Americans is not a contribution to the American people.

UNSAFE DRUGS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on August 10, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on Small Business, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] revealed some alarming information. An unbelievable percentage of the drugs produced by the major pharmaceutical manufacturers is unsafe. These drugs may even be deadly.

The problem is a peculiar one. It is not that these are "fake" drugs, or worthless or poisonous drugs. If that were the case, authorities could simply stop the production of these bad medicines.

No, the problem is more difficult than that. At some point in the manufacturing process, something goes wrong, and drugs which are contaminated, nonsterile, mislabeled, or subpotent reach the market. And there is no way of knowing about it until after the damage is done. The removal of the drug from the market by the FDA often comes too late.

A few of the examples mentioned by Senator NELSON should be repeated here.

One of them is downright frightening. More than half a billion—that is, 570,374,450—tablets of Librax which had reached the market were found to be adulterated. Librax, one of the most frequently prescribed tranquilizers, is produced by Hoffman-LaRoche, a member of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and a leading drug company in the United States. The FDA determined that the hazard to the public was serious, and actual cases of injury were reported. Nevertheless, I wonder how many people suffered serious harm because of it. No one seems to know.

Although the Librax story is terrible, others are even worse. One case evokes a particularly horrible picture in my mind. It concerns the recall of three and a half million bottles of sterile water solution produced by Abbott Laboratories. I can visualize a patient—perhaps he is unconscious—lying in a hospital. He is being fed intravenously, in an effort to keep him alive. What happens, however, when it is found that the sterile solution being injected into him is not sterile after all? It sounds impossible. But the recall list tells me that just such a situation did occur. The solutions did reach the hospitals and were used on patients. Very little of this dangerous product was recovered. I doubt that we can ever really measure the extent of the injuries.

There is another item on the list which I want to point out. It is important because it relates to the experience of just about every one of us. It is generally accepted practice, I suppose, for doctors to receive samples of products manufactured by large companies. Many times, when I have gone to the doctor, he has reached into a drawer and pulled out a bottle of some medicine he wanted me to try. I imagine that is what many physicians did with some of the 40 million tablets Charles Pfizer & Co., sent, unsolicited, to doctors all over the country. There was something different about this particular batch though. The labels on the bottles were mixed up.

Without knowing it, a doctor could have given a patient suffering from upset stomach medicine used by heart patients. Instead of handing out a tranquilizer, he might have given a patient a potent antibiotic. Here again, the FDA's determination was that the danger to the public was serious. There is no way of knowing how much, or rather how little of the mislabeled medicine was recovered and what the consequences were.

These stories and the many others which could be drawn from the recall lists upset me greatly. But more than that they prompt me to ask a few questions which are particularly troubling.

I wonder, for example, just how good the checks for purity and potency are. Antibiotics and insulin are supposed to be batchtested at the end of the manufacturing process. Why, then, do so many impure, subpotent, and contaminated pills reach the market? Perhaps continuous surveillance of drugs is needed from the time they leave the manufacturer to the time they reach the consumer. Also, should we not consider expanding the testing program to include other kinds of drugs? Is there not some way in which we can prevent catastrophes or possible catastrophes which could result from something like Abbott's production of nonsterile intravenous solutions?

I wonder, too, why it is that only such very small quantities of these dangerous drugs are recovered. If it is impossible to improve the quality of the drugs that go on the market—and I, for one, cannot believe that something cannot be done—then at least we should be able to prevent these drugs from doing serious damage. Why, for example, could only 10 percent of a batch of 18,500,000 tablets of a subpotent Squibb antibiotic be recovered? And what happened to the other 96 percent of the 1,258,533/10 cc. vials of a Burroughs-Wellcome product that never got taken off the market? I am afraid to estimate the extent of the damage done to the well-being of our people before any of these mistakes are caught. This all leads me to the conclusion that communication between doctors, companies, and the FDA needs drastic improvement.

Finally, I must say that now, more than before, I doubt whether the big companies really are as reliable as they would have us believe. We are constantly told that we can depend on brand-name products, that a brand name is an assurance of quality. But it seems to me that rather than being more dependable, the products of large companies have potential for being more dangerous.

Of the 140 members of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, one-third had products recalled by the FDA during the past 2 years. But only 15 percent of the smaller companies—the non-PMA firms—had drugs called off the market.

Advertising and promotional activities increase the market for drugs—and the wider the market, the greater the number of people who will be affected by a mistake. Instead of helping the public, the major companies may be doing it serious harm.

Although it shocks and worries me greatly to learn of the dangers the American people face in this vitally important area, I am very glad, indeed, that this information is reaching the public. It is high time that something was done to insure that every phase of the health care our people receive is the finest and safest modern science can provide.

I ask unanimous consent that a partial list of major recalls by the FDA be printed in the RECORD.

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

MAJOR RECALLS, FISCAL 1966-67

Company	Drug	Quantity	Hazard	Depth	Percent recovered	Reason
Ayerst Laboratories (American Home Products).	Chlorhexidine dihydrochloride (Hibitane).	15,045,092 tablets	Moderate	Doctor	30.0	Cross contamination penicillin.
Squibb	Nystatin (Mycostatin)	18,500,000 tablets	do	Branch warehouse	10.0	Subpotent.
Abbott	Sterile water solutions	3,500,000 bottles	Serious	Doctor	10.0	Nonsterile.
Roche	Chlordiazepoxide (Librax)	570,374,450 tablets	Serious (injury)	do	17.9	Adulterated.
Pfizer	Mec izine HC-1 (Bonine)	6,905,408 tablets	Moderate (injury)	Retail	40.0	Not given.
Ciba	Aminoglutethimide (Elipten) NDA	41,600,000 tablets	Serious (injury)	Doctor	20.0	Not given.
Pfizer	Physician's samples	40,000,000 tablets	Serious	do	(1)	Label mixup.
Richardson-Merrell	Bacitracin (Bacimycin)	656,700 ½-oz. tubes; 810/100-g. jars; 10,450 ⅛ tubes.	do	Wholesale	(1)	Subpotent.
Burroughs Wellcome	Polymixin B sulfate (Aerosporin)	1,258,533/10 cc	Moderate	Retail	4.0	Do.

[1] Not given.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a penetrating analysis of some features of the war in Vietnam as set forth in an editorial entitled "The Price Is Right?" published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 27, 1967.

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

THE PRICE IS RIGHT?

Once again Senators and Representatives are raising questions about the Tonkin gulf resolution of 1964, on which President Johnson bases the legal justification for his escalation of the Vietnam war. Senator Case of New Jersey charges that the President took advantage of Congress in a way that tampers with "the trust of one man for another"—a polite euphemism for trickery.

While these protests express the growing dismay and frustration in Congress and the country, they do not go to the heart of the problem. The vital issue is not the President's legal authority to enlarge the Vietnam commitment from a small and limited aid program to a full-scale war on the mainland of Asia. What matters is that he pursued this policy, legal or not, after having gained election by promising exactly the opposite one. It is the discrepancy between the President's Asia policy before and after the 1964 election that raises the question of "mutual trust and confidence" which Senator Case refers to.

In a speech last week Mr. Johnson disclosed the outlines of the argument he will take to the voters next year. What the nation is going through in Vietnam, he says, is "worth the price," because the price of "Communist conquest" in Southeast Asia would be higher. He seeks to identify the war in Vietnam with all other wars we have fought—particularly, with World War II. And he justifies the national ordeal by describing it as necessary to avert a third world war.

We think it will take some doing to convince the American people that Ho Chi Minh, the leader of a tiny underdeveloped country struggling to emerge from one of the most backward colonialisms on record, presents the same menace to our vital national interest as Hitler did in his effort to conquer Western Europe, Britain and Russia. The false parallel is just too incredible to swallow.

The truth is that we are not fighting "Communist conquest" in Vietnam. We are fighting Vietnamese nationalism, which developed out of years of colonial exploitation and accepted Communist leadership because Communists like Ho Chi Minh offered the most implacable resistance to foreign domination, whether by France, Japan or anybody else. President Roosevelt, whose mantle Mr. Johnson aspires to don, was farsighted enough to consider supporting Ho as the best expression of Indochinese self-determination. He did not live to carry out that policy, and America instead backed first the French and then a succession of agents in efforts to crush an indigenous anti-colonial revolution. Having failed over 20 years to gain that end by proxy, we are now trying to achieve it with our own military power.

When Mr. Johnson says Vietnam is saving us from a third world war, he is saying that the Hanoi government is simply a front for Chinese Communism which would have to be fought elsewhere if not in Vietnam. The truth is that despite 20 years of desperate war Hanoi has amazingly avoided becoming a puppet of either China or Russia. We are not fighting Chinese Communism. We are fighting a native nationalism which, far from opening the door to Chinese conquest, offers the best hope of erecting political and cultural barriers to such conquest. We are ravaging a small country which presents no threat to our interests or security. And for this we are paying a price which more and more Americans regard as far, far too high.

OUR CHOICES IN VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Mr. Edwin O. Reischauer, former Ambassador to Japan, has written an important article on the issue of Vietnam for the September 19 issue of Look magazine. In a penetrating way, based upon years of study and experience, Reischauer traces our involvement in Vietnam. He makes it quite clear that our involvement in Vietnam has progressed to such a point that whatever way we choose to end the war in Vietnam will cost us dearly, and I quote from Ambassador Reischauer's article:

My purpose is to bring home the fact that we are paying dearly for the war and face a miserable selection of choices of ways to end it. The question is: To what purpose is all this suffering and travail? What could possibly emerge from this war to make it all worthwhile? Wars sometimes seem justified by their end results, but this justification hardly applies to the Vietnam war. Even the most extravagantly optimistic outcome would leave far more losses than gains.

Mr. Reischauer's final paragraph is both a warning and a future guideline:

Our men in Vietnam are superbly equipped, are well organized and are fighting valiantly, but the best they can hope to achieve is worse than what we could have had, virtually for nothing, if we had only had enough interest in Vietnam and in Asia to study in advance the problems we faced there. If we are to avoid more national catastrophes like that in Vietnam, we must devote a great deal more attention and careful thought to our relations with the half of the world's population that lives in Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Reischauer be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a valuable contribution to the discussion of the issue of Vietnam.

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

WHAT CHOICES DO WE HAVE IN VIETNAM?

(By Edwin O. Reischauer, Ambassador to Japan, 1961–66)

I do not know any American who does not want a speedy end to the war in Vietnam. No one can be happy about the suffering it brings to the Vietnamese; and we, too, pay a heavy price—in American lives, in domestic political disunity, in the diversion of so much of our national wealth away from constructive tasks at home, and in the mounting disapproval of our friends abroad. The question on everyone's mind is how to bring the war to a quick and tolerable end. What can we do to induce our opponents in Vietnam to stop the fighting through a reasonable negotiated settlement?

Some have argued for an escalation of the bombing. They believe the resultant increase in the pain of the war to the North Vietnamese will increase their willingness to negotiate. I find this unconvincing. In fact, the bombing could so build up hatred and distrust of us among the North Vietnamese that it could increase their determination to go on fighting. This might be true in any country, and it is all the more likely to be true in Vietnam because of deep resentments and fear of the Occident developed during a century of colonial domination. Thus, from one point of view, chances for a negotiated settlement might be slightly enhanced if we cut down or eliminated the bombing of the North.

This, however, is not necessarily the full story. To the extent that bombing cuts down the flow of men and munitions to the South (a point on which estimates vary widely), it reduces the capacity of the other side to wage war in the South and thus might possibly increase its willingness to negotiate. If, on the other hand, a reduction of the bombing permitted a substantial increase in this flow, it might from this point of view reduce the chances for negotiations.

A solution to this dilemma might be some sort of a barrier across Vietnam and Laos at the 17th parallel that would largely eliminate the military flow and at the same time remove the need to bomb the North, thus helping in two ways to increase the chances for negotiations. But is this really feasible? And if it is, how long would it take to establish such a barrier and have it take effect? At best, this would bring no speedy end to the war.

Some people feel that if we were to develop a more democratic, civilian-controlled government in Saigon, a negotiated settlement would become more possible. Perhaps so, but I have my doubts. Hanoi would have no more liking for a democratic government in the South than for the present one, and in any case, the hate and distrust that separate the supporters of Saigon from their adversaries are too great to be easily bridged. But the important point is that, even at best, this program, too, would offer no speedy solution. Given the lack of experience of South Vietnam in democracy, the divisive intellectual and social climate, the disruptions of war and the limitations on what we as outsiders can do politically in Vietnam, the development of a more democratic, civilian-controlled government would be a very slow, difficult and chancy business.

Many people rest their hope on a negotiated settlement guaranteed by some international force. This might be possible if such a force existed, one that both sides could trust and that could be brought to Vietnam in sufficient strength to underwrite a settlement. It would take tens of thousands, probably hundreds of thousands, of well-organized and well-armed men. But I see no signs of such a force. If there were one, not only Vietnam but many other world problems would be much less pressing than they are. For the present, at least, this does not seem to be a realistic solution.

However desirable a negotiated peace may be, therefore, we cannot count on achieving one, even with the best intentions in the world. Whether or not we stop bombing the North, whatever success we have in reforming the Saigon government, and however assiduous we might be in pursuing every lead toward a negotiated settlement, the chances of ending the war in this way in the near future are not great. In fact, I wonder if any sort of settlement will ever be reached until one side or the other recognizes that it faces eventual defeat.

People usually discuss what Hanoi or Washington might be willing to concede and what pressures Peking and Moscow might bring one way or the other. The problem, however, lies fundamentally with the two original and still basic protagonists in the war: the supporters of Saigon and the Vietcong—or the National Liberation Front, as they call themselves. Perhaps the bulk of South Vietnamese belong to neither side. These are the peasant masses, who only wish to be left alone. But a large part of South Vietnam's 16 million people have divided into two strongly hostile groups—one, the Vietcong, apparently united in revolutionary zeal; and the other, the South Vietnamese military establishment and a congeries of quarreling religious bodies and political factions held together only by a determination not to fall under Communist rule.

These two groups of millions of Viet-

namese have fought each other fiercely and brutally for years. Their distrust and fear of each other run deep. Will either side be willing to lay down its arms and trust in the good faith of the other? Will either be willing to share control with the other over the territories it now dominates?

And if not, what meaning would there be to a division of cabinet seats between them? It is hard to envisage at this stage a negotiated settlement that is not virtually a surrender by one side or the other.

Perhaps I am being too gloomy. I hope that is the case. But at least at the time of this writing, there seems no easy or certain way to reach a negotiated settlement, and if one proves impossible, we are left with three choices, all of them unsatisfactory. We can seek to end the war quickly by greatly increasing our military effort, but this course would obviously run great risks. We can end the war by withdrawing our support for South Vietnam and letting the Saigon regime be overwhelmed by the Vietcong, but this, of course, would mean that we accept defeat. Or we can go on fighting on somewhat the present terms, in the hope that in time, we could bring about a de-escalation of the scale of the war and could eventually persuade the Vietcong and Hanoi to seek a settlement, but this course means that we would go on paying the high price of the war with no clear end in sight.

The first of these choices—escalation—would give little promise of ending the war, while exposing us to absolutely unacceptable dangers. We could greatly expand the bombing of the North, say by wiping out the cities; we could land in the North, occupying the cities and cutting the lines of communication to the South; or we could use nuclear weapons. But what would we achieve by any of these acts? They would contribute relatively little to stamping out the original guerrilla war in the South. We might be able to destroy the Hanoi government as it now exists, but this would probably mean only that we then would have two guerrilla wars on our hands—the old one in the South and a new one in the North.

Any of these steps of escalation would seriously damage our position in much of the rest of the world. They might well wreck our whole relationship with Japan—and perhaps with other important allies as well. We would also be running serious risks of tangling with the 700 million people of China in a war neither side could ever win. China's Communist leaders believe that we are compelled by our very nature as "imperialists" to wish to destroy them. When, during the Korean War, we pushed into North Korean territory contiguous to China, they came out to meet us. We should assume that they might do the same in North Vietnam. And if we were to come to blows with the Chinese, no one could guarantee that the Soviet Union would not feel impelled to join in, and we then might end up with the nuclear holocaust we are all trying to avoid. Clearly, a major escalation of the war in Vietnam would be absolute folly.

I find the second alternative—withdrawing—though more debatable, not much more attractive. There would be many ways in which we could seek to conceal our defeat. Sen. George D. Aiken has put forth the tongue-in-cheek suggestion that we declare ourselves the victors and then de-escalate the war. Others advocate that we allow ourselves to be negotiated out, presumably with the understanding that the Saigon government would be allowed to exist free of Communist control long enough to let us get out before the roof falls in on it. This would be a settlement much like what the Geneva agreement of 1954 was intended to be for the French. Some have suggested our withdrawal into enclaves, though this would seem to me merely a surrender of South Vietnam with the additional disadvantage for us of having military bases left in this hostile land.

However our withdrawal might be papered over, it would be recognized everywhere as a defeat for us, and we would have to face the consequences. The real question is what these consequences would be. All of Vietnam would fall under Communist rule—but this in itself would be only a relatively minor drawback to us, as I hope to show later. Nor would the problem, as I see it, be primarily that the United States was "losing face." If one means by "face" prestige or self-esteem, then we, as overwhelmingly the strongest and richest country in the world, have, if anything, too much face. Our size, wealth and power are already so great that in some ways they militate against us in our relations with other countries. In many, they stir up suspicions and resentments against us; in others, they create a sense of apathy because of overreliance on Uncle Sam to carry all the burdens of the world. Even in a great and friendly country like Japan, I found that our very size and power made it difficult for the Japanese to feel a sense of full equality with us. If only "face" were involved, we could safely withdraw from Vietnam tomorrow.

A far more important consequence of our withdrawal would be the psychological and political impact of our defeat on Southeast Asia and the whole world—and, not the least, on the United States itself. I do not subscribe to the simple "domino" theory, that if one country falls to communism, it will, in its fall, knock down the next one to it geographically and so on down the line. In a less mechanical sense, however, there is something to the domino theory.

While there is extreme disapproval of our Vietnam policies in much of the world, this is not true in several of the countries closest to Vietnam. There is, in fact, strong approval in Thailand, Laos, the Philippines, Taiwan and South Korea; and in several other Southeast and South Asian lands, there is a considerable degree of quiet support, masked either by discreet silence or by an official stance of mild condemnation. Many of these countries are themselves unstable and either fear the sort of internal subversion that has torn South Vietnam apart or are apprehensive about the intentions of their great Chinese Communist neighbor and suspicious of the loyalties of the sometimes sizable Chinese populations within their borders. They would feel much less secure if the United States, after having committed itself to the fight, were forced to admit defeat at the hands of Communist insurgents. In fact, such an outcome of the Vietnam war would send a massive psychological tremor through all these countries, further threatening their stability and perhaps sharply shifting their present international orientation.

Conversely, all those who hope for Communist take-overs in the less developed countries of the world, whether in Asia or elsewhere, would receive a shot in the arm. America's defeat in Vietnam would seem to be proof positive of the Maoist doctrine that what the Communists call "wars of national liberation" are irresistible. It would be far better proof than Ho Chi Minh's victory over the French in North Vietnam, or the Communist triumph in China, or the sweep of communism in the wake of the Soviet Army in North Korea and East Europe, because in none of these cases was the military power of the United States directly involved. The old concept that communism was the wave of the future, at least in the less developed parts of the world, would be strongly revived, just at a time when the wave seemed spent. The possibility that Communist insurgency will develop or succeed in other Asian lands depends, primarily on internal conditions in each country, but a clear-cut defeat of the United States in the Vietnam war would certainly be one external factor that could have a seriously adverse influence on this situation.

Some argue that these reactions could be minimized by strenuous American efforts to build a more tenable defense line against Communist subversion on sounder terrain in Asia. Specifically, it is suggested that shifting our military strength to Thailand would largely offset a defeat in Vietnam. This might be true, but I have my doubts.

Whatever our countermeasures, the defeat in Vietnam undoubtedly would change the political climate of Asia decidedly for the worse. Moreover, the proposed counterstrategy would, in essence, mean the further spread of American military power into areas where the Vietnam war had just shown that our type of military power was relatively ineffective.

Our withdrawal from Vietnam would not be a defeat in the sense that France, a far smaller and weaker country, was forced to accept defeat in 1954. As has been stated all too often, we cannot be defeated in Vietnam. We simply would be deciding to go back on our commitments. We might have good grounds—political, strategic or moral—for doing this. The commitments may have been unwise in the first place. But, nonetheless, we would be failing to carry out commitments not just solemnly made but repeated, often in grandiose overstatement, by one administration after another.

One wonders what effect this might have in other countries, such as Japan and our European allies, that have been relying on commitments made by us. It would certainly increase doubts in some of these countries about the reliability of the American nuclear umbrella, and thus encourage nuclear proliferation.

What worries me most, however, is the effect that our withdrawal from Vietnam might have on ourselves. Some Americans would justify withdrawal on moral grounds and, with renewed confidence in their own country, would return to the task of making American strength a more constructive influence for the healthy advance of the less developed countries. The more strategically minded would justify it as a sound cutting of losses in an unimportant area so that American power could be more effectively used in more important places. They would argue for what might be called a sophisticated neo-isolationism of the West from the East. Already, we can detect the *leitmotifs* of this theme in some of the leading newspaper columns of this country—the argument that, after all, "East is East and West is West." Asians, having their own distinctive cultures and special problems, should go their own way, presumably in poverty and turmoil, while we of the advanced nations go our own prosperous and peaceful way.

These sophisticated justifications, however, would probably not be those of the bulk of grass-roots Americans. They, I believe, would justify what would otherwise seem a humiliating defeat on the grounds that all the benighted Vietnamese (I refrain from writing the actual adjectives and nouns that would be used) aren't worth the life of "one good, clean, Christian American boy" and that these "little yellow people" and all their ilk deserve to be left to "stew in their own juices." This attitude could all too easily turn into the worst sort of racist isolationism, which might drastically reduce our usefulness to the less developed parts of the world and might also damage our relations with the advanced nations. One can understand the desire to conserve American strength for more constructive tasks than this unhappy war. We are all eager to save American lives and stop the carnage in Vietnam. But it is possible that in our eagerness to do this, we might help produce such instability in Asia and such impotence in ourselves that the development of a more stable, prosperous and peaceful Asia might be delayed by decades.

All these dire consequences of withdrawal are only speculation. They may be exaggerated. But my own guess, as of the present, is that the less costly course will prove to be to continue somewhat along the present lines,

working toward reducing the scale of the war and ending it as soon as possible, but not resorting to either extreme—withdrawal or major escalation. This is what I understand to be in general the Administration's policy, and it is for this reason that I have been basically in support of it. While I, like everyone else, keep praying that a negotiated settlement will end the war quickly on some satisfactory basis, I believe the chief hope we have for a tolerable outcome is to force the other side gradually to reduce the scale of fighting and eventually to accept some sort of reasonable settlement.

Is this slow simmering down of the war, however, a real possibility? I believe it is. We are putting tremendous military pressure on the Vietcong and have so built up our forces in South Vietnam that we cannot really be defeated in a war that remains localized there. There are signs that we may be starting to make slow progress toward getting the rural population and its produce out of the hands of the Vietcong. We are beginning to help build a broader base of support for the Saigon government. This approach to ending the war is admittedly a slow and somewhat dubious one, but it seems more promising and less hazardous than the other two.

If the gradual process of damping down the war is our best way to end it, or at least cut its costs, then our strategy should be directed primarily toward this objective. This is why we should direct not just verbal emphasis but our chief efforts toward political, social and economic development in the parts of South Vietnam under Saigon's control. This is why it is important to carry out a slow but sound pacification of as much of the agricultural area of South Vietnam as possible. If the Vietcong could be denied access to the peasants and the rice they produce, their main sources of manpower and food would dry up, and thus their capacity to continue the war would be sharply reduced.

Pacification is more a political and economic job than a military one. The chief task is to convince people that they have more to hope for from Saigon than from the Vietcong, and this must be done by the Vietnamese themselves. The Saigon government must hold out a more convincing promise of a better day to its people, and the South Vietnamese Army must be retrained, both politically and militarily, so that it can spread the influence of Saigon more effectively throughout the country. This reform must be based not just on our alien ideas but on ideas that are appealing and meaningful to the Vietnamese.

This, unfortunately, is not a quick solution, calculated to meet American election deadlines. The reasoning of our leaders in Washington, I suspect, is not very different from mine, but being oriented toward politics in this country, they naturally pay primary attention to the influence of the war on elections here. As a consequence, they seem sometimes to be grasping for quick but unsound solutions to the war. They have permitted a creeping escalation of the fighting, apparently in the unrealistic hope that some new, even if minor, pressure on Hanoi will cause a spectacular change of attitude there. Actually, Hanoi and the Vietcong have their eyes set, too, on the 1968 American Presidential election, hoping that it may somehow lead to an American withdrawal from Vietnam. Until this hope has been dispelled by the election itself, they are not likely to show any willingness to compromise, no matter what pressure is put on them. Thus, instead of trying to force them to give up before the election, which probably cannot be done no matter how much pressure we apply, we might better concentrate on slower but surer ways of tipping the scales against them, so that by the autumn of 1968, when they see themselves facing an American President with a four-year mandate, they may be more inclined to seek peace through negotiations. One important element of such a strategy might be the elaboration of realistic and generous terms of settlement that would give the Vietcong a tolerable alternative to an apparently endless war.

But even assuming a decided worsening of the Vietcong position by the autumn of 1968 and the formulation of realistic peace terms on our part, I doubt that a negotiated settlement would be much more than a cease-fire, at least at first. The Vietcong, in effect, would be suspending their attempt at an immediate military seizure of all South Vietnam, but only in the hope that the terms of the settlement would allow them to win by other means or to recoup their strength for another try at a forceful take-over sometime in the future. Even this, however, would give South Vietnam and the world a breather—a chance to move beyond the present stalemate to a phase in which the war might no longer seem necessary or relevant.

I put forth these personal views of the war in Vietnam with some diffidence because no one can be sure about these very complex problems. My purpose is to bring home the fact that we are paying dearly for the war and face a miserable selection of choices of ways to end it. The question is: to what purpose all this suffering and travail? What possibly could emerge from this war to make it all worthwhile? Wars sometimes seem justified by their end results, but this justification hardly applies to the Vietnam war. Even the most extravagantly optimistic outcome would still leave far greater losses than gains. South Vietnam, only a tiny corner of Asia, would have a precarious chance to start restoring slowly and painfully the great damage, both spiritual and physical, done during the many years of fighting. There would be an opportunity to try to build a free society and democratic institutions, but certainly no guarantee of success. Nor would there be any guarantee that, ten or twenty years after the war had ended, political rule over South Vietnam would not be more or less what it would have been if we had never got involved there.

It is also doubtful that even a favorable outcome to the war would do much to deter Communist subversion in other less developed countries. Instead of being discouraged by our ultimate victory in Vietnam, would-be revolutionaries might be encouraged by the obvious pain of the war to the United States and the clear reluctance of the American people to get involved in further wars of this type. Whatever international goodwill might be engendered by a settlement would only slightly offset the hatred and the distrust the war had bred. Restored confidence in American power would only partially balance the harm done to our image abroad and our unity at home.

Of course, wars are usually justified more in terms of the might-have-beens they prevented than by anything positive they produced. Some prices just have to be paid—as in World War II. But is there even this justification in Vietnam? I have no doubt that if those who determined American policy toward Vietnam had foreseen even dimly the costs and futilities of the war, they would have made different choices at several times in the past and thus avoided the present situation, with only trifling costs, if any, to American interests.

The obvious alternative was to allow Ho and his Communist-dominated Vietminh to take over the whole of Vietnam. This would have happened early if the United States had made quite clear in 1945 that it did not approve of the revival of colonialism in Asia and would give it no support. It would still have happened if we had not given massive aid to the French war effort after 1949. It would have happened if we had been willing in 1954 to support the Geneva agreements and had not tried to build up a permanent regime under Diem in South Vietnam. It would have happened if we had not steadily increased our military commitments to South Vietnam between 1960 and 1963. It would have happened if we had decided against massive participation in the war in the winter of 1964–65. Thus, under each of our last four Presidents, decisions were clearly made, even if not fully thought out, to reject this one obvious alternative.

What would have happened if, at any of these moments of decision, we had chosen the alternative? If we had clearly favored Vietnamese nationalism over French colonialism in 1945, it seems obvious that Ho, in short order, would have established effective control over the whole of Vietnam. He probably would have set up the same sort of dictatorial, oppressive, Communist rule over all Vietnam that he actually did over the North. He would probably have encountered much the same sort of problems he did in the North, and the economic progress of Vietnam would have been slow, though, of course, not as slow as in a war-torn land.

The society and government of this unified Vietnam would probably not have been something we would have approved of, but we have not found much we could approve of in the society and government of a divided Vietnam either. Quite possibly, a unified Vietnam under Ho, spared the ravages of war, would have gone at least as far toward the evolution of a stable and reasonably just society as has the divided, war-torn land we know today. For us, however, the question is what that sort of Vietnam would have meant in international politics. I believe it would be safe to assume that it would have been a highly nationalistic Vietnam. By the same token, I believe it also would have been free of Chinese domination. The Vietnamese have instinctive fears of their great northern neighbor. While they have always admired and imitated China, for more than a millennium they have had a deep national tradition of resistance to its domination. If they had had no specific reason to fear or resent us, the chances are that their fears and resentments would have come to focus on China, whether or not it, too, were Communist.

It seems highly probable that Ho's Communist-dominated regime, if it had been allowed by us take over all Vietnam at the end of the war, would have moved to a position with relation to China not unlike that of Tito's Yugoslavia toward the Soviet Union. Ho, like Tito, had had cordial wartime relations with us. He apparently expected our continued friendship and had more to hope for in economic aid from us than China. He and his associates were ardent nationalists and probably had deeper fears and suspicions of the Chinese than the Yugoslavs had of the Russians. While such a Vietnam might have been more circumspect and respectful toward China than Tito has been toward the Soviet Union, it would probably have been even more fiercely independent. The way in which Hanoi has sought to maintain its independence of Peking and Moscow, despite the military dependence on both, which was forced on it by the protracted war with us, suggests how strongly independent a Communist Vietnam would have been, if not pushed by these military necessities.

Would such a Communist regime in all Vietnam have been a serious menace to its neighbors or to world peace? I doubt it. A Communist take-over in all Vietnam shortly after the end of the war would probably have seemed to the rest of the world no more of a Communist triumph than the successive victories of Communists over anti-Communists that have taken place in Vietnam since 1945. It is hard to believe that a united Communist Vietnam would have had any more harmful an influence on Laos than a divided war-torn Vietnam has had. Laos and Cambodia might have fallen under Vietnamese influence, but this at least would have kept them out of Chinese control. Or, possibly,

Cambodia's traditional animosity toward Vietnam would have induced it to veer further away than it has from association with the Communist nations, if South Vietnam, too, had been Communist. Thailand would probably have been less adversely affected by an entirely Communist Vietnam than it has been by the prolonged war there. Meanwhile, a united, strongly nationalistic Vietnam, while paying lip service to Communist China, would probably have served as a far more effective dike against the southward extension of Chinese power and influence than have a North Vietnam forced into military dependence on China and an unstable South Vietnam. And this general situation in Vietnam and Southeast Asia, which would have been so much less unsatisfactory for us than what we have today, would have been achieved without any of the terrible costs that have mounted so high.

Our men in Vietnam are superbly equipped, are well-organized and are fighting valiantly, but the best they can hope to achieve is worse than what we could have had, virtually for nothing, if we had only had enough interest in Vietnam and in Asia to study in advance the problems we faced there. If we are to avoid more national catastrophes like that in Vietnam, we must devote a great deal more attention and careful thought to our relations with the half of the world's population that lives in Asia.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS NOT IN TROUBLE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate will soon begin to debate the Social Security-Medicare-Welfare Amendments of 1967. The Committee on Finance has already concluded comprehensive and informative hearings on the legislation and the major social issues related to it.

The transcript of that hearing record is a tribute to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who, as chairman of the committee, is determined that the Senate will make its final decisions on this year's amendments with full knowledge of the importance of the legislation to the people of this Nation.

At a time when the Committee on Finance is laboring so effectively to search out the facts needed for intelligent decisions, it is disheartening to discover that several newspaper columnists and magazine writers have recently written articles to the effect that, first, social security cheats the young generations of this Nation by forcing them to pay for social security benefits given to the disabled and the aged; and, second, that somehow the financial reserves of social security have been ruthlessly pillaged, creating grave doubts about the soundness of the social security fund.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, I am acutely aware of the deficiencies of social security benefits and other forms of retirement income. I believe that it is necessary to go even beyond the modest and well-reasoned proposals for increased benefits sought by President Johnson this year, and I will certainly give all possible support to the proposals offered by the Finance Committee.

But while it is reasonable to seek improvements that will increase the help social security gives to millions of Americans, it is reprehensible to distort basic issues about the program at a time when objective appraisal is vital.

Perhaps the most misleading article on the subject appears in the October issue of the Reader's Digest. I believe that it does a great disservice not only to present social security beneficiaries, but also to all of us who count upon such income for security in retirement for ourselves or for our elders.

Fortunately, the article's arguments have been answered in some detail in a statement issued by Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Cohen, who has labored long and effectively for major innovations in the social policy of this Nation, is both incisive and informative in his analysis of the Reader's Digest article. His statement should be at the disposal of every American who wants the facts about social security today. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY WILBUR J. COHEN, UNDER SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. Charles Stevenson's article on "How Secure is Your Social Security?" in the October issue of the *Reader's Digest* is misleading, and, in my opinion, creates anxiety and fear about the financing of our social security system that are groundless.

I state categorically that: The social security system is soundly financed. Present and potential future beneficiaries of social security will get the benefits provided by the social security law.

I

Mr. Stevenson begins his article by saying our "social security insurance is in trouble." This is not so.

The subtitle of Mr. Stevenson's article says that "Recent disclosures are raising grave doubts as to how much—if anything—today's taxpayer will get back when his time for retirement comes." Use of the words "disclosures," "grave doubts" and "if anything" can only result in worry to millions of people who are now drawing social security benefits or expect to draw them in the future. This worry is wholly without factual basis.

The article seeks to depict Chairman Wilbur D. Mills and the ranking minority member, Representative John W. Byrnes, of the House Committee on Ways and Means as profoundly alarmed about the basic design and fiscal integrity of the social security program and about the course that the program is taking. The facts, however, are that as recently as 5 weeks ago these men jointly supported legislation in the House of Representatives, the Social Security Amendments of 1967 (H.R. 12080), which builds upon the present social security program and, with careful attention to actuarial soundness, makes needed improvements in the benefits of the program.

The implication that Representative Byrnes, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, agrees with the charges made by Mr. Stevenson flies in the face of the fact that Mr. Byrnes was a co-sponsor of the social security bill now before Congress and is contradicted by his remarks on the floor of the House of Representatives during the debate on the bill. At that time he stated:

"I personally do not feel that the burdens imposed by this bill are greater than the taxpayers will be willing to pay. After all, today's taxpayer is tomorrow's beneficiary. I was very glad to join the chairman of our committee in sponsoring the social security bill—a bill which gives due consideration to the needs of our elderly citizens as well as those who are called upon to pay the taxes."

Representative Byrnes went on to say that: "Everyone paying taxes today can do so with the knowledge that he is participating in a sound program of social insurance which will provide commensurate benefits in the event of his death or disability."

The House Committee report on H.R. 12080, which was signed by 24 out of 25 of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, bears ample witness to the care and thoroughness which the Committee has devoted to assuring the continued soundness of the social security program.

The proposals contained in H.R. 12080 were considered during 18 days of public hearings over a period of 6 weeks, and during 64 executive sessions over a period of 16 weeks. Following debate, the House approved the bill by the overwhelming non-partisan vote of 415 to 3. The bill reaffirms the soundness of the contributory, wage-related social security program.

The soundness of the social security system has been examined a number of times by groups of independent, nongovernmental representatives of business, insurance, labor, and the public.

In 1957, under the Eisenhower Administration, an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing was appointed by Secretary Flemming. It reported as follows:

"The Council finds that the present method of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is sound, practical, and appropriate for this program. It is our judgment, based on the best available cost estimates, that the contribution schedule enacted into law in the last session of Congress makes adequate provision for financing the program on a sound actuarial basis."

Among the members of the Council who made this statement were the President of a Federal Reserve bank, two actuaries—one from a private insurance company and one from a university—and representatives of business, labor and professional groups.

The most recent Advisory Council on Social Security, again made up of outstanding experts in the field, examined thoroughly all of the issues connected with the "security" of social security. Like the preceding council they concluded, in their report of January 1965, that the social security program is soundly financed and that its income—out into the long range future—will be sufficient to meet its obligations.

Both Advisory Councils took note of such charges as those made in the article to the effect that social security taxes are used for purposes other than social security, that the trust funds contain only IOU's, and that the system is "in the red" by hundreds of billions of dollars. Both Councils found these charges to be without foundation.

II

The article says that the social security program puts a "squeeze on the young." This is not so. The fact is that even without taking into account that social security benefits have been and will continue to be increased from time to time as changes occur in wage levels and cost of living, young workers as a group will get social security protection worth 20 to 25 percent more than they will pay in social security contributions. This is the case under present law and would be the case under the House-passed bill and under the Administration's proposal.

Young workers could not buy comparable insurance protection from private insurance companies at anywhere near the amount they pay for their social security protection.

The article takes no account of the fact that the benefits provided by the present social security law are very much lower than the benefits that will actually be paid when today's young workers reach retirement age. As wages rise—as they have throughout the history of the country—benefits can be increased *without increasing the contribution rates*. This is because the contributions are

a percentage of covered payroll and because, as wages go up, income to the system increases more than the corresponding liabilities.

As a matter of fact, if benefits were *not* increased as wage levels rise over the years, the contribution rates scheduled in present law would be too high, and they could be reduced. Whether benefits are increased or contribution rates are reduced the result would be the same, namely, more protection in relation to contributions than is shown by analyses that assume no change in wage levels and in benefits.

The calculations referred to in the article assume that the covered employee would have within his control an amount of contributions paid by his employers equal to the amount of his own social security contribution. This assumption rests on a misconception of the nature of the social insurance program and indeed the nature of private group insurance. If such an assumption were used, the whole fabric of private group life insurance, annuity insurance, and other forms of group insurance in this country would have to be regarded as inequitable.

As a general rule, under private group insurance plans the employer contribution is not allocated to each employee in an amount related to the employee's own contribution. On the contrary the employer contribution, as in the case of social security, is what makes it possible to pay larger benefits to workers and their survivors who are in the upper age brackets when the group insurance plan goes into effect than could be paid only on the basis of the worker's own contributions.

I believe it bears repeating that even without taking into account the fact that benefits will be increased in future years, even young workers covered under social security will get insurance protection worth 20 to 25 percent more than the value of their contributions, and moreover, they will actually do much better than that when account is taken of the fact that social security benefits can and will be increased as wage levels go up without any need to increase the contribution rate.

In deciding whether younger people get their money's worth it must be kept in mind that social security provides not only retirement protection but also survivors and disability insurance protection. While Mr. Stevenson's figures do take into consideration the fact that social security provides protection against loss of income due to death and disability and also provides hospital insurance protection at age 65, most of his discussion ignores the importance of these parts of the program. That importance may be illustrated by an example: The value of the social security survivors insurance protection provided under the House-passed bill in the case of the worker whose earnings are about the median earnings of regularly employed men ($550 per month) who dies at age 35 leaving a wife aged 32 and two small children is about $56,000. Were this worker to become disabled at age 35, the value of the disability insurance protection to him and his family would be about $59,000.

Social security is a sound and equitable program for the young and the old.

III

Mr. Stevenson's article contains nearly two columns on the so-called *Nestor case,* decided by the U. S. Supreme Court in 1960 (pp. 76–77). Mr. Stevenson distorts the legal issues. He has several quotes which to a lawyer and a general reader would appear to be from the Court's decision. But they are *not.* He not only does not quote from the Court decision but fails to mention that the Court decision reversed the contention of the Justice Department brief (prepared in the Eisenhower Administration) that the program is not an insurance program. What the U. S. Supreme Court actually said was:

"The Social Security system may be accurately described as a form of social insurance, enacted pursuant to Congress' power to 'spend money in aid of the general welfare,' whereby persons gainfully employed, and those who employ them, are taxed to permit the payment of benefits to the retired and disabled, and their dependents."

The fact is that the Supreme Court decision rejected many of the contentions made in the brief and stated that: "The interest of a covered employee under the [Social Security] Act is of sufficient substance to fall within the protection from arbitrary governmental action afforded by the due process clause."

Thus, as the Supreme Court stated, although the Congrses can modify rights granted under the statute, it cannot do so in an arbitrary way. The right to benefits under social security, as the Court has said, is protected under the due process clause of the United States Constitution against denial or diminution by arbitrary Government action.

IV

The article attempts to show that social security is unsound by referring to "unfunded outstanding obligations" of $350 billion and stating that under the Administration bill this amount will rise to $417 billion. (pp. 79–80). The $350 billion referred to is the amount that would be needed—if social security were a private, voluntary insurance program—to pay off all obligations on the assumption that there would be no new entrants into the system. The idea of there being a huge unfunded liability in the social security system is wholly meaningless and irrelevant for any practical purposes. There is no need in a Government program such as social security for funding on the basis referred to in the article. It would not only be unnecessary but also unwise to build up such a huge accumulation of social security funds. No life insurance expert nor social security expert, nor business nor labor organization, and no Advisory Council or Committee of the Congress has ever recommended such funding.

The most recent Advisory Council on Social Security—an independent group of experts in the field which reviewed all aspects of the social security program over a period of 18 months—stated in its 1965 report:

"The Council is in agreement with the previous groups that have studied the financing of the program that it is unnecessary and would be unwise to keep on hand a huge accumulation of funds sufficient, without regard to income from new entrants, to pay all future benefits to past and present contributors. A compulsory social insurance program is correctly considered soundly financed if, on the basis of actuarial estimate, current assets up future income are expected to be sufficient to cover all the obligations of the program; the present system meets this test. The claim sometimes made that the system is financially unsound, with an unfunded liability of some $300 billion, grows out of a false analogy with private insurance, which because of its voluntary character cannot count on income from new entrants to meet a part of future obligations for the present covered group."

V

The article is in error in saying that the social security changes recommended by President Johnson would take persons out of poverty "partly by raising the Federal income taxes" of other people over 65 (p. 79). Under the President's proposal, over 2 million persons would be removed from poverty (1.6 million aged 65 and over and 0.5 million under age 65) by the increase in the amount of the social security benefits—especially the increase in the minimum benefits from the present $44 a month to $70. There is no truth in the statement in the article that the method of removing these people from poverty would be through raising income taxes.

The article speaks disparagingly of the improvement of social security benefits for the purpose of reducing the number of persons on assistance or relief. But this has been the objective of the social security program since it was enacted in 1935! This was the original congressional intent. In fact, the carrying out of this intent has been one of social security's greatest achievements. The proportion of the aged on welfare has decreased from about 22 percent in 1950 to about 10 percent today. We hope to decrease the proportion to 5 percent. Increasing the level of social security benefits will aid in this objective.

VI

One more of the many inaccuracies contained in the article is the allegation in the article that social security contributions are put into the "Treasury's general fund" (p. 76). The fact is that the contributions are automatically appropriated by law to the social security trust funds, which are kept separate from one another and from the general funds of the Treasury and can be used only for the payment of the benefits and administrative expenses under the social security program.

VII

Mr. Stevenson says that the Government is discouraging beneficiaries from augmenting their incomes by collecting social security contributions with no comparable increase in benefits and by withholding benefits from those beneficiaries who earn over $1500 a year. (p. 79)

The purpose of the social security program as determined by the Congress is to pay benefits when there is a loss of earnings because of death, disability, or retirement. The law prescribes a test—generally referred to as the retirement test—for determining whether such loss of earnings has occurred. The amount of the retirement test and whether there should be any retirement test is certainly a question which warrants discussion.

What Mr. Stevenson didn't say in his article is that eliminating the retirement test would increase the cost of the program by $2 billion a year. The additional cost would be incurred to pay benefits to about 2 million people, many of whom are fully employed and earning as much as they ever did. The vast majority of social security beneficiaries—some 20 million other persons—either are unable to work or cannot find a job and therefore would not be helped one iota by the elimination of the retirement test. Would this be an intelligent and equitable way to spend $2 billion a year additional?

The author's statement that beneficiaries who work and pay social security contributions get "no comparable increase" in benefits may give the impression that this work cannot increase their benefits or that, if it can, the benefit increases are insignificant. The fact is that the beneficiary who works can get a benefit increase if he has even just a single year in which his earnings are more than his earnings in any one of the past years that were used in computing his benefits.

In short, Mr. Stevenson didn't tell a full or fair story on the retirement test.

VIII

The article concludes that further study of and basic changes in social security are called for. Some of the concluding remarks are repetitions and of misleading assertions made earlier and some go further.

The article raises a number of questions about what will happen to the social security program in the future after whatever "temporary tinkering the House and Senate may do regarding the President's program"—as if the House and Senate are not comprised of the elected representatives of the American people and as if the President is not responsible to the American people. It is through such processes as the article calls "tinkering"—studied proposals such as those made

by the President, and congressional deliberation and debates—that this Nation builds its public programs, orders its economy, and carries on the affairs of Government, and this will doubtless be true in the future.

The article goes on to suggest, on the basis of the increases in social security contribution rates that have been enacted over the years, that private pensions may not be able to remain "afloat." Such scaremongering ignores the fact that social security has not prevented the rapid growth of private pensions. Private pensions have made tremendous strides since the 1930's, when social security began. There were only about 400 private pension plans in 1935 when social security was enacted. Today there are over 60,000!

With regard to Mr. Stevenson's proposal to establish a "blue ribbon commission," over the years since the Committee on Economic Security submitted its report to President Roosevelt and the original Social Security Act was enacted in 1935, there have been numerous independent studies of social security by advisory councils composed of highly respected and knowledgeable citizens. For instance there was an Advisory Council Report in 1939, 1948, 1959, and 1965. Since 1956, studies by advisory councils have been provided for in the social security law itself, and there have been periodic studies by these councils. Through the councils, consisting of representatives of employees, employers, the self-employed, and the general public, the social security program has had the benefit of a great deal of intelligent and thoughtful examination. Under the law, the next advisory council, scheduled to be appointed in 1968 (under the bill recently passed by the House, it would be appointed in 1969), will review all aspects of the social security program, including the status of the social security trust funds in relation to the long-range commitments of the program and will make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Board of Trustees of each of the social security trust funds and to the Congress.

IX

Mr. Stevenson has not clarified any fundamental issues. He has not pointed out the great unmet social needs. What he has done has been a great disservice to the millions of social security beneficiaries and the millions who are counting on social security benefits in the future. He has obfuscated and confused the major policy issues in social security. A critical and constructive review of social security would be welcome. A glib and superficial attack on a program so important to millions of Americans is not a contribution to the American people.

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR TEACHER TRAINING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention was called to an article entitled "Federal Funds for Teacher Training," appearing in the September 1967 issue of American Education, a publication of the Office of Education.

It is an exposition of the current fellowship programs under title IV of the National Defense Education Act and title V–C of the Higher Education Act of 1965. In my judgment, the article will be of interest to Senators because it contains on a State-by-State basis the number of fellowships awarded to the institutions of higher education for the purposes of these two acts.

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:

FEDERAL FUNDS—TEACHER TRAINING

To meet the ever-increasing need for teachers and to improve the quality of classroom instruction, Congress has authorized several programs specifically aimed at training teachers for the nation's schools, colleges, and universities.

Title IV of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 encourages graduate students to prepare for college teaching careers and to work toward their Ph.D. or its equivalent. This academic year, 15,000 NDEA title IV fellows are taking courses in such varied programs as city planning, economic history, physics, speech and drama, nuclear engineering, entomology, computer science, and comparative education. Each student receives a stipend of $2,000 for the first academic year of tenure, $2,000 for the second, and $2,400 for the third, together with an allowance of $400 a year for each dependent. An additional stipend of $400, plus $100 for each dependent, is available for summer study. Participating colleges and universities receive an annual allowance of $2,500 per student in lieu of tuition fees.

Under title V (C) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 teacher fellowships are available for up to two years of graduate study leading to an advanced degree other than the doctorate. These fellowships may be awarded to persons teaching now or intending to teach at the elementary or secondary level. This year, 2,336 prospective and some 1,500 experienced teachers are enrolled in the program and academic institutions listed on the chart on the opposite page.

Prospective teachers receive a stipend of $2,000 for the first academic year, $2,200 for the second, and an allowance of $400 per academic year for each dependent. Experienced teachers selected for the program receive a stipend of $4,000 per academic year and $600 for each dependent. An annual allowance of $2,500 per student is given to each participating institution.

Graduate fellowships for college and university teachers under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, academic year 1967–68

State and institution	*Number of awards*
Alabama:	
Auburn University	25
University of Alabama	40
Alaska: University of Alaska	4
Arizona:	
Arizona State University	30
University of Arizona	60
Arkansas: University of Arkansas	14
California:	
California Institute of Technology	25
Claremont Graduate School	30
Loma Linda University	2
San Diego State College	2
Stanford University	85
University of California—Berkeley	85
Davis	50
Irvine	30
Los Angeles	85
Riverside	27
San Diego	30
San Francisco	4
Santa Barbara	25
Santa Cruz	4
University of Southern California	60
Colorado:	
Colorado School of Mines	8
Colorado State College	7
Colorado State University	25
University of Colorado	80
University of Denver	12
Connecticut:	
University of Connecticut	45
Wesleyan University	2
Yale University	85
Delaware: University of Delaware	12

Graduate fellowships for college and university teachers under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, academic year 1967–68—Continued

State and institution	*Number of awards*
District of Columbia:	
American University	2
Catholic University	32
Georgetown University	20
George Washington University	14
Howard University	12
Florida:	
Florida State University	60
University of Florida	80
University of Miami	22
Georgia:	
Emory University	32
Georgia Institute of Technology	26
Georgia State College	4
Medical College of Georgia	4
University of Georgia	60
Hawaii: University of Hawaii	28
Idaho: University of Idaho	12
Illinois:	
Illinois Institute of Technology	14
Illinois State University	4
Loyola University	12
Northern Illinois University	10
Northwestern University	85
Southern Illinois University	32
University of Chicago	85
University of Illinois	85
Indiana:	
Ball State University	8
Indiana State University	4
Indiana University	85
Purdue University	65
University of Notre Dame	38
Iowa:	
Iowa State University of Science and Technology	35
University of Iowa	70
Kansas:	
Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	28
University of Kansas	65
Kentucky:	
University of Kentucky	40
University of Louisville	10
Louisiana:	
Louisiana State University and A. & M. College	43
Tulane University	60
Maine: University of Maine	12
Maryland:	
Johns Hopkins University	75
Peabody Conservatory of Music	2
University of Maryland	55
Massachusetts:	
Boston College	14
Boston University	31
Brandeis University	40
Clark University	10
Harvard University	85
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	65
Northeastern University	10
Springfield College	4
Tufts University	28
University of Massachusetts—Amherst	45
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	4
Michigan:	
Michigan Technological University	4
Michigan State University	70
University of Detroit	2
University of Michigan	85
Wayne State University	34
Western Michigan University	4
Minnesota: University of Minnesota, Minneapolis-St. Paul	85
Mississippi:	
University of Southern Mississippi	4
Mississippi State University	14
University of Mississippi	12
Missouri:	
St. Louis University	30
University of Missouri—Columbia	55
Kansas City	2
Rolla	12
Washington University	72

Graduate fellowships for college and university teachers under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, academic year 1967–68—Continued

State and institution	*Number of awards*
Montana:	
Montana State University	12
University of Montana	8
Nebraska: University of Nebraska	30
Nevada: University of Nevada	8
New Hampshire:	
Dartmouth College	10
University of New Hampshire	18
New Jersey:	
Newark College of Engineering	4
Princeton University	80
Rutgers, The State University	58
Stevens Institute of Technology	9
New Mexico:	
New Mexico State University	10
University of New Mexico	32
New York:	
Alfred University College of Ceramics	2
City University of New York—all institutions	50
Clarkson College of Technology	4
Columbia University—main division	85
Columbia University—Teachers College	21
Cornell University	85
Fordham University	25
Juilliard School of Music	4
New School for Social Research	4
New York University	80
Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute	12
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	25
State University of New York—Albany	26
Binghamton	7
Buffalo	60
College of Forestry	10
Stony Brook	18
Syracuse University	60
University of Rochester	72
Yeshiva University	15
North Carolina:	
Duke University	60

Graduate fellowships for college and university teachers under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, academic year 1967–68—Continued

State and institution	*Number of awards*
North Carolina—Continued	
North Carolina State University—Raleigh	30
University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill	85
North Dakota:	
North Dakota State University	14
University of North Dakota	8
Ohio:	
Bowling Green State University	7
Case Institute of Technology	32
Kent State University	12
Miami University	7
Ohio State University	70
Ohio University	25
University of Akron	4
University of Cincinnati	25
University of Toledo	4
Western Reserve University	45
Oklahoma:	
Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	27
University of Oklahoma	30
University of Tulsa	2
Oregon:	
Oregon State University	32
University of Oregon	75
Pennsylvania:	
Bryn Mawr College	10
Carnegie Institute of Technology	35
Drexel Institute of Technology	4
Duquesne University	6
Lehigh University	16
Pennsylvania State University	80
Temple University	23
University of Pennsylvania	85
University of Pittsburgh	45
Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania	4
Rhode Island:	
Brown University	60
University of Rhode Island	18

Graduate fellowships for college and university teachers under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, academic year 1967–68—Continued

State and institution	*Number of awards*
South Carolina:	
Clemson University	24
University of South Carolina	15
South Dakota:	
South Dakota State University	5
University of South Dakota	12
Tennessee:	
George Peabody College for Teachers	10
University of Tennessee—Knoxville	60
Vanderbilt University	50
Texas:	
Baylor University	4
North Texas State University	6
Rice University	45
Southern Methodist University	10
Texas A. & M. University	28
Texas Christian University	6
Texas Technological College	8
Texas Woman's University	4
University of Houston	10
University of Texas	85
Utah:	
Brigham Young University	14
University of Utah	45
Utah State University	22
Vermont: University of Vermont and State Agricultural College	12
Virginia:	
College of William and Mary	2
Medical College of Virginia	7
University of Virginia	65
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	25
Washington:	
University of Washington	85
Washington State University	28
West Virginia: West Virginia University	14
Wisconsin:	
Marquette University	16
University of Wisconsin—Madison	85
Milwaukee	10
Wyoming: University of Wyoming	16
Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico	4

GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS UNDER THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, ACADEMIC YEAR 1967-68

[P denotes prospective teachers; e experienced]

State and Institution	Program	Number of awards
Alabama: University of Alabama	Elementary education	4–p
Alaska: University of Alaska	Biology	4–p
	Rural education	25–e
Arizona:		
Arizona State University	English math	10–p
	Art	25–e
	English	15–e
University of Arizona	Reading	25–e
Arkansas:		
Henderson State Teachers College	History	4–p
University of Arkansas	do	4–p
	Modern foreign languages	15–e
California:		
California State College, Los Angeles	Social studies education	4–p
Chapman College	Modern media	25e
Claremont Graduate School	Elementary education	4–p
Sacramento State College	English	4–p
San Fernando Valley State College	do	25–e
San Francisco State College	Early elementary education	20–e
Stanford University	Secondary education	16–p
	Elementary education	25–e
University of California, Berkeley, Los Angeles.	do	4–p
	English	4–p
University of Southern California	Elementary education	4–p
Colorado:		
Adams State College	Elementary and secondary education	4–p
Colorado State University	Earth science, education reading, English	12–p
University of Denver	Elementary and secondary education, international relations.	10–p
Western State College	Elementary education	4–p
Connecticut:		
University of Connecticut	Math	18–e
Wesleyan University	Secondary education	6–p
Yale University	do	10–p
Delaware: University of Delaware	Math	4–p
District of Columbia:		
Howard University	Elementary and secondary education	10–p
Trinity College	History education	4–p
Florida:		
Florida State University	Art, English, social science, foreign language.	16–p
	Math	25–e
	English	25–e
Stetson University	Social studies	4–p
University of Florida	Chemistry and physics	4–p
	Spanish	15–e
	Supervision	25–e
University of Miami	Mental retardation	4–p
University of South Florida	Early elementary education	4–p
Georgia:		
Emory University	Secondary education	12–p
University of Georgia	Math, geography, history, science and social science education.	12–p
	Reading	25–e
	Psychology	20–e
Hawaii: University of Hawaii	Science education	4–p
	Communications	20–e
Idaho: Idaho State University	English	4–p
Illinois:		
Illinois Technical College Chicago, North.	Language, arts, education	4–p
	Disadvantaged	25–e
Northwestern University	Elementary education	4–p
Southern Illinois University	Curriculum supervisors, helping teachers, department chairmen.	25–e
University of Chicago	Biology, English, math, foreign languages, physical and social science.	16–p
	Urban elementary education	10–e
University of Illinois	Latin, math, secondary education	16–p
	Early elementary education	20–e
	English	20–e
Indiana:		
Ball State University	English, physics	8–p
DePauw University	Math	4–p
Indiana State University	Guidance	20–e

GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS UNDER THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, ACADEMIC YEAR 1967-68—Continued

[P denotes prospective teachers; e experienced]

State and Institution	Program	Number of awards
Indiana—Continued		
Indiana University	Biology, reading, math, classic literature, music, Russian.	16-p
	French, Spanish	25-e
Purdue University	Secondary education	12-p
	Economics	25-e
	Political science, civics	15-e
University of Notre Dame	Secondary education	4-p
	World history	20-e
Valparaiso University	Social science	4-p
Iowa:		
Clarke College	Reading	25-e
Drake University	Biology, elementary education	8-p
Iowa State University of Science and Technology.	Sex education	4-p
State College of Iowa	Industrial arts education	4-p
Kansas:		
Kansas State College, Pittsburg	English	4-p
Kansas State Teachers College	Secondary education	4-p
University of Kansas	German, math, social sciences	12-p
	History	15-e
	Geography	20-e
Kentucky: University of Kentucky	Elementary education	4-p
Louisiana:		
Loyola University	Physical science	25-e
Southern University and A. & M. College.	English	4-p
University of Southwestern Louisiana	Computer science	15-e
Maine: University of Maine	Elementary and secondary education	4-p
	Guidance	20-e
Maryland:		
Johns Hopkins University	English, math, social sciences, science, modern foreign languages.	12-p
	History	15-e
University of Maryland	Teaching, guidance	25-e
Massachusetts:		
Boston College	Elementary education	4-p
Boston University	Chemistry	4-p
Clark University	Geography	4-p
	Geography, history	20-e
Harvard University	English, reading, math, art, music, science, social studies, foreign languages.	16-p
Springfield College	Physical education	4-p
Tufts University	Early elementary education, French	8-p
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	English	4-p
Michigan:		
Eastern Michigan University	Early elementary education	4-p
	Social studies curricula	20-e
Maygrove College	Educational reading	4-p
Michigan State University	History, social science	10-p
	Reading, math, science	25-e
University of Michigan	Music	4-p
	Elementary education	24-e
Wayne State University	Business education	4-p
	Industrial arts	24-e
Western Michigan University	International studies	4-p
Minnesota:		
University of Minnesota, Duluth	Science and math	24-e
Minneapolis-St. Paul	Classics, guidance	8-p
	Geography, history	20-e
Mississippi: University of Mississippi	History	4-p
	Reading	25-e
Missouri:		
St. Louis University	Elementary and secondary education	4-p
University of Missouri, Columbia	English	4-p
Washington University	Elementary and secondary education language arts.	12-p
Montana: Montana State University	Elementary education	4-p
Nebraska: University of Nebraska	Elementary education, social science	8-p
Nevada: University of Nevada	Elementary education	4-p
New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire.	Science	4-p
	Guidance, reading	25-e
	Science	20-e
New Jersey:		
Montclair State College	English	4-p
Rutgers, the State University	Romance languages	4-p
	Psychology	30-e
Seton Hall University	Elementary education, Japanese, Chinese	8-p
Trenton State College	Outdoor education	25-e
New Mexico: New Mexico Highlands University.	Mental retardation	4-p
New York:		
Colgate University	Science, English, math, social science, romance languages.	4-p
Columbia University Teachers College.	English	8-p
	Early elementary education	25-e
	Math	15-e
Fordham University	English, history	8-p
Hofstra University	Early elementary education	4-p
	Elementary education	20-e
New York—Continued		
New York University	Physical education, foreign language	12-p
	Disadvantaged-urban	18-e
	English as 2d language	25-e
SUNY College, Geneseo, Potsdam	Physics and science	4-p
	Chemistry	4-p
Syracuse University	Educational media	15-e
	Social studies	24-e
	Reading	15-e
North Carolina:		
Appalachian State Teachers College	Math	4-p
Duke University	English, French	8-p
North Carolina College	Media specialists	16-e
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.	Elementary and secondary education	12-p
North Dakota: University of North Dakota	Social science	4-p
Ohio:		
Kent State University	English, geography	8-p
Ohio State University	Art education	8-p
Ohio University	Speech	4-p
	Economics	25-e
University of Dayton	English	4-p
University of Toledo	Elementary and secondary education	4-p
Oklahoma:		
Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Sciences.	English	4-p
University of Oklahoma	Math	4-p
Oregon:		
Oregon College of Education	Geography	25-e
Reed College	Secondary education	4-p
University of Oregon	Elementary, secondary education, physical education, art, math, English.	12-p
	English	20-e
	Elementary education	15-e
Pennsylvania:		
Carnegie Institute of Technology	English	4-p
	History	15-e
Pennsylvania State University	Sex education	6-p
	Geography	15-e
Temple University	Disadvantaged-urban	25-e
University of Pennsylvania	Elementary education	6-p
Rhode Island: Brown University	Secondary education	16-p
South Carolina: South Carolina State College.	Elementary education	4-p
South Dakota: University of South Dakota	English	4-p
Tennessee:		
George Peabody College for Teachers	Music, social science, social studies education.	12-p
	Humanities	25-e
Memphis State University	Science teaching	4-p
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University.	Home economics, health, physical education.	8-p
University of Tennessee, Knoxville	Business education	4-p
Vanderbilt University	Secondary education	12-p
Texas:		
North Texas State University	Elementary education	4-p
Sam Houston State College	Science	4-p
	do	25-e
Southern Methodist University	History	4-p
	do	25-e
Texas A. & M. University	History, science	10-p
Texas Christian University	English	4-p
Texas Woman's University	Elementary education	4-p
University of Houston	do	4-p
University of Texas	Art, art education, music, physical education.	12-p
Utah:		
Brigham Young University	Physics, family life	8-p
Utah State University	Business education	4-p
	Social sciences	25-e
Vermont:		
St. Michael's College	English	4-p
University of Vermont	do	4-p
Virginia:		
College of William and Mary	Elementary education	4-p
University of Virginia	Secondary education	8-p
Washington:		
University of Washington	Music	4-p
	Germanics	25-e
Western Washington State College	English, math	10-p
	English	16-e
West Virginia: West Virginia University	Music	4-p
Wisconsin:		
Marquette University	Spanish	4-p
Wisconsin State University, River Falls, Platteville.	Social science	4-p
	Industrial arts	24-e
Wyoming: University of Wyoming	Elementary education, physical	6-p
Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico	English, social science, math	4-p

INCREASE TAXES OR CUT FEDERAL SPENDING?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, over the past few weeks an upsurge of interest in cutting Federal spending as an alternative to a tax increase has been very evident on Capitol Hill. I have gone on record as supporting this approach. Consequently, I was delighted to read an editorial in the San Jose, Calif., Mercury-News which stressed the need for a good hard look at Federal spending priorities with particular reference to Senator Proxmire's proposed legislation to create a Government Program Evaluation Commission.

Over the years, the Senator from Wisconsin has achieved a reputation for carefully examining Federal expenditure policy. Thus I think it is appropriate that he should be in the forefront of those who are espousing a cutback in Federal spending rather than a 10-percent surtax.

I ask unanimous consent that the Mercury-News editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

PROXMIRE'S REFORM IDEAS POPULAR WITH TAXPAYERS

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis) is one of those on Capitol Hill who does not believe that the Johnson administration's proposed 10 per cent surcharge on corporate and individual income is a good idea.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, who is ranking majority member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and chairman of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, believes the surcharge will not reduce inflationary pressures, halt the price spiral or—for that matter—even produce as much revenue as the President hopes.

Senator Proxmire would rather see the federal government cut its spending programs than raise taxes, and, in this the gentleman from Wisconsin surely must echo the heartfelt sentiments of a majority of Americans.

In point of fact, Senator Proxmire has gone so far as to suggest specific areas in which budget cuts can be made—the space program post-Apollo, supersonic transport development and "pork barrel" public works projects to name but three.

This approach to the problem of federal spending, however, is hopelessly inadequate, Senator Proxmire concedes, because too many Americans believe that the federal government is so big, and the mechanics of it so cumbersome, that meaningful reductions in spending are impossible.

Senator Proxmire disagrees. What is needed, in his view, is a review of old federal programs, to see which should be retained and which jettisoned, and establishment of a set of national priorities that could guide Congress in establishing new programs.

To this end, Senator Proxmire has introduced S. 2032, which would establish a government commission to evaluate programs, both old and new with an eye to their cost effectiveness, and to ponder the question of national priorities.

In the Senator's words:

"The commission members would be appointed by the President, the Speaker of the House and the President Pro Tem of the Senate, and would be required to report to the President and the Congress by Feb. 1, 1969. It is my great hope that this commission will be useful to the President, to the Congress, and, above all, to the people whose tax dollars pay for everything the federal government does. . . .

With over 20 per cent of the national income passing through the federal till, federal expenditures are of major importance. The ways the federal government chooses to spend tax revenue has a tremendous effect on the allocation of our basic resources in this nation and upon our growth and prosperity as an economy."

The point is a telling one. Senator Proxmire's colleagues in the Senate and in the House should support his program evaluation commission bill. It represents a step, and a significant one at that, toward a long-needed government reform.

AMENDMENT TO ADD GOVERNOR VETO PROVISIONS TO TITLE III(b) OF THE ANTIPOVERTY BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the response to the amendment proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] to add a provision which would allow the Governors to veto programs for migrant and farm workers under title III(b) of S. 2388 was immediate, spontaneous, and unanimously opposed to such an amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD 12 telegrams which are representative of the viewpoint expressed to me.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The problems of migrant workers cannot be solved on a State basis. A very large part of the self-help housing program in this country is among seasonal and migrant farm workers financed by OEO section III(b) funds. There is no Federal program we know of where there has been a finer cooperative working relationship between low income families local religious business and professional people and a Federal agency than in self-help housing. Consequently we are deeply concerned about any proposal which would inject a veto power between local groups and OEO. This program is so locally oriented that an official at a higher level might not be possessed of the requisite information to pass wise judgment on the validity of programs. The only State in which a self-help housing program has been dismantled was in a State OEO office. There is nothing in our experience to indicate that migrant programs would be improved by placing Federal funds under State control. Indeed the contrary is quite clear.

Sincerely,

CLAY L. COCHRAN,
Executive Director, International Self-Help Housing Association.

VISALIA, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Chairman, Subcommittee, Migratory Labor, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

We strongly object to amendment title III (b) OEO giving Governor veto power. Interstate of program makes this amendment impractical. An added bureaucratic factor will preclude benefits to low-income migrants.

EVERETT S. KRAKOV,
Executive Director, Tulare County Community Action Agency.

DES MOINES, *Lowa,*
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

We desire maximum flexibility of operation under the various phases of the OEO program and reiterate our strong opposition to any amendment which would give governors at the State level veto power over the application of funds whether public or private we urgently request defeat of the amendment introduced by Senator George Murphy.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE.
Msgr. EDWARD W. O'ROURKE,
Executive Director.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge voting down Murphy amendment to poverty bill giving veto power to governors of title III(b) programs would seriously endanger and delay some of the most effective and urgently needed programs to needy seasonal farm workers and their families.

FAY BENNETT,
Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON ARLINGTON WILLIAMS,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please oppose the Murphy amendment which would give Governors veto power over title III, part B of poverty bill. Proposed amendment would be a handicap for poorest rural people.

BEN M. HERBSTER,
President, United Church of Christ.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator Murphy's motion to subject title III of EOA to Governor's veto would emasculate or eliminate many title III projects.

SCOTT NIELSEN,
Director, Farm Labor Program Southeastern Pennsylvania, American Friends Service Committee, Kenneth Square, Pa.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge you do everything to prevent title III of the Economic Opportunity Act being subject to Governor's veto through title III innovative programs in many previously neglected areas have begun to find solutions and create a partnership in the use of public and private resources. Seasonal farm labor programs require multi-Stage approach difficulty of securing for example approval of six or more east coast Governors staggers imagination. Possibility of veto and delays inevitably inherent in procedure would effectively minimize participation and contribution of private agencies to war on poverty. Present title III has enabled imaginative and conscientious use of anti-poverty resources in line with stated intent of original act.

ELEANOR A. EATON,
Community Relations Division, American Friends Service Committee.

MIAMI, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Chamber of U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Feeling here in south Florida that Murphy amendment to section 3b of OEO bill can be terribly damaging to migrant programs since many considerations expand beyond State boundaries.

EDWIN TUCKER,
Director, Diocese of Miami Office of Community Service.

MIAMI, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator PETE WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge against amendment placing 3b under Governor's veto.

Rev. D. W. HAVENS,
Director, Liberty City Community Council.

LANTANA, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

Urge Senate reject Senator Murphy's amendment to OEO Appropriation Bill allowing Governor's Veto Title 3B.

EDWARDS RODGERS,
President, Palm Beach County Chapter, Florida Council on Human Relations.

WILMINGTON, DEL.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We object to placing Title #3 OEO under Governors Veto.

ROBERT AND KATHARINE WAY.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please help defeat the Murphy amendment.

S. W. GEORGE,
President, Broward County NAACP.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CHANCES FOR REELECTION GIVEN REALISTIC APPRAISAL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, these are difficult days for President Johnson. Problems and more problems, domestically and internationally, weigh heavily on our Chief Executive.

President Johnson is beset by opposition, often within the Democratic Party, as well as from Republicans. But a reasoned assessment of Mr. Johnson's reelection chances is contained in the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, September 27, 1967. It is titled "Johnson No Pushover." Most keen observers can agree.

Yes, President Johnson is a truly hard-working man. He is, I believe, a man to match our times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks, at this point, the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 27, 1967]

JOHNSON NO PUSHOVER

The "dump Johnson" move failed at the board meeting of the Americans for Democratic Action in Washington, and maybe that was a victory for LBJ. Or maybe it was a modest victory for political realism within the free-wheeling, leftward-winging ADA.

It is normal for the ADA—and even for the "New Left" which met in argumentative convention in Chicago recently—to make vigorous noises of dedicated protest. But the basic rule of politics is that "you can't beat somebody with nobody." When Sen. Robert Kennedy warmly endorsed the Johnson-Humphrey ticket for 1968 last May, he removed himself from the Democratic lists. There is no one else save the White House incumbent for Democrats to rally round.

By those political columnists who examine and reexamine the Johnson phenomenon, the Prsident could be dubbed the "unhappy warrior," these recent months. The political polls which he so closely watches do not show that sweeping strength for the Democratic presidential ticket that they displayed in 1964. Yet even at this moment, at the supposed nadir of Johnson popularity, after a summer of ghetto violence and with Vietnam dragging on, the latest Harris survey finds that no Republican candidate is running ahead of LBJ.

Opinion polls can change rapidly, of course. But as of now the strongest Republican combination against Johnson-Humphrey would be a Rockefeller-Reagan ticket. These rival slates stand even at 50–50. A Romney-Reagan ticket would run seven points behind Johnson-Humphrey. Other possible GOP combinations lag further.

So Lyndon Johnson is hardly a political cypher. The Vietnam dilemma, the reduction in America's world prestige, the city savaging racial friction, the discreditable credibility gap, even the proposed tax increase—have in various quarters, combined to beat down the President's public image.

But this is a time when the United States is negotiating one of its toughest passages in history. It is fighting a war where issues are not clearcut and simple. It is experiencing a hometown revolution, as blacks seek to shake off what has been called internal colonialism. It is patiently continuing to pump out foreign aid in remarkable amounts and, as a practicing Christian, is not demanding "gratitude" in return.

In all this, Mr. Johnson has exhibited considerable dogged staying power. Governor Rockefeller said on TV last weekend that the President anticipated the problems of the cities with his antipoverty program. A political realist, LBJ knows precisely the value, or lack of value, in wafting unofficial peace envoys to Hanoi. Some intellectuals decry him as the last "frontiersman" President, but no one ever found a western (or southwestern) frontiersman to be lacking in steady patriotism.

Wily, resourceful, politically savvy, LBJ is a formidable force in and out of his party. If the Vietnam war were removed to the conference table before next year's election, he would be tremendously difficult to defeat. But even if Ho Chi Minh keeps the war going, and if the travail of America's cities persists, the hardest-working President in Washington's recent history will be no political pushover in 1968.

OREGON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL 1968

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish once again to thank my good friend, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and all other members of the Committee on Appropriations for the fine help and consideration they gave the State of Oregon in connection with public works appropriations for fiscal 1968.

I wish to pay special tribute to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, the Senator from Louisiana, for his usual fine courtesy to our Oregon witnesses who appeared to testify in support of Oregon public works appropriations and to the serious consideration and study he has given to the needs of our State in the field of public works appropriations.

One of the projects of special concern and importance to the coastal area of Oregon is Siuslaw Harbor, at Florence, Oreg. The preconstruction planning on the project was completed almost 2 years ago and the proponents of the project have, during that period, amply demonstrated the urgent need for the harbor improvement. The Public Works Subcommittee, under the leadership of the Senator from Louisiana, recommended funds for the project in fiscal 1967; unfortunately, we were not able to hold the Senate recommendation in conference. This year I am most grateful that the committee approved $500,000 for an initial start of construction on this most desirable $2,435,000 harbor modification project. I cannot overemphasize the importance of efforts on the part of the Senate conferees to hold the $500,000 in conference because the economy of the area will be enhanced by this development and its benefits will be enjoyed not only locally but by the Federal Government through increased tax revenues.

The people of Oregon owe a debt of gratitude to the committee and to the Senator from Louisiana for retaining the items of $100,000 and $500,000, respectively, which were not recommended in the budget, but which were approved in the House of Representatives for development of the Cheto River harbor and the Tillamook south jetty. These excellent projects are long overdue, and the actions taken by the Senate and House of Representatives in including appropriations for these harbors will bring them to completion at a much earlier date.

The economy of Portland and the lower Columbia River area received a great stimulus when the committee increased by $1,300,000 the House-approved budget request of $2,700,000 on the Willamette River 40-foot project. Portland and other harbors in the lower Columbia River area will benefit greatly by the increased water commerce which will be induced by the $22,600,000 Columbia River channel deepening program. It is my hope that the Senate conferees will do everything in their power to convince the House conferees of the wisdom of retaining the Senate-recommended $4,000,000 for the Columbia River 40-foot project.

The Corps of Engineers has on file a long list of projects upon which bank protection works are required in the Willamette River Basin. Floods on the Willamette and its tributaries take their annual toll by way of heavy damage including the washing away of priceless topsoil. The people of the Willamette River Basin should be grateful to the committee and to the Senator from Louisiana for their action in recommending an increase of $125,000 over and above the $375,000 budgeted and recommended by the House for Willamette River bank protection. If this increase can be held in conference, it will mean the acceleration of work on bank projects which are long overdue.

In the area of funds for general investigations, the Senate Appropriations Committee is to be commended for recommending a total of $36,246,000, an increase of $2,501,000 over the amount recommended by the House. These studies warn us of the needs in the fields of navigation, flood control, and related water projects. They represent wise investments in the future of our Nation.

To the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I wish to express the thanks of the people of Oregon for the excellent help he has rendered to my home State over the many years in the fields of appropriations for reclamation projects and the program of the Bonneville Power Administration. Not only did the committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Arizona, bring about the approval of the budgeted amounts for our Oregon projects, but it also recommended an impressive sum of $21,555,000 for general investigations of reclamation projects. This reflected an increase of $5,555,000 over and above the amount

recommended by the House. This favorable action made possible the recommendation of a new reconnaissance survey of the land and water resources of the Juniper division of the Wapinitia project. We are indeed thankful for this new survey project.

In closing, I should add that the committee has followed an extremely wise course of action because it has recommended the investment of taxpayers' dollars in projects that will redound to the benefit of our generation and generations of future Americans.

EULOGY TO JEFF KIBRE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I was deeply grieved and shocked to learn of the death of Jeff Kibre on the morning of September 27 after a long illness resulting from a series of strokes.

A militant and vigorous advocate of the cause of labor unionism all his life, Jeff Kibre served during the last 15 years as a representative of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union here in the Capital.

In this capacity he served long and well. He became a familiar figure around Capitol Hill, and he counted as personal friends literally scores of Members of the Senate as well as the House of Representatives.

Across the country and in the Nation's Capital, his reputation as an acknowledged expert in all aspects of law pertaining to organized labor, to maritime and transportation became firmly established.

Many of the laws on our Nation's statute books stand as a monument to his memory. His lifelong work is indelibly recorded in the history of this country.

Before working as Washington representative of the ILWU, Jeff represented the Fishermen's Union on the west coast. Before that, he had been secretary of the United Studio Technicians Guild in Hollywood.

He was born in Philadelphia 60 years ago, but his family moved to Los Angeles when he was only 6 months old—so that he was reared and attended public schools in Los Angeles. He received his B.A. degree from the University of California in Los Angeles.

Earlier this year, Jeff retired from active service with the ILWU and moved back to Los Angeles to recuperate from several strokes he had suffered—the first one of which occurred in October 1964, while he was on the island of Maui in Hawaii.

Even after retirement, and until quite recently, when he suffered another serious stroke which proved fatal, Jeff continued to assist the ILWU in an advisory capacity.

His life was cut off at a time when he was contributing significantly to the forward progress of our Nation. For Jeff was a thoroughly dedicated, fighting and courageous champion of workingmen everywhere.

He had great vision, and he had the courage of his convictions. Perhaps equally important, he knew how to go about implementing his ideas and his beliefs to make them realities.

Jeff slipped into a comatose condition on June 21 and never awakened after that. His death came peacefully. But he died as he lived all his life: his fight for life continued right up to the very end.

He is survived by his wife Pearl and a son, Joe, who is now doing graduate work at UCLA.

He also leaves four brothers, Maynard, James, Walter, and Bert, and three sisters, Cecile, Pearl, and Adele.

He will be sorely missed by all of his many, many friends here in Washington and throughout the country, including the hundreds of people who knew, admired and respected him in Hawaii. More than 600 delegates to the eighth biennial convention of ILWU Local 142 in Honolulu stood in 1 minute of silence in his memory 2 days ago.

Mr. President, the Longshoremen's Union has lost a loyal and devoted leader. Working men and women everywhere have lost an eloquent champion. The Nation has lost one of her leading citizens. I have lost a friend.

My wife, Ellyn, and my entire staff both here and in Honolulu join me in offering warmest and sincerest condolences to his wife, his son, and his entire family.

OUTSTANDING WORK OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in today's world of advanced technology and mass production, the Nation's small businessman is finding it increasingly difficult to keep abreast of change and innovation so vital to maintaining a competitive position in the business world.

Small industrial and service firms in New Jersey account for a large part of the total number of businesses in our State. They have contributed millions of dollars to the national economy, provided jobs for thousands of workers, and have also provided products and services essential to the expanding American economy.

I invite attention to the outstanding job that the Small Business Administration is doing in helping small business in New Jersey under the progressive leadership of its new Administrator, Robert C. Moot.

SBA has approved a total of 95 loans amounting to $6,075,000 to small business firms during the first 10 months of this fiscal year in the State of New Jersey.

As in the case of many small businesses throughout the United States, they frequently need assistance and guidance in maintaining their competitive position, and more important, to develop new products and services demanded by our space-age economy.

The SBA provides several broad programs of assistance to these small firms, and it is doing a superlative job of helping America grow and prosper by aiding deserving small firms with management guidance, financing, technical knowledge, and counseling.

In many cases, SBA's assistance helps unite community resources with Federal, State, and business factors in a self-help effort inherent in our American tradition.

I invite attention to the success story of the Middlesex Tool & Machine Co., of Mountainside. It is particularly noteworthy because it clearly illustrates how SBA, working with the private business community, has wisely lent taxpayers money to expand and modernize a small firm, which in turn provides additional jobs, larger payrolls, and supporting services and taxes.

I am pleased to mention this SBA assisted firm, a leading manufacturer of molds for the plastic industry, because of its industrial leadership and contribution to the economic growth of Mountainside and the State of New Jersey.

Deficiency in the company's working capital position interfered with economically sound operations, and while fairly substantial sales were being conducted, operating capital was meager.

Mr. Joseph Schmidt, president of the firm, and Mr. Robert White, vice president, decided that more working capital was needed to place the company in a favorable position to meet competition.

Messrs. Schmidt and White consulted with Mr. Andrew Lynch, regional director for the Small Business Administration in Newark about their company's problems. This was in June 1964. On August 31, 1964, a $90,000 loan was disbursed in participation with the National State Bank of Elizabeth, N.J. National State Bank's participating share of the loan was 25 percent.

Today Mr. Schmidt and Mr. White report that the SBA loan improved the working capital position of their firm allowing it to purchase in quantity at favorable prices. The loan also helped them to exercise better inventory control and take advantage of available trade discounts. Improved cash flow eased tight operating position with profit potential enhanced.

While sales have fluctuated modestly, profits have followed a decisive upward trend. The firm's net profits have multiplied 25 times in the 3-year period since that SBA loan was disbursed. Net profits in 1964 were $933 and in 1966 the profit had reached an all-time high of $25,936. Deficit working capital of $26,453 on December 31, 1963, has been steadily improved by the loan and through retained earnings to $71,263 on December 31, 1966. Net worth on December 31, 1963, was $116,850. This was increased to $159,596 by December 31, 1966, an increase of over 36 percent. The loan has always been current and has been reduced from the original $90,000 to $53,000.

There are 38 presently employed as compared to 34 at the time of the loan disbursement. Employment opportunities with the firm are expected to expand even more in the near future, bringing new impetus to the economy of Mountainside.

President Johnson has, on numerous occasions, noted the important role which America's small businessmen play in building our Nation's economy. They are the seedbed of democracy nurturing the free and innovative development of our Nation's wealth.

Mr. President, I commend the Small Business Administration for the outstanding work it is doing in developing our Nation's small businesses.

I certainly hope that the outstanding success story of the Middlesex Tool & Machine Co., of Mountainside, will serve as an incentive to other small businessmen throughout the Nation.

They, too, can play an important role in our Nation's growth and prosperity by taking advantage of the advice and counsel which their regional SBA office stands ready to give.

Mr. President, the President has repeatedly stated that the economy can only prosper to the extent that the individuals in our country prosper. In his annual budget message to Congress the President stated:

> Government must always be responsive to human needs.

In proclaiming Small Business Week during May of this year, President Johnson stated:

> We recognize and applaud the contributions made by our 4.8 million small businesses. We must insure that they will continue to hold a vital place in our Nation.

Mr. President, we have here a good example of how a Federal agency—the Small Business Administration—under favorable conditions, can work in partnership with our citizenship for the kind of development and progress that President Johnson wants for all Americans.

NATIONAL PLANNING NEEDED TO BALANCE FUTURE GROWTH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the big cities of the country are in serious trouble. The Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser, for years has been advocating the creation of a national planning agency to make studies and recommendations for the location of new Federal bases and installations and for the award of Federal contracts. This suggestion seems to me to be a very meritorious one in that it could lead to a more evenly dispersed population throughout the country and would relieve the already overcrowded urban centers from further congestion.

Mr. Wendell Reynolds, editor of the editorial page of the Advertiser, has just completed the presentation of four related editorials, all of which deal with the difficulties of big cities and the ills of small towns. I ask unanimous consent that the thought-provoking series of editorials be included in the RECORD.

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

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Sept. 25, 1967]

DIFFICULTIES OF BIG CITIES TIED TO ILLS OF SMALL TOWNS

The baffling problems of the big cities, particularly those of the ghettos, have resulted to a considerable extent from the troubles of the rest of the country.

The drift of people from rural areas and small communities to the cities has been under way for many years. In the last decade it has been greatly increased by three factors:

1. The inability of many tenant farmers and owners of small farms to make a decent living.

2. The elimination of jobs, particularly in coal mines, by the use of machinery.

3. The determination of more and more Negroes to gain their civil rights and better opportunities for themselves and their children.

Surveys have shown that the movement to the cities is beginning to slow down. But federal officials have reported that the number of migrants still reaches about 600,000 a year.

Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty said recently that about 1,000 newcomers arrive there each week. He estimated that at least a fourth of them come from the South.

Most of the migrants lack skills for any job that pays well. These usually drift into the ghettos and increase the crowding in the woefully substandard housing there.

Thousands that can't find work have to depend on welfare benefits. Some turn to crime.

But besides the disadvantaged newcomers who greatly complicate the problems of the big urban centers, many talented and educated young people who could benefit their smaller communities go to cities to take advantage of more promising opportunities for a career.

Men from Huntington have risen high in law, medicine and business in New York and other large cities. Several have done well in art, science, engineering and the entertainment field.

The hospital and research facilities of the big cities offer strong attractions especially to young doctors of exceptional ability.

The major cause of the acute shortage of doctors in this state is the tendency of graduates of the West Virginia Medical Center to leave for practice elsewhere.

The acquisition of independent retail and wholesale businesses and industries by large corporations also has tended to drain competent and ambitious young people away from towns and small cities.

The most capable employes of the corporations move up to better jobs and generally reach a big city.

The affiliation of the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Baltimore & Ohio railroads has already resulted in the transfer of more employes from Huntington than will come here.

The loss of community leaders through such transfers and the removal of young people who would become leaders tend to reduce the launching of new enterprises that would create jobs.

There are opportunities here for the development of profitable aluminum fabrication industries such as those operating near the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. works at Spokane, Wash.

Before the Kaiser plant opened at Ravenswood, the company took a number of newsmen and Chamber of Commerce representatives to Spokane. Company spokesmen pointed out that operations similar to those in that area could be developed along the Ohio and Kanawha Valleys for fabricating aluminum from the Ravenswood plant.

The possibilities were discussed in West Virginia newspapers at the time. But fabricating industries have not developed as they might have if there had been more enterprising men in the area.

Similarly there are opportunities here for the opening of plants to fabricate nickel, steel and plastics produced in and near Huntington. But there are few such operations even though the city is prospering from the payrolls of its big industries and from heavy shipments of coal.

The constant draining of people away from rural and small urban areas to the overcrowded cities is comparable to giving an overweight patient with high blood pressure one transfusion after another from an underweight victim of anemia.

The big patient has already suffered attacks similar to apoplectic strokes in the form of destructive riots. His well-being is further endangered by polluted air and water, increasing crime and the nerve strain of crowding, commuting and competing for advancement.

The rising costs of government and the increasing welfare load comparable to medical bills are forcing the patient to call for more and more aid.

The anemic patient, who represents the rural urban areas, lacks the means to provide the remedies for the symptoms or the basic causes of his trouble.

Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnittker said in an address at Columbus, Ohio, some time ago:

"Rural towns that once flourished with manufacturing or as railroad centers are now stagnant or deteriorating aggregations of grocery stores, taverns, feed stores, filling stations, garages and empty buildings. They have lost their place in our modern economy."

For several years The Advertiser has been urging legislation to deal with the twin problems of the deterioration of towns and the festering of overcrowded cities.

Now riots and other troubles of the cities have forced themselves upon the attention of high federal officials. At the same time members of Congress and some members of the President's Cabinet have taken up the problems of rural America.

Remedies proposed to adjust the imbalance in which 70 per cent of the people live on one per cent of the land will be discussed in other editorials of this series.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Sept. 26, 1967]

EFFORTS UNDERWAY TO SLOW DRIFT OF PEOPLE TO CITIES

Several federal programs have been launched to help relieve poverty, create jobs, provide training for them, improve living conditions and in general offer a better life for both city and rural dwellers.

Such efforts should be continued, and some of them should be expanded to meet the needs of millions of disadvantaged people.

But while these remedies relieve some of the troubles, they do not sufficiently reduce the migration of people from the stagnant rural areas to the already crowded big cities. For that a more extensive effort is necessary.

The continuing flow of people from farms and rural towns to the congested big urban areas has been called by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman one of the most serious problems of our times.

For a penetrating study of possible solutions he has announced the sponsorship of a symposium by himself and five other Cabinet members in Washington next December. Eminent economists, sociologists, city planners and population specialists will attend.

Meanwhile, other officials have proposed attacks on the problem.

West Virginia's Democratic Sens. Jennings Randolph and Robert C. Byrd have joined in cosponsoring a rural development bill presented by Republican Sen. James B. Pearson of Kansas.

The measure proposes these tax incentives for attracting job-producing industries and commercial establishments to rural areas:

1. A 14 percent credit on machinery instead of the normal 7 per cent.

2. A 7 per cent investment credit on the cost of the building.

3. An accelerated depreciation of two-thirds on machinery, equipment and building.

4. A 25 per cent tax deduction above the normal 100 per cent for wages paid low-income persons.

Credits and deductions can be carried backward three years and forward 10 years.

A number of conditions are provided for the benefits. The firm must locate in a county that does not have a city of more than 50,000 population.

At least 15 per cent of the families of

the county must have incomes of under $3,000 a year, or employment must have declined at an annual rate of more than 5 per cent during the last five years.

Areas are included where the closing or curtailing of operations of a Defense Department installation is likely to cause a substantial removal of residents.

The secretary of agriculture may also certify the eligibility of Indian reservations after consulting with the secretary of the interior.

Another of the several additional requirements is that the employer must prove that he has not discontinued a similar enterprise and will not reduce the employment in any other area as a result of opening the new establishment.

Restrictions upon the areas in which the benefits would be effective would prevent the development of jobs that would attract many unemployed workers from the big cities.

But if it proved as effective as its sponsors hope, the measure would at least slow the removal of people from rural areas.

Possibly in time its provisions could be extended to encourage the opening of establishments offering work for which city dwellers could be trained and resettled.

Many depressed rural areas, such as those in much of Appalachia, however, are not suitable for extensive industrial development. The best hope of economic progress for the mountainous counties of eastern and southern West Virginia lies in the development of vacation and recreational facilities.

Dams, reservoirs, parks and forest reservations already existing or proposed in that region offer encouragement for building a great playground that would provide work for thousands.

Completion of the Interstate Highway system, Appalachian development roads and the Allegheny scenic highway proposed by Sen. Byrd would open those areas of rugged natural beauty for the enjoyment of millions from the steaming cities of the East and Middle West.

For full success of this development and others in the program of balanced economic growth of the nation, however, still faster transportation facilities will be necessary.

Business and industrial personnel will need jet plane service back and forth and rapid helicopter travel to and from regional airports. There will also be need for fast passenger trains that will carry automobiles.

The rural areas and small cities must have the means of providing theatres, libraries, playgrounds, better schools, regional colleges, swimming pools, golf courses, hospitals and other medical facilities.

There must be facilities to enable young people to develop their full potential for success and to enable them and their elders to travel quickly and frequently to the big cities for business or pleasure.

And these less populous areas must grant the full rights of citizenship and full opportunities for education, employment and advancement to all persons regardless of race or color.

The disadvantaged particularly should be urged to profit by their opportunities.

This should be done because it is right and just.

But besides that, encouraging the millions of low-income families throughout the country to qualify for a higher standard of living would bring a level of progress and prosperity never before approached.

The resultant wealth and harmony would give the nation a strength and respect in the world that it could never otherwise achieve.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Sept, 27, 1967]

STUDY PROPOSED AS BASIS FOR BALANCED U.S. GROWTH

A plan for an extensive study of means of achieving a better balance in the economic growth of the United States has been offered in a proposed joint resolution of Congress.

The measure was introduced in the Senate by Sen. Karl E. Mundt, R-S.D., for himself and 18 others, including Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va.

To carry out the study the resolution authorizes the President to appoint a commission of 20 members.

Four of the appointees would come from United States cities having a population of at least a million. Four would be from cities of between a million and 100 thousand population, four from those of between 100 and 10 thousand, and four from communities of less than 10 thousand.

The final four would be appointed for special qualifications to help carry out the work of the commission without regard to place of residence or political affiliation.

Not more than half of those chosen from cities or towns could be from the same political party.

The commission would make an analysis and evaluation of:

1. The social, political and economic factors that affect the geographical location of industry;

2. The social, political and economic factors necessary to enable industries to operate efficiently outside large urban centers or to operate and expand within large urban centers without the creation of new economic and social problems;

3. The limits imposed upon population density to enable municipalities or other political subdivisions to provide public services in the most efficient and effective manner;

4. The effect on government efficiency generally of differing patterns and intensities of population concentration;

5. The extent to which a better geographic balance in the economic development of the nation serves the public interest;

6. The role that state and local government can and should play in the economic development of a state or region; and

7. Practical ways in which federal expenditures can and should be managed to encourage a greater geographic balance in the economic development of the nation.

The study would also cover various ways by which the federal government might effectively encourage a more balanced economic growth.

The resolution requires that the study be completed and a report of findings and recommendations be submitted to the President and to Congress within two years after its effective date.

The commission and its authorized subcommittees and members are empowered to hold hearings. Departments and agencies of the executive branch of the government are directed to furnish any information the commission requests to help in carrying out its work.

The study would not be limited to the subjects specifically assigned. Experience gained as the work progressed would doubtless open new avenues of investigation.

The major purpose of the resolution seems to be to open the way for planning national economic growth to obtain a better balance.

The imbalance now existing between the troubled, overcrowded cities and the deteriorating rural areas gives abundant evidence of the need of such a program.

The possible benefits of national planning have been demonstrated also by the improvements brought about by city and area planning.

If a planning program had been in effect for the nation a generation ago, it could have prevented or alleviated many of the social and economic ills that challenge city, state and federal governments today.

But besides providing the basis for a planning program, the study can encourage general economic development by:

1. Stimulating community agencies to greater effort in attracting business and industry to rural towns and areas.

2. Encouraging smaller cities to join in regional development programs, as The Advertiser has been urging the Huntington and Charleston areas to do in providing a new airport midway between them.

3. Pointing out to progressive companies opportunities for locating branch operations in certain areas and supplying ideas for expanding various lines of production.

The commission might perform a distinct service by studying the benefits of locating railway operating offices at the most advantageous points along their lines.

This Tri-State Area is near the center of the origin of much of the coal hauled by the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. It would thus seem to be a superior location for many of the company's offices.

Bringing more people here and providing faster service would tend to attract diversified industries to the area already highly favored by an abundance of fresh water and other resources such as coal, salt brines and natural gas.

Merger of the Norfolk & Western with the Chesapeake & Ohio-Baltimore & Ohio affiliation could open the way for the development of a great railway center here that would provide the stimulus for the growth of a much bigger metropolitan area.

Through such benefits of planned and speeded economic growth the sponsors of the resolution and the commission it established could become the architects for rebuilding the nation into a balanced new pattern that would assure all its people a fairer share of its great riches and would stand as a shining example of justice and wise management throughout the world.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Sept. 28, 1967]

NATIONAL PLANNING NEEDED TO BALANCE FUTURE GROWTH

The Federal government itself could set an example to private business and industry for bringing about a better balance in the nation's economic and population growth.

For several years The Advertiser has been advocating the creation of a national planning agency to make studies and recommendations for the location of new federal bases and installations and for the award of new space and defense contracts.

A short time ago the Republican party's National Coordinating Committee proposed in a five-point program that more government contracts and installations go to poor rural areas.

The five points were outlined in a New York Times News Service story to The Advistiser as follows:

1. Economic incentives for factories to locate in poor rural areas; channeling more government defense and supply contracts and building more installations in such areas.

2. Increased aid for schools, including more vocational-technical schools, in rural areas.

3. Enactment of the rural community action section of the opportunity crusade, the Republican alternative to the administration's antipoverty program.

4. Providing rural areas with the kind of employment service available to urban workers.

5. Stepping up the work of the economic development administration in poor rural areas to attract new industries.

Not only slowing but eventually reversing the migration from rural areas to big cities, as previous editorials in this series have pointed out, is necessary as an attack upon growing social and economic ills.

The need will become even more urgent as the population of the big cities increases. In recent years about four-fifths of the

rapid population growth has been in the already congested cities, and much of that has been in the crowded, impoverished slums.

How this crowding can increase, with consequent complication of problems, is illustrated by predictions of future population gains.

The number of people in the nation reached 100,000,000 between the census of 1910 and that of 1920. The total in 1920 was 105,710,620. Within a few weeks the population is expected to reach 200,000,000.

The increase from 100,000,000 to 200,000,000 will thus require about 50 years. But forecasters say only about 30 years will be necessary to reach 300,000,000.

If the proportionate rate of growth in the big cities continues as it has in the last few years, the problem of financing an adequate war on poverty, pollution and congestion could become too great for solution.

But as great as this problem would be, the danger of cataclysmic destruction from a possible nuclear attack upon the major cities would be much more awesome.

These populous centers would be the first targets of enemy missiles. The fact that some of them are on the coasts would make them still easier to hit with missiles from submarines.

And the location of many of our defense facilities and essential production industries on the coasts would simplify the work of an enemy in destroying them.

The need of dispersing essential defense industries and installations was widely discussed during the destructive bombing of World War II.

Some European countries, notably Sweden, have built extensive underground facilities. We have concentrated even our defense research facilities on the coasts, the most vulnerable areas.

Locating new federal installations on the recommendations of a national planning agency could definitely strengthen national security.

In most cases it would probably also give the installations other advantages not available at spots chosen by congressional committee chairmen influenced by their constituents.

The threatened serious national water problem is another vital reason for efforts to reverse the migration to the big cities. The seriousness of this threat has been demonstrated by the water shortage that existed in New York and other cities of the Northeast.

Conditions during the long drought there gave ominous emphasis to the 1966 report of a Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution headed by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine.

One paragraph of the report said:

"Our withdrawal of water was 40 billion gallons per day in 1900. It will reach 450 billion gallons in 1970 and 650 billion gallons per day in 1980. The current estimate of usable fresh water in lakes, streams, and reservoirs is 650 billion gallons a day. We will soon reach the limit of our water supply, and because water demands will continue to rise in accordance with population increases and per capita use, it is clear that water needs can be met only by an immediate large-scale expansion of our water resources development program and by continued reuse of the available water supply. Unless pollution is controlled, water cannot be reused."

Dispersing the population to make better use of the available supply of water is important not only because of the growing household consumption but because of the great quantities essential for some industries.

Once the federal government demonstrated the importance of dispersing its bases and installations, private business and industry would doubtless be inclined to follow its examples, particularly if tax incentives were offered.

A policy of channeling government contracts into rural areas would also influence industries to locate there.

The factors cited in this series of editorials definitely seem to justify congressional approval of:

1. A bill providing tax incentives for the location of business and industry in rural areas;

2. A resolution for studies to provide the base for a better balance in economic growth;

3. A measure creating a national planning agency to make studies and recommendations for the location of government installations and contracts.

The serious conditions discussed call for prompt efforts to generate popular enthusiasm for planned progress that can bring such enormous benefits.

Serious troubles within the cities have already demonstrated that it may be much later than we think.

Allowing the influx of people from rural areas and towns to continue while middle-class residents leave the core of cities for the suburbs could make the problems impossible of solution.

That could bring on a hopeless era of violence and destruction even if fortune spared the jam-packed millions cremation in the flames of nuclear war.

EUGENE V. DEBS HOME AND EUGENE V. DEBS AWARD

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last weekend another historical site was designated in the State of Indiana by a Department of Interior marker, and a great American, A. Philip Randolph, was honored at a related ceremony.

Our guest of honor for both these events was Stewart L. Udall, the Secretary of the Interior. I ask unanimous consent to print his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SECRETARY STEWART L. UDALL, AT PRESENTATION OF REGISTERED NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK TO EUGENE V. DEBS HOME, TERRE HAUTE, IND., SEPTEMBER 23, 1967

It is indeed a pleasure to be here today to take part in the ceremony officially designating the Eugene V. Debs Home as a Registered National Landmark.

In a way, it is rather remarkable that we are here at all.

As many of you know, it was only through the dedicated efforts of friends and admirers of Eugene Debs a few years ago, that this historic site was saved from destruction.

As recently as February, 1962, the Debs home was under private ownership. It was being cut up into two and three-room apartments, some of which already had been rented.

But the contractor who had purchased the home and was remodeling it, was persuaded to sell it for $9,500. Tilford E. Dudley, Director of the Speakers Bureau of the AFL-CIO, along with Professors Earl Stephanson and Howard D. Hamilton, of Indiana State College, wrote personal checks to cover the down payment.

They then took the leadership in forming the Eugene V. Debs Foundation, with Ned Bush, Terre Haute newspaperman, serving as Executive Vice President.

Contributions to the Foundation come in from labor leaders, unions, college professors and hundreds of admirers of Mr. Debs throughout the country. They made possible the purchase of the Home and the restoration we see today.

Under the leadership of President Pat Gorman and with the support of the distinguished officers and directors of the Foundation, I know that this restoration will be completed in the near future.

The certificate I present today to the Foundation testifies to the fact that the Debs Home possesses national significance of an historic nature, and that it retains its basic integrity as to original location and workmanship.

Before a building or site is designated by the Secretary of the Interior as a Registered National Historic Landmark, it must pass through a quite rigid screening process. The criteria for such a designation were established by the Historic Sites Act of 1935, and those who administer this program take their responsibility very seriously indeed.

This is apparent when you consider that less than 800 sites and structures throughout the United States have been found eligible for the program in the 32 years of its existence.

The fact that the Eugene V. Debs Home, which was dedicated only three years ago, so quickly won this official recognition is further testimony of its historical importance.

Today, with five of the eight rooms of the Home restored and furnished, and with hundreds of items, articles and memorabilia relating to his life on exhibit, the Home stands as a fitting memorial to the life of Eugene V. Debs.

Certainly there is no question as to the importance it played in the life of Mr. Debs. In 1889 he purchased the ground on which it stands. His wife, Katherine, designed the interior of the house, planning a fireplace in every room but one.

The young couple moved in when the house was completed in 1890, and it remained their home during his years of national prominence. Eventually, after the death of Mr. Debs in 1926 and of his wife 10 years later, the house passed into other hands. For a time it was a private residence, then a fraternity house until five years ago when it was rescued from the threat of being converted into an apartment building.

Much has been said and written about the life of this extraordinarily gifted man, Eugene V. Debs, who was in so many ways so far ahead of his time. There are at least three biographies and numerous scholarly efforts weighing the impact of the man upon his times and upon succeeding generations.

He was without doubt the father of industrial unionism in this country, although the concept was not firmly established until after his death. As a labor organizer his talents bordered on genius. Over a 20-year period he helped build the railway unions into a powerful economic force.

He was many things—writer, lecturer, passionate advocate of the underprivileged and the uneducated—the hero of millions of working people throughout the world, who looked to him to lead them out of their poverty and misery.

He didn't succeed completely, of course. But he never stopped trying. As Norman Thomas said of Debs when he dedicated this building three years ago: "His greatest contribution to mankind was his personality which found expression in his writing and speaking."

Many of the "radical" social reforms Eugene Debs advocated during his five losing campaigns for the Presidency have long since been adopted, and, indeed, are considered quite conservative today.

However, his vision of the society he so eloquently described—a society in which there is a brotherhood of races and nations living and working together in peace and prosperity—has not been realized.

Perhaps it never will be—at least in our

lifetime. But it is terribly important that we keep that dream before us.

More than most men, Eugene Debs knew the eternal truth voiced by the Old Testament prophet who said: "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Let us retain the vision of Eugene Debs.

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL, AT THE DEBS FOUNDATION AWARD DINNER FOR A. PHILIP RANDOLPH, TERRE HAUTE, IND., SEPTEMBER 23, 1967

This afternoon it was my pleasure to present the officers of the Debs Foundation the certificate designating the Eugene V. Debs Home as a Registered National Historic Landmark.

Many of you here tonight were present at that ceremony, and I know you share with me a sense of gratitude to the officers of the Debs Foundation for the excellent job that has been done in restoring the Home to its original condition.

Pat Gorman, Foundation president, Ned Bush, the executive vice president, and the others certainly deserve congratulations.

Special notice should be taken, too, of the efforts of Tilford Dudley and Professors Earl Stephanson and Howard Hamilton, whose decisive action five years ago saved this historic building as a lasting memorial to the life and career of Eugene Debs.

There is much to admire and inspire in the career of this eloquent and passionate spokesman for the underprivileged and the oppressed.

I am, however, particularly fascinated by one audacious practice of Eugene Debs, the politician—and that was his practice of charging a small admission fee to those who came to hear his campaign speeches!

No other candidate of his time dared do this. But such was the eloquence of Eugene Debs that he often drew a larger crowd to his paid campaign rallies than his opponents were able to attract to a free event.

Even in the days before television this was a remarkable achievement, and I must confess it fills me with envy.

We are here tonight to honor A. Philip Randolph, a great American whose life has been in the tradition of Eugene Debs.

The citation of the 1967 Eugene V. Debs Award to Mr. Randolph states that he is a Labor Leader, Educator, Journalist, Civil Libertarian, Partisan of Peace, and Great American.

He is all of these and more. For many years, he has served as the unofficial conscience of the American labor movement. He holds unchallenged, the title "Dean of the Civil Rights Movement."

In preparing my remarks for this occasion I was struck with the many parallels between the lives of Eugene Debs and A. Philip Randolph—a fact that I am sure did not escape the attention of the Committee that selected him for this Award.

Both Mr. Debs and Mr. Randolph were to a large extent, self-educated.

In both, the drive for knowledge was so strong that through extensive reading they obtained a broader and deeper grasp of history, economics and government than most people who hold formal university degrees.

Both men were dedicated and skilled labor organizers, starting from scratch to build powerful and responsible unions of railroad workers.

Both Mr. Debs and Mr. Randolph abhorred violence, but both stood fast to their principles in the face of persecution and vilification.

Both sought, through the columns of their union newspapers, to educate their fellow workers to the need for collective action.

And both men extended their vision beyond the narrow confines of trade unionism to work for the broad social goals that would create a better America.

Finally, both men believed in achieving those goals—peacefully through the democratic processes—through education, persuasion, and the moral rightness of their cause.

This point, I believe, is worthy of some elaboration in the context of the violence of this past summer.

Long before the militants and extremists who command the headlines today were even born, A. Philip Randolph was waging a peaceful war on the status quo. For more than half a century he has pushed, prodded, pressured and persuaded America to move closer to the goals of equal opportunity, brotherhood, tolerance and economic justice.

And he has met with no small degree of success.

Let me cite just two examples, both of which bore the personal stamp of A. Philip Randolph—and both of which resulted in considerable progress.

The first occurred early in World War II, when Mr. Randolph became increasingly concerned with the exclusion of Negroes from jobs in the defense plants. While on a trip through the South, he conceived the idea of a massive Negro march on Washington to dramatize this injustice and bring it to the attention of the American people.

So successful were his efforts in organizing this March throughout the country that it never was held. Instead, he was granted an audience with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, which was allowed by issuance of the famous Executive Order 8802. This landmark action created the Fair Employment Practices Committee, and—even more important—established the fair employment practice concept in the American economy.

Twenty-one years later, in August 1963, Mr. Randolph was again the Director, organizer and moral force behind another March on Washington, which produced even more dramatic results.

It has been said that this 1963 March on Washington—which brought over a quarter of a million persons to the Nation's Capital to urge full citizenship for all Americans regardless of race, color or creed—was one of our Country's finest hours.

Certainly, that gathering on the Mall was a spiritual experience, as anyone who was there can testify. And certainly, too, it mobilized the Nation's conscience in a manner that made possible the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In his remarks to that gathering, which he described as the largest demonstration in the history of this Nation, Mr. Randolph said, and I believe his words are worth repeating here because they so accurately express his philosophy:

"Let the Nation and the world know the meaning of our numbers. We are not a pressure group. We are not an organization or a group of organizations. We are not a mob. We are the advance guard of a massive moral revolution for jobs and freedom. . . .

"The March on Washington is not the climax of our struggle, but a new beginning, not only for the Negro, but for all Americans who thirst for freedom and a better life. . . .

"We here today are only the first wave. When we leave it will be to carry the civil rights revolution home with us into every nook and cranny of the land, and we shall return again and again to Washington in ever-growing numbers until total freedom is ours."

In keeping with Mr. Randolph's longstanding convictions on the necessity for achieving social change through the democratic process, the A. Philip Randolph Institute was established in New York in 1965.

Working with the A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund, it is helping to recruit and tutor minority youth to enter apprenticeship programs in the New York building trades unions.

This program already has placed 250 young men and it is significant that the only two who dropped out, withdrew to enter college. So successful has this program been that it is now being expanded to other cities with the financial support of the Department of Labor.

This, I believe, is the direction in which true progress lies—the path we must walk toward the goals of brotherhood and economic justice.

I have mentioned earlier, the courage of A. Philip Randolph and his willingness to hold fast to his principles in the face of persecution and vilification, regardless of how unpopular they might be at the moment.

And so it came as no surprise when rioting, looting and burning erupted in the streets of America this past summer, that he would be among the first to denounce the violence.

Joining with the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Roy Wilkins, and Whitney Young, on July 26 of this year, he issued a statement that said in part:

"We who fought so long and hard to achieve justice for all Americans have consistently opposed violence as a means of redress. Riots have proved ineffective, disruptive and highly damaging to the Negro population, to the civil rights cause, and to the entire nation.

"We call upon Negro citizens throughout the Nation to forgo the temptation to disregard the law. This does not mean that we should submit tamely to joblessness, inadequate housing, poor schooling, insult, humiliation and attack. It does require a redoubling of efforts through legitimate means to end these wrongs and disabilities. . . .

". . . . we support President Johnson's call 'upon all of our people black and white alike in all our cities to join in a determined program to maintain law and order, to condemn and combat lawlessness in all its forms, and firmly to show by word and deed that riot, looting and public disorder will just not be tolerated.' "

Events since those unhappy days have confirmed the judgment of these four leaders "that the riots have not contributed in any substantial measure to the eradication of these just complaints" and that the primary victims of the rioting were the Negroes themselves.

The plain truth is they have had just the opposite effect—stiffening opposition of pending civil rights legislation and hardening resistance to President Johnson's programs to improve life in the cities, to eradicate poverty and injustice, and to enrich the educational opportunities for the young people of America.

There are those, of course, who were against these programs all along and welcomed the riots as a convenient excuse for continuing their opposition.

But the vast majority of Americans do believe in these programs to eliminate discrimination and to correct economic injustice.

They believe, however, that they should be achieved in an orderly and peaceful manner—through the democratic processes that have served this Nation since it was founded.

As our President, Lyndon Johnson, said in his 1963 Memorial Day address at Gettysburg—

"In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake—it is our nation. Let those who care for their country come forward, North and South, white and Negro, to lead the way through this moment of challenge and decision.

"The Negro says, 'Now.' Others say, 'Never.' The voice of responsible Americans—the voice of those who died here and the great man who spoke here—their voices say, 'Together.' There is no other way.

"Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact. To the extent that the proclamation of emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free."

And it is in this spirit—exemplified by the

life and philosophy of A. Philip Randolph—that we will continue to make progress in the future.

LYNDON JOHNSON: THE URBAN PRESIDENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I disagree with those who tell us that the Johnson administration is marching "backward" on its urban programs, and that the administration is not doing enough in its poverty program, or not training enough people for jobs.

The fact is that there was no manpower training program until a Democratic administration took office in 1961 and adopted the policy that it is important to train people for jobs, and that Government should have a major role in such training.

Under Democratic administrations a million Americans have received job training and retraining—a record the Republicans can only attack, but cannot match.

The opposition asserts that we are not doing enough to fight poverty.

Well, there is one fact that is indisputable. Seven years ago when a Democratic administration took office, there was no antipoverty program.

But, today, here is what we see under President Johnson's war against poverty:

Nine hundred thousand men and women have enrolled in Neighborhood Youth Corps across the land.

More than 200,000 talented but poor students are attending colleges this fall under educational opportunity grant programs.

Two million preschool children have already benefited from Project Headstart.

Federal aid to vocational education more than quadrupled since 1964.

The second summer of the President's youth opportunity campaign has resulted in over a million jobs being made available to 16- to 21-year-olds since April 1967 alone.

In toto, almost 10 million people have been reached by the antipoverty program to date.

This is the very program which Republicans have tried to dismantle.

It was the Republicans in the House of Representatives who just a few months ago so diminished the model cities program and the rent supplements program. Republicans in the House of Representatives also voted, almost to a man, to stall the Federal aid-to-education program.

This is the same Johnson-Democratic aid to education program which in its first year helped 8 million boys and girls get a better education, and which last year aided another 9 million poor school children.

The fact is that Lyndon Johnson believes in the resurgence of our cities, and that he and the Democratic Party have worked hard, and will continue to work hard, for the people in our cities.

The record shows the results. The people will judge it, and not be misguided by partisan statements.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virgina. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 548, Senate bill 2388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 356

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding other motions now pending, it be in order for the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to call up his amendment No. 356, out of order.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

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

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

The amendment offered by Mr. PROUTY is as follows:

On page 126, after line 11, add the following new title:

"TITLE III—INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

"INVESTIGATION

"SEC. 301. The Comptroller General of the United States (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Comptroller General) is authorized and directed to make an investigation in sufficient depth of programs and activities financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under section 2 of this Act, in order to determine—

"(1) the efficiency of the administration of such programs and activities by the Office of Economic Opportunity and by local public and private agencies carrying out such programs and activities; and

"(2) the extent to which such programs and activities achieve the objectives set forth in the relevant part or title of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorizing such programs or activities.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 302. The Comptroller General shall make such interim reports as he deems advisable and shall transmit his final report to the Congress not later than February 1, 1969. Such final report shall contain a detailed statement of his findings and conclusions together with such recommendations, including recommendations for additional legislation, as he deems advisable.

"POWERS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

"SEC. 303. (a) The Comptroller General or, on the authorization of the Comptroller General, any officer of the General Accounting Office may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as he deems advisable. Any officer designated by the Comptroller General may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Comptroller General or such designated officer.

"(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Comptroller General, upon request made by him, such information as he deems necessary to carry out his functions under this title.

"(c) The Comptroller General is authorized—

"(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and

"(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $50 a day for individuals.

"(d) The Comptroller General is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of his duties under this title.

"AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 304. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this amendment directs the Comptroller General to make an investigation of all programs financed in whole or in part by Economic Opportunity Act funds.

This amendment specifies that the Comptroller General's investigation shall be in sufficient depth to determine, first, the efficiency of the administration of such programs by OEO and by local public and private agencies, including the questions of duplication of effort and overlapping of functions among Federal agencies; and, second, the extent to which such programs are achieving the objectives outlined as the intent of Congress in initially authorizing them under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The Comptroller General is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, or individuals for the performance of such activities as he deems necessary to discharge his investigative duties. He is also given the discretion to hold hearings for purposes of taking testimony, and all Government agencies are directed to furnish, upon request, any necessary information.

Interim reports are required to be submitted to Congress as the Comptroller General deems available, but he is directed to submit a final report to Congress not later than February 1, 1969, containing a detailed statement of his findings and conclusions, together with recommendations, including recommendations for additional legislation.

This investigation will be truly representative of all aspects of the war on poverty, and should be equally concerned with the implementation of these programs in rural areas as it is in urban or city areas.

I consider this amendment as perhaps the most important one to be offered in terms of insuring the long-term success of the war on poverty.

I am happy to say that the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], has agreed to accept the amendment.

With that statement, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is correct that I have as reluctantly agreed to accept the amendment as he has reluctantly agreed to cooperate in certain other areas.

My reasons for agreeing to accept the amendment I should like to state briefly for the record, because my position represents a change over what I thought was the proper thing to do earlier this year right on down to the present time.

The Senator will recall that at the time the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty sought funds from the Committee on Rules and Administration, and from the Senate to conduct the inquiry, evaluation in depth, investigation—whatever we wish to call it—the Republican members of the subcommittee urged very strongly that most of the funds we have obtained from Congress should be devoted to contracting with a private management firm in the free enterprise sector of the economy to make what our Republican friends felt would be an impartial and businesslike investigation of the poverty program. We on the Democratic side felt that it was part of the legislative process and part of our duty as members of the subcommittee to conduct our own inquiry, our own investigation, and we therefore rejected the position of the minority. We did, however, retain, with the money which was voted for us, seven consultants, experts in the area covered by the poverty program, to make evaluations and reports to us on conditions in the several regions into which the OEO has divided its administrative operations.

Those reports were received and filed. I believe they were useful. They have certainly influenced me with respect to the position I have taken with respect to this bill, though it should be noted that those evaluations were independent of the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

Nevertheless, I think my friends on the other side of the aisle from me remained unconvinced. I deplore it, but they do remain unconvinced that the study of the subcommittee was adequately objective, and they still remain convinced that an impartial investigation, outside the area of the subcommittee, needs to be made.

I still think it does not, but I think it is most important that we should minimize partisanship in this area; that we should, wherever possible, attempt to seek agreement between differing points of view.

I believe the suggestion made by the Senator from Vermont is perhaps—I use the word "perhaps" advisedly—a happy compromise between those conflicting views. That is because the Comptroller General is historically an agent of Congress. He is a part of the legislative branch of Government. True, he is appointed for a long term by the President of the United States, but I believe the precedents are clear that the Comptroller General is an arm of the Congress, an agency of the Congress.

Therefore, when the Senator's amendment proposes to turn this investigation of the poverty program over to the Comptroller General, he is, in effect, saying the Congress retains this legislative power of oversight, but, instead of delegating it exclusively to a legislative subcommittee, will share that responsibility of oversight of the program with another arm of the Congress, the Comptroller General.

I have great respect for the Comptroller General. I think he is impartial and able and has a good staff. Therefore, largely because I would like to have the minority believe that we in the majority do pay careful heed to their recommendations and their suggestions in this whole field, I am prepared to accept the amendment and take it to conference; and, indeed, to press it on our friends in the House when we get to conference.

That is about all I care to say about the Senator's proposal. I, therefore, accept the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania. I assure him, as I have in the past, that it is not my intent to sabotage this program in any way. I agree fully that the Comptroller General is perhaps the most desirable agency to conduct a study of this nature. I am sure it will be objective. I am sure it will be most helpful to all of us who serve on the committee.

My only concern with the investigation which has been procured by the committee is that it does not have the numerical personnel or sufficient money to do the job which I think should be done.

I am grateful to the Senator for accepting the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I take it the Senator will agree with me that by authorizing the Comptroller General to make this investigation, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and its Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, does not in any way waive the investigative and oversight functions which we presently have with respect to this program.

Mr. PROUTY. No, it does not. I think it is most important that we continue to have it.

Mr. President, I am ready for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 351

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that other motions are pending, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to call up amendment No. 351 out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments (No. 351).

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

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

The amendments (No. 351) are as follows:

On page 16, line 10, strike the words "The Director shall seek to" and insert in lieu thereof the words: "The Secretary of Labor shall".

On page 17, line 7, change the period after the word "offices" to a comma and add the following: "and shall furnish copies of such records to the Secretary of Labor."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I mentioned in my remarks on Monday, I had several amendments adopted in committee which improve the effectiveness and recordkeeping of the Job Corps.

Amendment No. 351 proposes wording in the bill which provides that records kept by the organization in the placement of members of the Job Corps be placed with the Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator asking that the amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, these are simply clarifying amendments.

I understand that the distinguished floor manager of the bill has no objection to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending amendment makes, I think, a useful change in the present law. We discussed this subject in committee and agreed on language slightly different from that proposed by the Senator from Vermont in the present amendment.

I ask my friend from Vermont if I am correct that the purport of this amendment is to make it possible to send to whatever agency appears to be most sensible under the circumstances the last paycheck of a member of the Job Corps, but to assure that the Secretary of Labor has at all times copies of

such correspondence or records. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. I think it is a useful amendment. I am prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the acting majority leader agreed to unanimous consent to set aside the pending business, seriatim, so the Senator from Vermont could continue to propose amendments.

AMENDMENT NO. 352

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that other motions are pending, the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] may be permitted to call up amendment No. 352 out of order.

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

The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment (No. 352).

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the amendment is short, and I would like to have it read to be sure I understand it.

Mr. PROUTY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment (352), as follows:

On page 30, line 11, add the following new sentence at the end of subsection (c): "In the case of programs under subsection (a) (1) of this section, financial assistance may be provided directly to local or State educational agencies to carry out such programs in accordance with policies, procedures, and requirements covered by existing agreements between the Director and the Secretary of Labor providing for the delegation to the Secretary of Labor of the Director's authority with respect to such programs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, my amendment No. 352, in effect, formalizes a practice which is presently being carried out by the Secretary of Labor. That practice is that the Secretary of Labor has authority to pay funds for the operation of in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps programs directly to local or State educational agencies.

I believe, Mr. President, that it is obvious why the in-school neighborhood youth program is presently and should be funded by direct payments to the local or State educational agency. The very nature of the program is such that it is most properly run by the State or local educational systems.

It is my understanding that the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania is prepared to accept this proposal also.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, again my understanding is—and I ask the Senator from Vermont for confirmation—that this amendment merely puts into legislation what is currently the existing practice of the office. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is exactly what it would do.

Mr. CLARK. There has been some discussion within the committee as to the extent to which it is desirable to legislate administrative practices. Generally speaking, I believe there ought to be a great deal of flexibility reserved to the Director of OEO so that, as conditions change, administrative regulations can change, and indeed the whole area of the organization of programs can change to meet changing conditions.

However, the Senator from Vermont and a number of other Senators feel very strongly about the desirability of writing this particular provision into the law, and since it does comply with existing practice, and to me is quite unobjectionable, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

I had been of the view that perhaps the Senator would modify his amendment; but as I heard it read, I understood it was just the way it had been printed.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I just noticed that I did not send the modified amendment to the desk, as I had intended. I do so now.

Mr. CLARK. May we have it read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modified amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 34, line 11, insert the following new sentence at the end of subsection (c): "In the case of programs under subsection (a) (1) to this section, financial assistance may be provided directly to local or State educational agencies pursuant to agreements between the Director and the Secretary of Labor providing for the operation of such programs under direct grants or contracts."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the amendment as modified, I believe, is an improvement over the original version. Therefore, I am prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, notwithstanding other motions that are pending, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] be permitted to call up an amendment out of order.

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Has this amendment been printed?

Mr. PROUTY. No, it has not.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have a copy which I could follow?

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived.

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

The amendment of Mr. PROUTY is as follows:

On page 19, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(h) Title VI of such Act is amended by adding the following new section after section 618:

"'RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOLLOWTHROUGH PROGRAM

"'SEC. 619. Pursuant to section 602(d), the Director shall delegate his functions under section 221(b) (2) to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and such functions shall be carried out through the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.'"

On page 91, strike out line 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(i) Title VI of such Act is further amended by—".

On page 55, line 22, insert the following at the end of the sentence: "Funds for such program shall be transferred directly from the Director to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Financial assistance for such projects shall be provided by the Secretary on the basis of agreements reached with the Director directly to local educational agencies except as otherwise provided by such agreements."

On page 54, line 22, strike the word "subsection" and insert the following: "subsections (b) (2) and".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum so that I may have an opportunity to inspect the amendment.

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.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this amendment transfers the followup program to the Office of Education. It does so by providing that the director of OEO shall delegate his functions to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, under the committee bill, primary responsibility for administering the Followthrough program was given to the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, to fund the program directly through community action agencies. This was so despite the understanding between the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of HEW which specifically spells out that grants would be made directly to local educational agencies, and administered by the Commissioner of Education.

My amendment simply restores the status quo.

It is again by understanding that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I understand it—and I ask the Senator from Vermont whether or not by understanding is correct—the purpose of this amendment is to transfer the Followthrough program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct, in accordance with an agreement which they already have.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is attempting to write into the legislation the administrative procedures which are presently in effect.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I am not happy about this amendment, although I have agreed to accept it.

I believe that the Followthrough program still needs the watchful eye of the OEO. I would like the RECORD to show that the reason for creating the Followthrough program was that a substantial volume of evidence was accumulating indicating that in a number of areas of the country the young children, mostly 3 and 4 years of age but some of them 5 years of age, who had benefited enormously from the Headstart program, both the yearlong Headstart program and the summer Headstart program, were falling back when they got to the first grade or even kindergarten in the public school system and losing the benefits which they had attained from attending Headstart.

For that reason the OEO instituted the Followthrough program and retained control over it in order to assure that steps would be taken, which were not all educational by any means at all, to see that these youngsters held the gains they had made under Headstart.

It is true that for administrative purposes Followthrough has been delegated to the Office of Education. Nevertheless, there are many school boards and school districts in this country which are still allergic to the Headstart program and will, I fear, be allergic to Followthrough.

It does not follow, of course, because a program is delegated to the Office of Education that it need necessarily go from the Office of Education to the school board at the local level. Nor is it essential, I take it, with respect to the noneducational features of Headstart which involve medical and dental services and public health services and the bringing of the parents into the program to give them a little adult education so that they will be better equipped to handle their children when they come home, that it necessarily follows that all of this has to be abandoned.

I do not share the disillusionment of some Senators with the Office of Education. I think it is well run. I have very high regard for Mr. Harold Howe, the Commissioner of Education.

I could have wished that we could have retained flexibility so that if it turned out in certain areas of the country that the Office of Education was not having the appropriate impact on the local school system—for various reasons including racial—that OEO could step in, as it did with the Headstart program in Mississippi, and see to it that an appropriate Followthrough program is carried on outside the formal bureaucratic structure of the local boards of education.

We must remember that this Followthrough, starting with the kindergarten and first grade children, is still getting these youngsters at a very young age.

I would think that in many areas it would be desirable for Followthrough to remain in the end under the jurisdiction of the OEO if that agency felt the school system in the particular area was not capable of handling it. However, I would like to suggest, as a matter of legislative history, and I wonder if the Senator from Vermont will agree with me, that the Commissioner of Education should be advised that it is the intent of Congress to be very sure, indeed, that the local school system, the local principal, and the local school board are sympathetic to the Follow Through program before he undertakes to make funds available to carry on this program in a school district which may well be philosophically opposed to the whole system.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I think that is highly desirable. I certainly hope that the Commissioner would make very certain that a school would intend to carry out the program effectively, efficiently, and without any discrimination whatever.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his concurrence in the views I have expressed.

Under those circumstances, I call the attention of Mr. Howe and his successors to this colloquy, and I am prepared to accept the amendment.

(At this point, Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the pending question as it pertains to the transfer of part of the program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, perhaps since the Senator from Vermont and I appear to be on the same side, I might be able to satisfy some of the doubts of the Senator.

Mr. HARTKE. I point out that I am basically in sympathy with the approach taken. I think it is a good amendment. I think we ought to put our house in order. However, it puts us in a sort of ridiculous position to take the Headstart program and insist on the one hand that it must be kept in the Office of Economic Opportunity and then take the program of carry through and say that this——

Mr. CLARK. Followthrough.

Mr. HARTKE. I should like the Senator from Pennsylvania to know that I am very much interested in all these programs. I disagree with him as to how they are being handled, and I disagree with the procedures by which we are trying to get some of the work done.

The mere fact that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have jurisdiction of this program, for jurisdiction over the program of Operation Headstart, would not mean that they necessarily had to be carried through to the school systems all over the country if the school systems would not perform.

I believe the Senator will have to agree that what you are doing is duplicating governmental services. This would in effect provide for no elimination of duplication because all it would do would be to transfer from one administrative agency to another the operation of one of the programs that is before the country.

In good conscience, it certainly appears to me that since we have had a rollcall vote upon the question of Operation Headstart, this other program, Followthrough or Carry Through—what is the name of it?

Mr. CLARK. Followthrough. If the Senator will think about his golf game, he will get it right.

Mr. HARTKE. I am not a golfer. I am a basketball player.

The operation of Followthrough should be accorded the same right to have it nailed in or nailed out by rollcall vote.

I would respectfully suggest, if the Senator from Vermont were here, that he should give consideration to that fact.

I am hopeful that somehow it could appear that the entire Senate is heading in the same direction, that we are not going off in two directions at one time—that is, eliminating Headstart and putting Followthrough into the same category that the Senate voted against doing with respect to Operation Headstart.

Mr. CLARK. If I may say a word in support of my Republican colleagues, Senators PROUTY and JAVITS, the Senator from Indiana has a good deal of basic logic on his side in the comments he just made. However, I believe that when you get down to the grassroots and the actual administration of the program, the Senator might be prepared to concede that the logic is somewhat afflicted by having been evolved in a vacuum.

The fact is that Headstart was initiated as a poverty program largely because the school systems all across the country were not doing their business. They were not doing anything to see that the children from poverty-stricken families were given the preliminary and very simple educational, medical, public health, and other instruction and treatment which was necessary, when they got to the first grade, if they were to be able to keep up with those of their same age group.

The local school boards were not doing that, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, with what I think was great wisdom and with a great sense of initiative, undertook to create Headstart. I am one of those who believe that in due course Headstart should be transferred to the Office of Education. At present, Headstart has been delegated to the local school boards in approximately one-third of the programs during the wintertime and two-thirds during the summer. This is the point at which the situation becomes a little complicated, and I ask the Senator to acknowledge the existence of the complications. It is much easier for a school board to run a Headstart program in the summer, when school is not in session, than it is in the winter, when the classrooms and the teachers are occupied in taking care of the children in the first twelve grades.

The fact that Headstart has been delegated to the schools already to the extent of two-thirds in the summer and one-third in the winter is some indication of a gradual transition from a new program evolved by a new agency, which

was asked to pitch in and plan well, to a more established bureaucracy at the local level. In a couple of years, in my opinion, the time will come to put all of Headstart into the school boards. In the meantime, the Office of Education might have acquired some adult education itself.

When you move over to Followthrough, you find that the school boards are now approximately where they were with respect to Headstart two and a half years ago, except that since many of the Followthrough children are in the first grade and many school boards now conduct a kindergarten, the school boards have primary jurisdiction over these children, anyway.

The thought was to hold the money and standards in the OEO, in order, frankly, to put the match to the feet of the school boards to see that they did the job properly.

I, for one, would agree with the Senator from Indiana that perhaps this amendment is a little premature; we should keep Followthrough in the OEO, although delegated to the school board for another year or two. When you let the school boards run it, you avoid all the administrative duplication. But what you do is hold onto the purse strings and assure that where a school board is not doing the job it should, you will be able to take the money away from them, and OEO can run the program directly.

However, since the Director of OEO is perfectly willing to write into the law the present administrative practice, and since the Senator from Vermont and his colleagues on the minority in the committee feel very strongly about this matter, I am perfectly willing to accept their amendments. I do not see any logical inconsistency. It appears that way on the surface, but I do not believe there is any inconsistency.

So far as the rollcall vote is concerned, if the Senator from Indiana insists on a rollcall vote, I shall cooperate with him. But I wish to point out that a rollcall vote this afternoon—and this is the understatement of the day—might embarrass a number of our colleagues who, for various reasons, usually in the public interest, were of the view yesterday, rightly or wrongly, that we would have no rollcall votes this afternoon.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I believe I should say, on behalf of the majority leader, that the statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania, to the effect that Senators might be embarrassed in the event there were a rollcall vote this afternoon, is a statement for which I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania takes full responsibility.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield, I certainly do. But I have had a look at the list of absent Senators.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, so have I. But the majority leader has not put out this word. The leadership has not put it out. The leadership has indicated to all Senators who have inquired that there may be rollcall votes this afternoon. I wish to make that position clear. There may be rollcall votes this afternoon, and the leadership hopes there will be.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

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

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. May I say to the Senator from Indiana that I am in complete accord with what the Senator from West Virginia has said. But the ball is in the corner of the Senator from Indiana. If he desires to call for a rollcall vote this afternoon and can get sufficient Senators to the floor to order the yeas and nays, I certainly shall not stand in his way.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the leadership will cooperate in getting sufficient Senators to the floor, if the Senator from Indiana wishes to ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is the matter still open for debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw his request?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, with the understanding that I will not be precluded from offering this amendment on Monday, I withdraw the amendment at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, perhaps there should be an informal ruling from the Chair that the Senator is not prejudiced in any right to offer this amendment on Monday next, or any other day, when the bill is up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would be in order at the proper time on Monday or any other day while the bill is still before the Senate, and there is no preferential amendment or motion pending.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that is, the bill has to be before the Senate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] have full authority to offer the amendment which was withdrawn prior to a vote on anything relating to title II; namely, the motion to send to committee with instructions, so that his rights will be fully preserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the Senator include the second of the pending motions, the motion to strike title II?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Only the first. Only one motion is pending at present.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. But there are two motions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Before either motion could be voted on——

Mr. DIRKSEN. If that is the desire of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I shall be glad to include both motions.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the distinguished minority leader wish to specify that the Prouty amendment, when it is resubmitted, will be the same amendment which has just been withdrawn?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Illinois is agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am perhaps mistaken, but I thought the Senator from West Virginia had withdrawn the motion to strike and then filed a motion to recommit.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No; that is not correct.

Mr. CLARK. Then will the Senator explain what the difference is? It seems to me that the two motions are practically identical; are they not?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No. As to the final result, they would be identical, but for procedural purposes the thought of the Senator from West Virginia was that it would be best to have a second motion to strike title II in the event the first motion was not agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from West Virginia, of course, is entirely within his rights. It occurs to me, as a pragmatic and practical matter, that there is little, if any, difference between the two motions. That is, of course, my personal opinion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We set aside an earlier motion on which agreement was entered into. At least, the yeas and nays were ordered on yesterday. Will the Chair now advise the Senate what motion was it that was temporarily set aside?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Illinois that there was proposed a unanimous-consent request but it was not actually entered into.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The pending motions were never set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from West Virginia has asked unanimous consent, in each instance that, notwithstanding the fact that there were motions pending before the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] be allowed to proceed out of order to bring up certain amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the present business of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that one motion to strike title II was offered after which a motion to recommit with instructions to report forthwith was called up.

The motion to recommit takes precedence over the motion to strike.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, Mr. President, the motion to recommit is the pending business of the Senate; is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That takes care of that.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CURRICULAR AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I am supporting the distinguished floor manager of the bill in trying to pass in the Senate a measure which, because of the care and thought that was given to it in the committee stage and on the floor, will survive the test of conference to become law, substantially as it passes this body.

I want to pay tribute to the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania for the consideration he gave to proposals offered in committee on certain aspects of the proposed legislation.

As an example of the type of thoughtful consideration that was given, I direct attention to sections 243(4); 243(6); and 224(d)(2) of S. 2388. The discussion of this language is to be found on pages 54 to 55 and 60 to 61 of Senate Report No. 563.

What I now say to the Senate is in the nature of legislative history on this language, and upon conclusion of my statement I shall appreciate hearing the comments of the floor manager of the bill on whether my summary of the committee report language is his understanding of the situation and reflects the intent of the committee.

The availability of financial assistance from the Office of Economic Opportunity to assist in the education of the poor has raised a number of questions as to the relationships which are to be established with the U.S. Office of Education and with State educational agencies and local schools. A number of persons in the education community have expressed concern about the role of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In order to clarify this question I offered, and the committee accepted, three amendments designed to delineate the respective responsibilities of the two agencies. For the purposes of legislative history I would like to explain the theory upon which the delineation is based and to explain intent of the committee with regard to the amendments. Present law clearly prohibits community action program assistance for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system. The committee amended this provision to limit financial assistance in the educational field to such noncurricular educational services as special health, remedial, and welfare services. Nothing in the bill would expand the present authority of the Office of Economic Opportunity with regard to curricular education.

This limitation must be viewed in light of the fact that there are other funds available for the education of disadvantaged children. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes about $2.4 billion for programs for educationally deprived children. Funds from the Economic Opportunity Act are not to be used to duplicate or compete with programs funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The coordination language in title VI is designed to insure that Federal programs be carried out efficiently and without duplication. In no case can community action funds be used to support a school program which competes with the public schools.

Community action funds may be used to make the services of school social workers and psychologists, nurses and doctors, speech therapists, and education specialists—such as remedial reading specialists—available to poor children when such children have a special need for those services. However, those funds may not be used to hire teachers or instructional personnel for schools.

The role of the Office of Education in the Nation's education program may be described as one of increasing educational opportunities by improving the quality of education offered by school systems as institutions. The Economic Opportunity Act is designed to increase opportunities for poor children. This necessarily involves improving educational services. The institutional approach of the Federal education programs and the individual approach of the antipoverty legislation converge in improving the educational opportunities for disadvantaged children. If duplication is to be avoided and if efficiency and coordination are to be attained, a distinction must be drawn where the two approaches meet—with the child. Poverty programs are intended to supplement education programs and therefore are limited to noncurricular educational services. For the purposes of this program curricular education, as distinguished from noncurricular educational services, should be defined as those aspects of education which are offered as part of the normal school program in the area to be served. I offered and the committee accepted three amendments which are designed to insure that, first, Federal, State, and local education programs and the community action programs will be mutually complementary and will not be duplicative or competitive; and second, Federal support of educational institutions will continue to be within the purview of the Office of Education. These amendments provide:

First, that, educational services provided with community action program funds will be noncurricular in nature;

Second, that, in extending such educational services, there will be maximum use of the services and facilities of the Office of Education and State and local educational agencies; and

Third, that, where a public school offers educational services which can be expanded or adapted to meet more effectively the educational needs of poor children and the purposes for which assistance is being extended under the community action program, that school's services will be utilized in providing the extended assistance.

The administration and funding of the followthrough program has also been subject to question. The Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education have initiated a pilot followthrough program which is being administered by the Office of Education on the basis of a memorandum of understanding between the two agencies. The memorandum provides that funds authorized by title II of the Economic Opportunity Act and delegated to the Office of Education are to be used for grants to local educational agencies for followthrough projects. The Commissioner grants funds directly to local educational agencies. The committee bill has drawn up more explicit guidelines for the administration of all community action programs. Generally, all such programs within a community will operate under the general sponsorship of the community action agency for the community. The general change made in the funding of community action programs will not alter the basic operation and funding mechanism of the followthrough program. Local educational agencies will submit applications through the appropriate community action agency which will forward the application to the Office of Education.

Final approval rests solely with the Commissioner, subject to the conditions of the memorandum of understanding with OEO.

Nothing in the amendment would require a change in the memorandum of understanding between the two agences.

PRINTING ERROR

I want to point out that there was a printing error in the committee report. On page 61 of the report in the second paragraph, the fourth sentence was garbled in the printing of the report. It should read:

> The institutional approach of the Federal education programs and the individual approach of the antipoverty legislation converge in improving the educational opportunities for disadvantaged children.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the statement by the Senator from Oregon correctly reflects the interest of the committee. It is our view that efforts of community action agencies should complement and not duplicate the work of schools and other community agencies. Moreover, funds appropriated under the Economic Opportunity Act should not be used for curricular education but should be limited to special health, remedial, welfare, and other noncurricular services.

An illustration of remedial services which would not duplicate in-school programs are special tutoring programs, such as those operating in store fronts and neighborhood centers with financial assistance under the community action program. In many communities these and related programs support and supplement the on-going school programs in poverty areas.

REPORT ON VISIT TO TEXAS WITH PRESIDENT JOHNSON TO INSPECT HURRICANE DAMAGE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Thursday, September 28, I accompanied the President of the United States to Texas on Air Force 1 for the Presidential inspection of flood-damaged areas of the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas.

In addition to the Presidential staff, the President was accompanied on this tour of inspection by my colleague in the Senate, Senator JOHN TOWER, the Governor of Texas, Congressmen ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, and KAZEN, of Texas, and the outgoing Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Farris Bryant.

The President landed at Harlingen, Tex., where he inspected the refugee camps of the refugees from the flood waters of Arroyo Colorado, who were sleeping in public buildings. He made numerous inquiries as to the extent of the care provided for the refugees.

We then traveled by helicopter to Rio Grande City, Starr County, where the President inspected the food kitchen operations, where thousands and thousands of homeless refugees from both the United States and Mexico are being furnished food, and inspected the temporary hospitals set up in the schools of Rio Grande City to care for refugees from the flood who had become ill and were being cared for medically. The President then returned by helicopter to Harlingen, Tex.

The Governor of Texas had handed the President a request that 24 south Texas counties be declared an emergency disaster area. On the return to Harlingen, Tex., in a public announcement Thursday afternoon, September 28, 1967, the President of the United States declared those 24 south Texas counties an emergency disaster area.

The President, immediately upon the request from the Governor of Texas, moved with dispatch and with immediacy and with a sense of urgency and with a sensitivity of the needs of the people there, to the distress suffered by the people in this great area, where a million people reside and where hundreds of thousands are homeless in Texas and Mexico.

I commend the President of the United States for his personal attention to the flood-ravaged areas of Texas, and for the dispatch and speed with which he declared this to be a disaster area, immediately upon the legal right flowing to him to declare this a disaster area.

The President immediately made available $2½ million of the President's emergency disaster relief fund for emergency disaster relief, on the preliminary figures by the officials involved. Twenty million dollars was the preliminary estimate of the emergency disaster relief that would be required in this Hurricane Beulah disaster in Texas; and in their statements to the President, made on Air Force 1 en route to the Lower Rio Grande Valley, they said that this was a beginning, that the emergency disaster relief expense would be higher in the long run.

Mr. President, this makes the action of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, September 21, 1967, in adding $10 million to the Bureau of the Budget's estimated $15 million needed for emergency disaster relief for fiscal year 1967, a very necessary action.

With $20 million being the first estimated needs for emergency disaster relief in the wake of Hurricane Beulah in Texas, and with the officers of the Office Emergency Planning and the State both stating that this was only a beginning, that the expense would be higher than that, the addition of the $10 million by amendment on the floor of the Senate September 21, bringing the total appropriations for this fund to $25 million, was urgently needed. The Senate acted with great vision in adding $10 million.

It also points up the recognition by the Senate of the real problem when the leaders in the Senate on September 21 stated that additional funds could be added in the supplemental appropriation toward the close of this year's session of the Congress.

I thank my colleagues in the Senate for the unanimous action by which the $10 million was added to the President's emergency disaster relief fund. My 3-day inspection in Texas on Sunday, September 24, Monday, September 25, and Tuesday, September 26, and my return to Texas with the President from Washington on Thursday, September 28, convinced me that the $20 million will not be sufficient to pay all the public damage payable out of the President's emergency disaster relief fund, caused by the monumental Hurricane Beulah, which did an estimated $1 billion in damage in Texas alone.

Mr. President, I am also grateful for the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee on Thursday morning, September 28, shortly before the presidential plane left Washington for the Rio Grande Valley, in adding $1 million to the appropriation for the Army engineers for emergency work, looking to the rehabilitation of the intercoastal canal, the Corpus Christi ship channel, the Brownsville ship channel, and the other navigation facilities constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the area along the Texas gulf coast damaged by Hurricane Beulah. This, too, was a preliminary estimate. The chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, the Honorable ALLEN ELLENDER, senior Senator from Louisiana, stated that, on his communication with the Army Engineers, they had stated that this $1 million would not be sufficient to rehabilitate the navigation facilities of the area—it was a beginning.

I am grateful to the Senate Appropriations Committee for moving with such great alacrity and dispatch and understanding in making this $1 million available as soon as the appropriations can be passed through both Houses.

I have today addressed a letter to the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, which reads as follows:

> DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The past weeks have been especially difficult ones for the people of the Rio Grande Valley. The immediate job will be to restore community services to normal. After that the big clean up will begin. Undoubtedly many people who have lost their normal jobs will be utilized in this clean up operation. However, when that is finished the hundreds of individuals who earned their livelihood on the farms of the

Rio Grande Valley, which have been devastated, will have no place to turn. The people who would harvest the crops which have been lost very likely will have no work, no money, and no place to turn for help. The time to think of their prospective plight is now.

I have heard from operators of canning factories who have told me they would not be able to undertake their normal canning operations because of the hurricane damage and that therefore there will be thousands of jobs lost.

I continue reading from the letter:

You recently announced that a number of workers would be allowed into California from Mexico in order to help harvest the crops. On Thursday September 28, 1967, Senator Murphy of California remarked on the floor of the Senate:

"California agriculture is today in a desperate state. I am advised that our farmers as of now need at least 3,700 pickers for tomatoes and grapes, and that this number will increase by at least 1,500 within a week."

Would it not be wonderful for California, for the farm workers in Texas who have lost their customary employment, and for the country that needs this food production if some way could be found to use the farm workers presently homeless and unemployed in the Rio Grange Valley to harvest the crops in California. This would not only help California and the Texas workers but would also make unnecessary the additional importation of foreign labor in order to harvest the California crops.

As Chairman of the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I stand ready to take any action you may recommend which will have the effect of getting jobs for these people whose lives have been uprooted by Hurricane Beulah.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

I add, Mr. President, the tomato crop in the Rio Grande Valley which was just being planted not long ago is lost The crop now being harvested in California consists largely of tomatoes. The agricultural workers in Texas whom this disaster has thrown out of employment are tomato and citrus fruit harvesters; for many of the crops grown in the valley are of the same type as those grown in California.

The loss of wages and employment by these agricultural workers has not been counted in the billion-dollar loss created by Hurricane Beulah. I hope that a way may be found for some of them to be used to fill the need for skilled farm labor in California.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is now 2:45 on Friday afternoon. I had hoped that a number of Senators would be prepared to present amendments to be considered, and many of them, perhaps, modified and accepted; or, if necessary, that we might have proceeded to dispose of them adversely by rollcall votes. However, it now seems pretty clear that there are no Senators present and ready to propose amendments.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to recommit the bill to the committee, with instructions to strike title II.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I intend to address myself in opposition to that proposal. However, I state for the benefit of the acting majority leader and the minority leader that if any Senator wishes to come to the floor and propose an amendment, I shall be entirely happy to yield the floor in order that such amendment may be presented, and we can at least debate it and determine whether or not it can be accepted, or modified and then accepted, or whatever the situation may be with respect to the particular amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He did yield.

I ask that the Chair notify staff and all others that this will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 270 Leg.]

Allott	Dirksen	Mondale
Bartlett	Dominick	Monroney
Bible	Ellender	Montoya
Boggs	Griffin	Morse
Brewster	Hatfield	Pell
Burdick	Hill	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Stennis
Cannon	Jackson	Yarborough
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.
Clark	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Cooper	McIntyre	

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Anderson	Hansen	McCarthy
Baker	Harris	Mundt
Church	Hartke	Nelson
Curtis	Hayden	Randolph
Fannin	Hruska	Smith
Fong	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Gruening	Kennedy, N.Y.	Williams, N.J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

THE BUDGET

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in a remarkable editorial which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune of Saturday, September 23, 1967, entitled "The Budget Box: Panacea or Pandora?" the Minneapolis Tribune editorializes on the difficult and complex problems which confront our Government in funding the necessary programs, and in particular, the relationship of that funding to the current proposal for the tax increase.

While each of us may have disagreement with one or another of the suggestions contained in the editorial, the approach and its maturity are obviously of profound and compelling good sense.

The editorial concludes with this statement:

Instead of panaceas, Americans should look for accommodation.

They strike the theme of approach which should commend itself to every mature and public-spirited American. I commend the Minneapolis Tribune for this editorial and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE BUDGET BOX: PANACEA OR PANDORA?

Critics of the administration proposal for an income tax surcharge point to congressional reluctance to enact such a measure. They see Congress as reflecting the public weariness with excessive government spending programs which ought to be cut down before tax increases can be justified. The taxpayer, they say, is overburdened.

Nonsense.

At all levels of government, the rates of taxation are indeed high, but so are prosperity and both quantity and quality of publice services. Certainly there are misguided programs, and just as certainly there are many people continuously looking for ways to change them.

The sweeping statement, "Cut down spending," is insufficient without the qualification of saying where it should be cut. If there is abuse in welfare programs, for example, should the public welfare concept be discarded in mystical reverence for the good old frontier days when men really determined their own destinies? . . . overlooking embarrassments like slavery, child labor, disease and starvation.

And no one objects to the elimination of pork-barrelling. Well, almost no one. The difficulty is the susceptibility of federal works projects to the law of inverse political geography: The closer the pork barrel is to one's own district, the less objectionable it becomes.

Of course there's the war in Vietnam which induces an economic myopia by the fact that its annual cost is about the same as the presently projected federal budget deficit of $29 billion. Stop the war and stop the deficit! . . . that is, if the North Vietnamese and Russians and Chinese will only co-operate.

There is no panacea. The state of the economy is good, but potentially dangerous because of budget imbalance, a tightening money market, and an auto strike which may be the harbinger of steeper wage-price spirals.

In the enormous but tightly inter-related U.S. economy, a mixture of actions is what is needed: a federal tax increase combined with reductions in such categories as the supersonic jet transport and race-to-the-moon programs; and a strike settlement which gives auto workers less than the six per cent annual increase demanded but will impinge somewhat on industry profits.

Instead of panaceas, Americans should look for accommodation.

ACTIVITIES, SUCCESSES, AND GOALS OF THE COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY IN MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the war on poverty effort is now 3 years old and we are beginning to see the successes of this program and the opportunities it offers for the continual social and economic improvement of those living in poverty.

Recently, I received a letter from the Intercounty Community Council, the Community Action Agency for the counties of Clearwater, East Polk, Pennington, and Red Lake, in the rural northwestern part of Minnesota. This letter describes the activities and the successes of the CAA and outlines its future goals.

Mr. President, this letter serves as a testimonial to the efforts of the poverty program and as an example of how local communities in a rural area have been able to improve the conditions of the poor. It is a clear endorsement of the continuation of the innovative spirit associated with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD.

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

INTERCOUNTY COMMUNITY COUNCIL, INC.,
Oklee, Minn., August 31, 1967.

Hon. WALTER W. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: In order to assist you in your legislative considerations of Community Action Programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, this Council wishes to provide you with an evaluation of what has been done locally, what is planned for the future, and the status of Community Action Programs within this area.

Project Pretty-Up, Nelson Amendment, has employed 170 of our elder citizens on a beautification and community improvement program since June of 1966. 75% of these employees are 65 years of age, or older. They had been *existing* on below-subsistence Social Security benefits that averaged less than $800 of yearly income.

The supplementary income provided by employment on Pretty-Up has enabled these older folks to purchase needed household appliances, to repair and improve their homes, to raise their standards of living by spending more for food and clothing, to remedy physical handicaps (one man used his first three paychecks to purchase a new artificial leg. Others have replaced, or been fitted with new dentures, eyeglasses, etc.), and to live among their friends and neighbors with the reinstatement of pride and self respect that comes from having proved their worth, their skills and their determination to still be a useful member of the community.

These are Pretty-Up benefits to the employees. Consideration should also be given to the community improvements. 21 villages in our four counties have cleaned and repaired public parks, streets and other facilities, and incidentally, spent a considerable amount of their local funds on problem areas, and with an enthusiasm and interest previously lacking.

Our Nursing Home Activity Program, operating in seven nursing homes, has taken hold like an epoxy glue. Residents of the homes, who had previously remained in their rooms, dejected and despairful, waiting only for death, have joined in and are proving to themselves, and to others, that there is still much to live for, and a considerable enjoyment in the process.

Recent County Fairs had entrees of craftwork from all of the Nursing Home Activity Projects. The ribbons they won hang proudly in the centers. We must consider this as an indication of the involvement these people now feel toward community affairs.

Our School Social Service Program, funded to provide family counseling for Head Start and other pre-school projects, has revealed new directions and concepts for home, school and family coordination, and according to school administrators is one of our most valuable programs.

We are now trying to have this taken over by the schools so that it may be expanded and improved through the use of educational funds. This, as with all of our projects, fulfills the committee of OEO to develop programs that are feasible for the area, that alleviate specific problems, and that are ultimately operative under local administration.

Head Start has proven itself in our area as it has in all areas. Here, it is furnishing the influence that promotes and permits the simple integration of Indian Children into predominantly white schools, and it is fulfilling its promise of social adjustment and cultural improvement for the children and families from more unfortunate circumstances.

Head Start is now being supplemented by a locally initiated Follow-Through phase that is attempting to insure a permanency of the effect of the Head Start program. This Follow-Through is on a local basis only and precedes a similar innovation at the Federal level.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps Project, sponsored by this CAA, has employed 564 youth from 16 Northwestern Minnesota counties during the summer and will continue such employment, on a curtailed basis, during the coming school session. It has provided income and work experience to boys and girls in dire need, and even more important, it has instilled in many the desire to complete or further their education.

All of these statements are the tangible and measurable benefits of programs sponsored by this CAA. There are other benefits, intangible perhaps, but no less important to our area and its people. They include the coordination of effort between our agency and other Federal Agencies that sees the benefits of all programs reaching more and more of the intended beneficiaries. After two full years of operation, our council is an accepted part of community service and the people we are organized to serve are turning to us for assistance of all kinds.

For the reasons mentioned, this council respectfully requests your careful consideration for the continuation of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the influence of your high office toward the maintenance of Community Action Programs at at least their present level of Federal assistance, and if possible, that such assistance be increased so that we may provide service and assistance to more of our people.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP C. STOLTENBERG,
Chairman.

MERLE A. LINDBERG,
Vice Chairman.

H. A. FINK,
Secretary.

SILDNEY KIRK,
Treasurer.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

POVERTY AND UNEMPLOYMENT—THE INSEPARABLE TWINS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, over the past 20 years—almost, in fact, since the end of World War II—the Nation's unemployment rate has hovered around 4 percent. Seldom has it dropped below that point, and the several postwar recessions sent the jobless rate climbing to 5 percent, 6 percent, and higher.

We have learned in the last few years that even unprecedented national prosperity and affluence, and excellent economic growth rates, will not help some 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 unemployed. Our concern is based not only on the economic waste and drain that mass unemployment means. Our concern is also based on the human waste, the tragedy of millions of families sustaining themselves on substandard incomes or on pitifully inadequate public assistance benefits. We cannot begin to calculate the price this country pays in lost self-respect, despair, and frustration.

The Senate is here considering an omnibus antipoverty bill, legislation which we hope, when enacted, will help us continue our commitment toward the eventual eradication of poverty, hunger, disease, and illiteracy in the United States.

We must face the realities of poverty. We can never be wholly successful in abolishing poverty as long as mass unemployment persists. Poverty and unemployment feed upon each other, fatten each other. A man cannot endure prolonged unemployment in the United States without becoming poverty stricken and without his family suffering the consequences—which are inadequate housing, medical care, nutrition, and inadequate educational opportunities.

These deprivations are what unemployment means; they are also what poverty means.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has wisely seen that poverty and widespread joblessness are inseparable twins, twin afflictions, twin evils.

Those who have studied the causes of urban riots and disorder—those who have looked at the desolation of the urban poor—have nearly unanimously concluded that the lack of jobs is one of the major causes leading to the hopelessness and alienation which sets the stage for urban warfare.

The evidence is overwhelming. Expert after expert has agreed on this point.

Consequently, in developing this legislation and sending it to the Senate, the committee also incorporated into the basic bill what is known as the Emergency Employment Act of 1967. This is a specific and calculated attack on the problem of hardcore unemployment. It is an attempt to make a major inroad on the several millions of jobless Americans seeking work today. It will create an estimated half-million jobs in the next 2 years.

One of the most important aspects of the purpose of the Emergency Employment Act is that the jobs it will create will be public service jobs. They will not be boondoggles or leafraking jobs, as some federally created employment was known during the depression years.

On the contrary, these will be public service jobs in badly needed and socially productive areas such as education, welfare, health, public safety, municipal maintenance, reconstruction, recreation, and neighborhood improvement. They will be the kind of public service jobs that cities and towns in every State of the Union need but cannot afford. They will be jobs that will have enduring social and economic value, and—equally important—will give the men and women who perform the work a sense of dignity, value, and individual worth.

This public service employment is directed toward another goal. Rioting and civil war are a threat to the very structure of our society. Our society cannot do what is required if it is in shambles. This bill will help remove the causes of civil disturbances, violence, bloodshed, arson, and looting.

I would like to be able to say, Mr. President, that my State of Minnesota was singularly free this past summer of those storms of hatred and destruction that swirled like tornadoes through more than 40 communities, large and small, from coast to coast. But events in Minneapolis proved that no community has immunity, that the turbulence born out of discrimination—both economic and racial discrimination—can strike any American city.

Every mayor, every city official, every city councilman, and community leader who has commented on the outbreaks of violence in his city this past summer has, without exception, emphasized the fact of unemployment.

Beyond any possible question widespread and persistent joblessness has been the most powerful fuel to the flames of ghetto violence. The important fact is that the jobless rate among Negro residents of our big city ghettos has been—and is—enormously higher than the national figure.

The national jobless rate, as I have already pointed out, hovers around 4 percent, but the jobless rate in our Nation's slums is a horrifying 10 percent.

Even more appalling is the fact that the U.S. Department of Labor has found that in urban slum neighborhoods the unemployed rate among nonwhite 14- to 19-year-old boys is 31 percent and among girls 46 percent.

The Emergency Employment Act offers Congress a unique opportunity to defuse the explosive potential that continues to exist in the ghettos of our cites, large, medium, and small. And unless we do defuse this social and economic dynamite, we can expect the pressures to build up and the hazards to intensify.

This is neither bribery nor a reward for past violence. On the contrary, we are doing in this Emergency Employment Act what we should have done long ago—remove the root causes of violence and hatred and hopelessness. We are depriving the hatemongers and the demagogs of their only weapons, their only instruments for the creation of chaos, if we wipe out mass unemployment and thus take the first big step toward the eradication of poverty.

Specifically what does this mean? The committee states that the number of jobless who can be reached depends on how long workers stay on these jobs before moving to other regular competitive employment. A conservative estimate is an average of 8 months, or a turnover rate that would mean 300,000 jobless could be reached in a year for each $1 billion. The annual wage for these public service jobs would average $4,000.

The question we face, it seems to me, is not whether we can afford the $2.8 billion the Emergency Employment Act calls for, but whether we can possibly afford not to wipe out mass unemployment and all the evils of hopelessness and hatred that it breeds—or whether we can possibly afford not to avoid future violence and terror in our streets—or whether we can possibly afford not to prevent the destruction of billions of dollars worth of property.

The answer, of course, is "No," Mr. President. Preventive, not punitive, measures will safeguard our cities from violence and bloodshed and looting. Preventive, not punitive, measures will strengthen the economies of our cities, our States, and the Nation by eradicating the waste of mass unemployment.

Preventive, not punitive measures, will move us toward victory in the war on poverty.

The Emergency Employment Act, Mr. President, is a must, a necessity, for the Nation's immediate future and its safe and prosperous future in the years to come.

Mr. President, in closing, I should like to pay tribute to the distinguished, creative, and courageous chairman of the committee who handled the hearings and developed this great, impressive, and necessary bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

I am proud to follow his leadership in this inspiring and most necessary proposal. In this effort, I take pleasure once again in saying that he is one of the great liberals—and—if I may say so—practical spirits in the country. I am proud to be with him on this question.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I want to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very kind words, which certainly warm the cockles of my heart at a time when there are those who do not agree with the somewhat extravagant estimate the Senator has made of my capabilities. I welcome him to this just cause and welcome him as an ally in our efforts to do something for the poor people of the United States of America. I am sure his inspired leadership will be of great assistance in the critical votes which we will have next week.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it has been suggested by some, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has found, that the chances and prospects for this measure are not too bright. I am one of those who believe that, hopefully, we will be successful; but whether we are successful or not, I believe it is important that the fundamental issue which this proposal presents is the question whether we are going to make meaningful and substan-

tial new efforts to improve the life of the ghetto dweller.

The effort to undertake the adoption of this proposal is important in itself because the word must get back to the ghetto that there are people in Congress who care, that there are people who understand, that there are people who realize that this problem cannot be solved cheaply; that it needs a substantial new effort on the part of the Federal Government.

I think that is an additional reason why the Senator from Pennsylvania is so wise in pressing this proposal.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may say I hold, as of this afternoon, a measure of optimism that the heart of this bill will be maintained; that the effort to recommit will be defeated; that the motion to strike title II will fail.

I say this because I believe the conscience of America has been aroused; that the conscience of America will require that we, the Congress of the United States, face up, regardless of the apparent fiscal cost, to the necessity of assuring that unfortunate individuals of the United States of America, living in our teeming cities and in our rural ghettos, will be given that fair chance which they were promised by President Johnson 2½ years ago when he instituted the war on poverty.

I cannot believe that the conscience of America, as represented by the Senate of the United States, is so callous that we can pass, with practical unanimity, bills amounting to nearly $80 billion for the swollen Military Establishment of this country and turn our backs on the poor of America.

Mr. MONDALE. Am I correct in understanding that virtually every expert who testified before the Senator's subcommittee in its exhaustive hearings on the problem of getting rid of the well-known frustrations and near rage which have become a national phenomenon, testified that jobs and the availability of jobs was central to the solution of this problem; that there cannot be a solution which does not include in the effort a real and substantial solution in finding employment for the ghetto dweller?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entirely correct. We had some 442 witnesses brought before the subcommittee from all over the United States. With the exception of the National Association of Manufacturers, there was only one extreme right wing representative of a small, and I might say, lunatic fringe group who was opposed to continuation of the poverty program.

With respect to title II, the special Emergency Employment Act, I have here a whole committee print of 184 pages of quotations from knowledgeable people in all walks of life, from all over the country, supporting a massive emergency job program.

Perhaps the most heartening thing that happened occurred 2 weeks ago when an Urban Coalition was formed consisting of leaders of American opinion from all across the spectrum. That spectrum ranged from people like David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, to I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America. It went from Mayor Ivan Allen Jr., of Atlanta, to Andrew Heiskell, chairman of Time, Inc. It went from Roy Ash, president of Litton Industries, to Mayor Joseph M. Barr, Mayor Jerome Cavanagh, and Mayor James H. J. Tate—respectively, mayors of Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Philadelphia. It included too Walter Reuther, George Meany, Whitney Young, and Roy Wilkins. It covered the whole spectrum of leadership opinion in America, as opposed to this motion to strike.

I say this with all sincerity, and perhaps with a stronger feeling than justified. The Senate will perhaps excuse my emotion under the circumstances, because of the long, long time in which I have been immersed in this problem. I think one can say the issue is whether the Government of the United States has been taken over by the Spartans, leaving the Athenians outside the seats of power. To me, those who believe in that kind of civilization in which the Age of Pericles was shining light should not now turn our backs on that vision of America in order to support a military group bent on war, instead of peace, and, in my opinion, constituting a grave threat to the survival of American democracy.

Those are strong words, but I have come to that point of view slowly and gradually, and I believe in my heart they are true.

Mr. MONDALE. I could not agree more with the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am glad he has mentioned the strong support given to his proposal and to the objective of finding jobs for the unemployed by the Urban Coalition. We had a large, balanced, highly prestigious delegation from Minnesota which was a part of that coalition. It included the mayor of my city. It included the publisher of one of our largest newspapers. It included many top businessmen and labor leaders from my State. They were unanimous that this proposal was not only something to be considered, but that it was absolutely essential. This is not the voice of the left wing radical being heard; this is the voice of responsible Americans.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. This is the voice of the conscience of America. I am happy to see so many successful businessmen joining in this effort. I think it should be of great interest to our colleagues when men of this caliber are willing to put their names on the list, not for the 200,000 jobs which title II of the bill would create, but for 1 million jobs, which would amount to increasing fivefold the amount asked for by title II of this bill.

Mr. MONDALE. We hear it said that the Senator is trying to push too far ahead with this proposal; that we are getting too far ahead of the American public. Yet we have an almost unprecedented assemblage of prestigious Americans calling for a proposal bolder than the one we are calling for. We have had indications from recent Harris polls that about two-thirds of Americans think that jobs should be provided, among other things. I would say that this is a case of the Senate following, not leading. It is about time we caught up.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator is correct. People talk about power structures in this country. If this is the kind of judgment they want to make as Americans, if they want to go along with the power structure, they had better take a long, hard look at the recommendations of the Urban Coalition, instead of the political-military industrial complex, which, in my opinion, is leading this country down the road to fiscal ruin.

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to support the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CURTIS obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding other motions that are pending before the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska be permitted to bring up an amendment out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—do we have an understanding that, in the event the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, there will be no vote had on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Under those circumstances, I have no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 341

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 341 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] proposes amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 3, strike out "$2,258,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,963,000,000".

On page 2, beginning with "$295,000,000" on lines 5 and 6, strike out down through "title I of such Act," on line 7.

On page 2, beginning with line 22, strike out through line 8 on page 26 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"JOB CORPS REPEALER

"SEC. 101. Part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is hereby repealed."

At the end of the bill add the following new title:

"TITLE III—AMENDMENT TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

"INCREASED VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 301. Section 2 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

" 'AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

" 'SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $60,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $118,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $177,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $225,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each fiscal year thereafter, $420,000,000 for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this part.' "

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished manager of the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania.

It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] will speak on his amendments at some length this afternoon, at least sufficiently to lay the groundwork.

He has indicated that he would be agreeable to a time limitation of 1 hour on his amendments at the conclusion of morning business on Monday, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Pennsylvania, the manager of the bill, and the author of the amendments, the Senator from Nebraska.

What is the thought of the Senator from Pennsylvania as to that proposal?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to have that time extended to 1 hour on each side. This is a very important amendment; it seeks to cut the heart out of the Job Corps. I would, however, agree to a limitation of 1 hour on each side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Up to 2 hours, then, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. CURTIS. Very well.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business on Monday next, at which time the pending amendments will become once again the pending business, there be a time limitation of not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Pennsylvania, the manager of the bill, and the Senator from Nebraska, [Mr. CURTIS], the proponent of the amendments now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That after completion of the routine morning business on Monday, October 2, 1967, further debate on Amendment No. 341, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], to the bill S. 2388, a bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, be limited to 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in order that I may speak very briefly to the majority leader, 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. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this amendment would substitute a vastly enlarged program of vocational and technical training in lieu of the Job Corps.

The bill before us authorizes the sum of $295,000,000 for the Job Corps. Amendment No. 341 strikes that out, repeals the Job Corps, and increases the authorization for the Vocational Training Act of 1963 from $225,000,000 to $420,000,000. This increase would substantially double the amount of money currently being spent by the Federal Government on vocational education under the act of 1963 and at the same time save the taxpayers $100,000,000 annually. The adoption of amendment No. 341 would result in a better job and the elimination of more poverty.

Mr. President, what is it that is needed to make a nonproductive and dependent individual who is able-bodied into a self-supporting, productive member of society? I believe the need is twofold:

First, he must be trained to perform useful work. He must have the knowledge and skills which are needed in our economy to the end that not only a job but advancement can be his.

Second, he must have character, a desire to be self-supporting, productive, and helpful to others or, in other words, the motivation to make his life worthwhile.

I seriously doubt if the latter can be acquired by the passage of a law. The providing of schools, however, to meet the first need is clearly the responsibility of Government. The untrained cannot provide their own schools.

Mr. President, if my amendment No. 341 were to be adopted and the amount authorized for vocational training were appropriated, it would enable the States to make a massive attack on unemployment. The following table has been assembled showing the amount of money currently allocated to each of the several States under the Vocational Act of 1963 and the amount which each State would receive if the sum set forth in amendment No. 341 were authorized and appropriated. It must be borne in mind that States and localities participate under the 1963 Vocational Education Act, so the total amount of money available to train individuals for good jobs would increase much more than the table herein listed would indicate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table I(a) and table I(b) be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE I(a).—*Allotment of Federal funds for grants to States and outlying parts under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210) fiscal year 1967, based on appropriation of $198,225,000*

State:	
Alabama	$4,610,512
Alaska	245,236
Arizona	1,805,218
Arkansas	2,519,605
California	14,665,140
Colorado	1,946,059
Connecticut	2,171,198
Delaware	390,298

TABLE I(a).—*Allotment of Federal funds for grants to States and outlying parts under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210) fiscal year 1967, based on appropriation of $198,225,000*—Con.

State—Continued	
Florida	$6,199,468
Georgia	5,810,089
Hawaii	797,792
Idaho	890,996
Illinois	8,216,394
Indiana	4,907,895
Iowa	2,883,076
Kansas	2,391,526
Kentucky	4,131,417
Louisiana	4,537,243
Maine	1,189,505
Maryland	3,202,493
Massachusetts	4,351,359
Michigan	7,856,956
Minnesota	3,720,844
Mississippi	3,132,779
Missouri	4,274,571
Montana	796,156
Nebraska	1,508,981
Nevada	337,727
New Hampshire	722,359
New Jersey	5,340,073
New Mexico	1,302,460
New York	13,630,868
North Carolina	6,711,898
North Dakota	794,770
Ohio	9,793,732
Oklahoma	3,005,524
Oregon	1,965,985
Pennsylvania	11,185,718
Rhode Island	888,672
South Carolina	3,614,447
South Dakota	833,066
Tennessee	4,954,951
Texas	12,595,165
Utah	1,200,597
Vermont	482,651
Virginia	5,507,219
Washington	2,942,267
West Virginia	2,403,411
Wisconsin	4,173,147
Wyoming	340,700
American Samoa	35,423
District of Columbia	546,495
Guam	107,156
Puerto Rico	3,599,103
Virgin Islands	56,610

TABLE I(b).—*Allotment of Federal funds for grants to States and outlying parts under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210) fiscal year 1968, based on estimates of appropriation of $420,000,000*

State:	
Alabama	$9,769,383
Alaska	519,653
Arizona	3,825,051
Arkansas	5,338,886
California	31,071,627
Colorado	4,123,364
Connecticut	4,600,048
Delaware	826,938
District of Columbia	1,157,713
Florida	13,135,073
Georgia	12,311,172
Hawaii	1,690,512
Idaho	1,887,962
Illinois	17,407,897
Indiana	10,398,779
Iowa	6,108,701
Kansas	5,067,158
Kentucky	8,754,147
Louisiana	9,614,059
Maine	2,520,393
Maryland	6,785,416
Massachusetts	9,219,235
Michigan	16,647,209
Minnesota	7,883,836
Mississippi	6,638,492
Missouri	9,056,679
Montana	1,686,961
Nebraska	3,197,228
Nevada	715,533
New Hampshire	1,530,523

TABLE I(b).—*Allotment of Federal funds for grants to States and outlying parts under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210) fiscal year 1968, based on estimates of appropriation of $420,000,000*—Continued

State—Continued	
New Jersey	$11,313,752
New Mexico	2,759,881
New York	28,878,477
North Carolina	14,222,152
North Dakota	1,684,076
Ohio	20,750,494
Oklahoma	6,368,179
Oregon	4,165,530
Pennsylvania	23,699,012
Rhode Island	1,882,856
South Carolina	7,659,175
South Dakota	1,765,177
Tennessee	10,498,864
Texas	26,687,298
Utah	2,544,025
Vermont	1,022,674
Virginia	11,669,144
Washington	6,234,171
West Virginia	5,092,596
Wisconsin	8,842,058
Wyoming	721,891
Guam	227,078
Puerto Rico	7,626,780
Virgin Island	119,961
American Samoa	75,071

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that my amendment would double the current allocation to each State for the purpose of vocational and technical training under the 1963 act. For example, Alabama, at the present time, receives $4,610,512. Under my proposal, that State would receive $9,769,383; and so on down the list.

Mr. President, it is said that the Job Corps is doing a better job than when it started. I am willing to concede that some progress has been made. I venture to say, however, that those Job Corps projects which have been most successful are the ones where a good program of vocational and technical training has been carried out. I believe the Job Corps project at Lincoln, Nebr., has done an unusually fine job under the circumstances. Its per capita cost is far below the national average. It has some very fine, dedicated people in charge. The central theme is vocational and technical training. I hasten to point out that the adoption of my amendment No. 341 does not mean the end of vocational and educational training at the site of the Lincoln Job Corps, which is occupying part of the facilities formerly used by the Air Force. The State of Nebraska could take over the activities, do a better job, and reach more people for less money.

It is my understanding that the national average cost per enrollee in the Job Corps is $6,950. This is a tremendous sum of money. I understand that the Lincoln Job Corps operation which I mentioned is much less than the average. I believe the Lincoln figure is a little over $5,409 per enrollee, but this is clearly out of line with the cost incurred by the State of Nebraska in operating the Nebraska Vocational Technical School in Milford, Nebr.

In arriving at the cost per enrollee at the Lincoln Job Center, nothing has been allocated to regional and national costs, and we know that bureaucracy is weighted down with a lot of high-priced people who are constantly on the move at the taxpayers' expense.

I wish to give a few facts about the Nebraska Vocational Technical School in Milford, Nebr., because it is a typical example of what can be done by States, localities, individuals, and the Federal Government.

The Milford school operated 11 courses of training with an enrollment of 958 students last year at a cost of $1,076,058, or an average of $1,123.26 per student. This cost includes equipment but not construction. Federal funds accounted for $352,911 of the total, or $368.38 per student; State funds, $384,045, or $400.88 per student; other sources, including tuition and earnings from production, $339,102, or $354 per student. Tuition for Nebraska students is $84 a quarter or $336 a year—the school has four 12-week quarters, or a 48-week year.

The Milford school also operates dormitory and cafeteria services. These cost a total of $185,500 last year, or an average of $193.60 per student, but all students did not utilize these services. The school charges $50 a quarter for dormitory residence and $100 a quarter for cafeteria services for students who want these services. Thus, a student can receive board and room at the school for $600 for a 48-week year.

Based on the figures in the foregoing two paragraphs, we find that the average enrollee cost to the school is $1,123.23. When we add to this the $600 for cafeteria and dormitory costs, it makes a total cost per enrollee of $1,723.23.

What do the foregoing cost comparisons mean? They mean that the cost per enrollee for the federally operated Lincoln Job Corps project is more than 2½ times that of our State-operated school at Milford. It must also be borne in mind that under the terms of the 1963 Vocational Training Act and in actual practice non-Federal sources are raising as much money or a little more than the amount of the Federal grant. This lower cost of operation, plus State and local sharing of the cost, means one thing: For every dollar spent by the Federal Government under the 1963 Vocational Training Act, the actual vocational and technical training provided is at least five times that which is provided by the Job Corps.

Again, let me stress that this illustration in Nebraska is very conservative. On a national level, the good to be accomplished by the adoption of my amendment would increase not fivefold, but much more than that. I also remind Senators that the adoption of amendment No. 341 would save $100 million annually.

Nationally, the Job Corps is in disrepute. It does not have the confidence of the American people. It has been overloaded with bureaucrats, and tremendous sums that should have been used to train minds and hands have been spent flying enrollees as well as bureaucrats all over the country. The young people intended to be helped are taken away from home and in some cases exposed to mass immorality. Nobody has an accurate check as to what happens to them after they leave the Job Corps. The basic plan of the Job Corps has some erroneous features. Vocational and technical training should be offered right in the community where the potential enrollees live. What better tax-supported function could be used to set an example in a depressed or slum area than an institution which trains people who want to be trained? Those who would view the institution first hand would see the opportunities which come to those who make good on their training. The mere location of these training centers in such an area would be a great motivating force without which we cannot attempt to cure the chronic unemployment existing in these areas.

A State-operated or locally run vocational training school is in a position to keep track of its students and know what happens to them. The fact is that industry picks up the graduates as fast as they are turned out. In Nebraska our vocational and technical training schools are not tied to an antiquated, historic pattern. They are based upon the needs of employers today, tomorrow, and next year. There is no accurate information as to what happens to the vast majority of Job Corps enrollees.

It must be pointed out also that even if the Job Corps were without blemish in its operation and without the moral problems that have arisen in some places, it reaches only a tiny fraction of the individuals who need to be reached for vocational and technical training. Those Job Corps enrollees who do complete their training probably seldom, if ever, go back to improve the surroundings from which they came.

We need to train more people and we need to do a better job of training people. To do this, it is necessary for us to get more for our money. I offer this amendment not because of any hostility toward Job Corps enrollees or the competent, dedicated instructors and administrators that we find here and there in the Job Corps. I offer this amendment because I am interested in having my Government improve the lot of those individuals who need a chance. The facts are conclusive that a partnership arrangement with State and local governments and individuals brings into play forces that make the training program a success.

In addition to all the costly procedures of the Job Corps in flying people around the country, taking over hotels, and other costly operations which seem to go hand in hand with a Federal bureaucracy, the fact is that the Job Corps at best is not reaching enough people to make a dent in the chronic unemployment. I will leave it to each Senator to draw his own conclusion as to the quality of training and the success which is being made by the Job Corps. Of the number of people being reached, however, there can be no dispute.

Mr. President, I am aware that the costs of running a vocational or technical school are higher in many States than the illustration I used with reference to the Nebraska Vocational Technical School at Milford, Nebr. I point out, however, that the costs of running more Job Corps centers elsewhere is far, far in excess of the figure which I have used in refer-

ence to the Job Corps center at Lincoln. Consequently, the relative comparison of what we get for our money under these two programs is applicable to all States.

Mr. President, I want to add that the Nebraska Vocational Technical School at Milford has been operating for a number of years and is doing an outstanding job. I want to give some brief facts about a new school operating within 30 miles of my home. I refer to the Central Nebraska Area Vocational School at Hastings. This school has been operating only a couple of years. It has the equivalent of 800 full-time students for the budget year. Like the Milford school, it operates for 48 weeks a year. The Hastings school's budget is $2,075,000. This means an average cost per student of $2,037, but because the school is new, considerable sums must be spent on equipment. Exclusive of equipment, this school is operating for a cost of $1,380 per year for each enrollee. If we add to that the food and dormitory costs which are paid at the Milford school, we would find that their costs of operation, exclusive of equipment, would be about the same.

I am sure there are many institutions in other States that likewise are doing a superb job. I have used as my illustrations those schools about which I have the most knowledge.

Mr. President, I am not going to submit a bill of particulars of the weaknesses and failures of the Job Corps. These weaknesses and failures are common knowledge and they have been well documented over the months. Most Senators can and do privately relate many shortcomings of the Job Corps. We should not be unmindful, however, that the taxpayers' money has been used to lobby for the Job Corps. This has been freely done by many of those who hold high-paying positions in the Job Corps.

I do want to point out that the program of the Job Corps in removing individuals from their own environment, is not solving the problem faced by the majority of the individuals enrolled and it is definitely not solving the problem of the areas from which they come. In this connection I wish to read from testimony taken by the Senate Committee on Finance on Tuesday of this week. The witness was one who had spent many years in welfare work in New York City and is dedicated in her desire to better the lot of the unfortunate. Please notice this testimony. The witness is Dr. Trude W. Lash, executive director, Citizens' Committee for Children of New York:

Senator CURTIS. How many individuals have been taken out of New York City to be trained by the Job Corps elsewhere?

Dr. LASH. Very few, sir. I am not sure about the exact number, but I think it is below 3,000; very few.

Senator CURTIS. So the Job Corps has not made much of a dent in training the people who need training in New York City?

Dr. LASH. No, no sir, it has not, and also those who know the situation best have questioned the removal of the young people under all circumstances and have wondered whether sometimes——

Senator CURTIS. I am very interested in that remark, because I question the wisdom of it as you have expressed there. It is because of those who go, perhaps a much, much smaller number return and never add anything to the poverty-stricken area from which they were taken.

Dr. LASH. Yes, sir. Also a good many come back because they are homesick. It is very difficult for children who have never perhaps been even 20 blocks away from their homes suddenly to be taken to a place where it is quiet and there are birds and everything is scarey whereas the noise is needed to be reassuring.

Senator CURTIS. Is it not also true that a well-organized and productive training program in a slum area sets an example for the whole area and provides a worthwhile activity there that makes a contribution?

Dr. LASH. I completely agree; particularly under the present circumstances after the summer's difficulties, this would be so.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of this amendment, because it would be of more and better help to the unfortunate unemployed individuals and would reach vastly greater numbers, and at the same time would result in a substantial saving to the Federal Treasury in this time of war, unprecedented deficits, and demands for a tax raise.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope very much that the proposed amendment will be defeated when it comes to a vote on Monday. I shall have more to say about it during the hour which has been set aside for the opponents of the amendment under the unanimous-consent agreement.

For the moment, I should like merely to categorically disagree with many of the statements made by my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, and with most of the conclusions which he drew in his argument in support of the amendment.

Let me point out that the Job Corps got off to a shaky start shortly after it was established as a result of the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. There were many bugs in the Job Corps; there was much dissatisfaction with it. I believe the OEO, under Mr. Shriver, has by now got most of those bugs out.

I believe I speak with some knowledge of the facts, since not only have I heard the testimony, but also, I have visited Job Corps centers, and my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Poverty have been to a number of other Job Corps centers. In fact, I believe that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] will have some statements to make in this regard as a result of the field hearing he held in Wisconsin, which concentrated pretty much on the Job Corps.

The consensus of testimony which was brought before the committee was that the Job Corps, as I have said, after a slow start, turned the corner toward success around the first part of 1966. It has been improving constantly since then, and presently is doing a fine job all over the country.

I recall that in January and February of 1967 there was much criticism in the local papers in New Mexico about the women's Job Corps Center in Albuquerque—criticism which, quite frankly, rather shocked me. The center was operated by the Bell-Packard Corp., a private contractor for profit, with some expertise in the field of personnel management.

I made a fairly careful examination of those criticisms on the site and found—at least, to my own satisfaction—that much of it had been remedied. The troublemakers had been discharged from the staff, the faculty, and a new superintendent had been brought in. I had an opportunity to discuss with the girls in the center alone, when none of the faculty or employees of the center were present, their views about the type of training they were receiving, and they were all enthusiastic about it. I believe this is generally true with respect to the other centers across the country.

So I would categorically deny that the American people are fed up with the Job Corps. Our own testimony and my own soundings indicate to me that the people of the United States are enthusiastic about the Job Corps and the splendid work which is being done with 42,000 boys and girls, in making useful and employable citizens of them.

The committee retained a consultant, Mr. Sar Levitan, a distinguished social scientist from George Washington University, who was engaged in making an evaluation of the Economic Opportunity Act for the Ford Foundation and he undertook to do some special work for the subcommittee.

His report on the Job Corps begins at page 1 in volume I of the staff and consultants reports in "Examination of the War on Poverty." I quote briefly from his comments on page 23, which have reference to proposals of which the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is typical. Mr. Levitan said:

Recent proposals (H.R. 10682, 90th Cong.) to place the Job Corps in the Vocational Education Division in the Office of Education, presents inherent problems, despite the indicated advantages. Since the residential centers would be operated by State vocational authorities, there would prevail in a number of States serious obstacles to establishing racially integrated residential centers.

This would be particularly true in the South.

While few Job Corps centers were located in the Southeastern States, where the problem was most acute, youths from these areas could enroll in centers outside their State or region. State operation of residential centers would intensify problems of integration and probably preclude some youths from enrolling. Past experience has shown that Federal proscription of racial discrimination does not solve the problem.

The vocational education establishment might also lack experience in handling the special problems of operating residential centers for disadvantaged youth. The Job Corps has gained considerable expertise in this area from its two and a half years of experience.

Mr. Levitan concludes that transferring the Job Corps to HEW and to the vocational education program would be a doubtful solution.

Mr. President, I will have more to say on this subject on Monday. At the moment, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that

the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in view of a certain colloquy which occurred in the Chamber today I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph under the heading "Program" in column 1, page 27165 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I believe the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] feels there will not be a vote on the pending motion before Monday next. The Senate will meet tomorrow at noon, and it is hoped that action can be taken to dispose of several amendments on tomorrow. There may be rollcall votes; I cannot be sure.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on yesterday six or eight Senators asked me, during the afternoon, whether or not it was likely that there would be any rollcall votes today. At the end of the day on yesterday I felt it to be my duty to contact those Senators who had made such inquiries and to indicate to them as best I could what the outlook might be for today. I dictated to a member of my staff the following verbiage, which I asked her to impart, by telephone, to the offices of those Senators to whom I have alluded. She accordingly relayed to those offices the following message which I had dictated:

Senator Byrd said that it was impossible for him to get an exact reading on the outlook for tomorrow. But there will not be a vote before Monday on the motion to recommit the bill to delete Title II. That is for sure.

Senator Byrd hopes that action can be taken to dispose of some of the lesser amendments tomorrow. There could possibly be one or more rollcall votes in this regard. Senator Byrd is not sure.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 2, 1967, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Alcohol and Alcoholism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the new, National Center for Prevention and Control of Alcoholism for some up-to-the-minute information on the use of alcohol by young people in the United States.

The information appears in the first report published on "Alcohol and Alcoholism" by the National Institute of Mental Health. The new center is the focal point for the expanded national program to prevent and control alcoholism which was requested last year by President Johnson in his health message to the Congress.

The report points out that adult concern about the use of alcohol by young people "has been directed primarily toward the supposed relationship of juvenile drinking to juvenile delinquency." It goes on to say that accounts of riots and automobile accidents are so alarming to most adults that the violence of these events often obscures the facts.

And what are the facts? At first glance, they are alarming. Surveys show that the average American first tastes alcohol—usually in the form of an experimental sip—by the age of 10. As many as 50 to 85 percent of high school students—depending upon the area in which they live—say they drink at least occasionally.

But the national center's report quotes Dr. Robert Straus, of the University of Kentucky, an expert in this field, as follows:

These figures, however, as shocking as they may seem, are meaningless in themselves. There is no proof to show that early exposure to alcohol will in itself lead to excessive drinking in later life. In fact, all the proof is clearly to the contrary.

Is a teenager who drinks a juvenile delinquent? A recent study in Massachusetts shows that the percentage of alcohol users is about the same among delinquents as among "normal" high school students. The chief difference, the study concludes, is not how many of each group drink but how they drink.

Research shows that teenagers follow adult models in their drinking patterns—

The national center's report says—

and the best single indicator of the teenage drinking pattern in any specific community is the adult pattern in the same community. If parents drink, there is a high probability that teenagers will drink; similarly, abstinent parents typically produce abstinent children.

These findings were based on five studies involving 8,000 high school students within the past 10 years in five areas of the United States. These studies also showed:

First. The average age at which students had their first drink is 13–14, although they may have "tasted" alcohol before.

Second. First exposure to alcohol is likely to be at home with parents.

Third. Practically every high school graduate will have experimented with at least one drink.

Fourth. One in four users claimed to have been "high" at least once during the month prior to the research in three of the five areas studied.

Fifth. One in 10 users in these studies reported having been "drunk" in this same period.

Sixth. In all the studies, beer was the most commonly used beverage.

Seventh. Laws relating to teenage drinking had little relationship to drinking practices.

There also have been studies covering 27 colleges and 17,000 college students. The national center's report says:

Those colleges with the lowest percentage of drinking students were generally marked by the highest percentage of students who had been intoxicated. By contrast, excessive drinking was reportedly infrequent in those colleges where drinking was most common.

Mr. Speaker, I think the report makes an excellent summary of what is known today about the use of alcohol by young people. It says:

A young person's decision to drink or not to drink is usually made on the basis of a complex of forces including the practices and wishes of his parents, the attitudes of his church, the influence of his peers, how much money he has to spend, and how strongly he may be impelled to assert his independence from adult authority.

I commend the National Institute for Mental Health and the National Center for Prevention and Control of Alcoholism for this first report. As Secretary Gardner observes in a foreword to the report, it surveys the present state of our knowledge of alcoholism. It represents a major step toward understanding and eventual control.

Milestone for Rent Supplement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on August 23, 1967, an event of national significance took place in Boston, Mass. It was a milestone for the rent supplement program—the dedication of the first all new construction project in the country. The occasion was the forerunner of many more such projects to come as the projects now under construction or in advanced planning are completed.

The rent supplemental program will do much for the poor of our country and we all can look forward to further advances in the housing program as these planning programs are strengthened. For me it is particularly pleasing because the first of these projects has

been established in my congressional district.

The Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development presided at the dedication of this housing project. His remarks are informative as to the progress and potential of this very worthwhile Federal aid in helping to meet the housing needs of low-income families.

I am pleased to include in my remarks the speech of Secretary Weaver:

REMARKS BY ROBERT C. WEAVER, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, OPENING OF CHARLAME PARK HOMES RENT SUPPLEMENT PROJECT OF THE CHARLES STREET AME CHURCH, ROXBURY, BOSTON, MASS., AUGUST 23, 1967

SUMMARY

There is always a need for informed criticism but that criticism must be rooted in facts. What are the facts about FHA today? It is a principal source of mortgage financing for existing homes purchased by nonwhites across all of the urban complex. It has lifted the barriers that once prohibited insuring mortgages in changing neighborhoods. It is taking positive steps to finance the rebuilding of blighted areas in the central city. It is increasingly involved in building and rebuilding housing for low- and moderate-income families. Indeed, today FHA is an effective instrument that is providing opportunities to nonwhites in all parts of urban areas. In recent weeks, FHA initiated a housing counseling service for low-income families. Recently it moved into insuring mortgages in riot-torn or riot-threatened areas. Thus FHA today is operating in many ways in the slums and blighted areas of our cities.

This is a symbolic occasion. I want to assure you that this occasion of opening seven buildings for 38 families has importance far beyond Roxbury and the City of Boston. In a sense, we are today formally opening the Rent Supplements Program—and that is a significant moment, and a new direction, for the Nation's urban housing policies.

This is the first development in the Nation consisting entirely of new construction that was planned, financed and completed under the Rent Supplement Program. There are already some families residing in housing that has been rehabilitated for this program. In fact, there are already one thousand families receiving Rent Supplement assistance.

But most of them are residing in housing provided by older programs. Some of the programs are administered by the Federal Housing Administration. Some are administered by other parts of FHA's parent organization—which I head—the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This occasion is appropriate to examine the Nation's efforts to help the ill-housed. Recently, it has become almost common to hear questions about whether the FHA—which has helped in housing millions of families—is genuinely concerned about the most serious social problem of housing low- and moderate-income families. Sometimes the criticism is confusing.

In a recent instance, the Mayor of a midwestern city asserted that FHA red tape had delayed a moderate-income housing development in his city. But only a few days earlier, he had written us to declare that the project could never have been completed without the full cooperation of FHA. Faced with this record of inconsistency, he recently wrote to me saying, and I quote: "Dear Mr. Secretary: I owe you an apology."

In a situation closer to home, the Mayor of Malden, Massachusetts, has complained of FHA's efficiency and concern for a moderate-income project in his city. He cited an 18-month delay. He attributed it entirely to FHA. He failed to mention that the site plan had been changed after the original submission had been approved by FHA. This occasioned a seven-month delay in processing.

Also the Mayor made much of FHA's requirement for a 100% bond. He was repeating a complaint made by the "packager" of the project. This is the same packager who had been placed on FHA's list of those determined to be undesirable risks—because of irregularities in his financial arrangements with the builders of moderate-income housing projects. And only last week, the same packager had to be advised that he has still failed to conform to the requirements that he had agreed to as a condition for being removed from the list.

Actually 100% bonds are not impossible nor even extremely expensive for builders who have the financial ability to construct the multiple-unit developments involved. It is not the amount of the bond but the financial capacity of the firm seeking it that is important. And the 100% requirement applies to *all* FHA insurance of multi-family projects in the Boston area. It was secured by the builder of this development. Bonding of this type is, in fact, a response to the requests of small subcontractors who frequently were unable to collect payment from out-of-town builders.

II

Let us turn to the Rent Supplement Program. It is administered by FHA. It received its first funds on May 13, 1966.

The specific chronology of this Charlame Park Homes Project is instructive. The sponsor, the Charles Street A.M.E. Church, applied for FHA insurance on June 11, 1965. On November 1, FHA agreed to make the commitment for the project. On May 30, 1966, the sponsor asked to change the project from that of standard, moderate-income housing to the new Rent Supplement Program. Two weeks later, June 17, FHA allocated funds for it. Two months later, August 29, FHA issued the commitment to insure it.

On September 26, 1966, construction was started. Today we are marking its completion.

Thus, 15 months after the new program was first funded; 11 months after initial endorsement; and 11 months after construction began, this development is complete.

One reason this development moved rapidly is that the sponsor has some experience. The Charles Street A.M.E. Church has already completed and now operates a moderate-income development near here. Thus, when the church undertook a Rent Supplement project, it was familiar with the procedures and processing requirements for an FHA multi-family development. And it was knowledgeable about construction and finance.

This development was financed out of the first $12 million appropriated for Rent Supplements, which became available on May 13, 1966. On September 6, 1966, an additional $20 million were appropriated. Between then and June, 1967, all $32 million were allocated. This involves 439 projects in 290 cities and 46 states. It will mean 33,905 dwelling units for low-income families.

All of these dwellings will be built and managed by private sponsors. Some will be non-profit and limited-profit corporations, some cooperatives. Since they are financed by mortgages obtained at normal market interest rates, as soon as the mortgages are seasoned, the financing, too, will be by private, rather than public funds.

Many are already privately financed, and this one today is an example. Indeed, I am confident that long before the first $32 million of Rent Supplements are translated into homes for low-income Americans, most of the mortgages will have been purchased by private investors.

If you recognize the size of the Rent Supplements Program, the relative inexperience of many sponsors, and the novelty of the undertaking, this is a record that simply does not fit the charges of indifference or ineptitudes by FHA.

There are problems of sites, land cost, design, construction cost, financial arrangements, and management proposals. Each has to be examined. Because the program is new, both FHA and sponsors have had to learn by doing. But the lessons are as important for the future as they are difficult for the present. Their importance is obvious when we recognize that the mortgages involved are long-term, extending over 40 years.

III

Aside from Rent Supplements, the moderate-income housing program of FHA holds a special interest for me. It was one of the innovations I sponsored in the Housing and Community Development Act of 1961. It is the first national program to provide housing for those who are too poor to afford housing in the open market, but who earn too much to qualify for public housing.

The subsidy here is a below-market-interest-rate mortgage. The other mortgage terms and eligible sponsors are similar to Rent Supplements.

It has been observed that only 40,000 moderate-income housing units are now occupied. It is alleged this reflects on FHA administration. These critics ignore the fact that the size of the program depends on the amount of funds authorized for financing the mortgages. Since the mortgage interest rates are below the market, special assistance funds are provided by our Federal National Mortgage Association.

Let us examine the records compiled in this effort. The first funds from FNMA were allocated in August 1961. This amounted to $30 million. In March, 1962, $100 million were added. And these additions followed: In July, 1962, $250 million; in July, 1963, $370 million; in May, 1964, $200 million; in August, 1964, $350 million; in June, 1965, $112.5 million; in October, 1965, $425 million; and in October, 1966, $32.5 million were added.

What about the housing? As of June 30, 1967, there were 40,000 units completed. Another 22,027 are under construction. An additional 83,000 are being processed. Thus, 145,000 units of housing for moderate-income families will be provided. And the effort will continue to expand with $500 million of further special assistance in the 1968 budget.

Both the moderate-income and rent supplements programs of FHA have moved more rapidly than any other multi-family program sponsored by the Department. They have not been neglected. Nor will they be neglected. I have constantly stressed their importance and the need to accelerate them. We are emphasizing improved processing and encouraging the development of more sponsors.

Every new housing program requires time for tooling up and developing effective processing methods. This involves trial and error. New sponsors have to become experienced. Standards have to be established. People inside and outside government have to be recruited and trained. These steps would have to be taken no matter what administrative machinery is devised.

Billions of dollars are involved. Those who commit the credit of the United States for immense programs have grave responsibilities. They are responsible to the taxpayer who may have to pay for any and all mistakes in market analysis, design, location, construction or management. They have a unique responsibility to protect and assist inexperienced sponsors. And most of all, they are responsible to the occupants who ought to get the best possible housing at the low-

est possible cost in all publicly-assisted developments.

IV

All of this is not to say that FHA is without fault. There have been instances where local offices lacked enthusiasm for low- and moderate-income developments. Some have questioned the wisdom of building in central cities. Some have been hesitant to approve developments that did not reflect traditional standards for mortgage insurance. But the record of these last few years clearly shows that these attitudes and practices are changing—and changing rapidly.

These years have also indicated to us in HUD what needs to be done to accelerate processing. We have brought in highly qualified teams from Washington to break administrative jams. We are experimenting with a series of techniques and methods to reduce processing time. We have simplified requirements and procedures.

In addition, we are increasingly bringing the decisionmaking in Rent Supplements and moderate-income housing into the HUD regional offices. This expedites processing. It also relates this housing more closely to other HUD programs. In short, we are learning how to act effectively in a market where private enterprise has had little previous experience, and where FHA has been equally uninvolved.

We are not satisfied with the results. Processing still takes too long. But we have profited from experience. These programs are moving. We are prepared to move them more rapidly in the future.

V

One striking fact about administering an agency such as HUD (and its predecessor the Housing and Home Finance Agency) is that there is a lag in public recognition of changes.

I first saw that in urban renewal. Initially it was somewhat insensitive about relocating families. It did often tear down the housing of low- and moderate-income families and rebuild housing for the affluent. It did too often emphasize bulldozer clearance. And it did take its lumps from the critics.

But we have significantly modified every one of these characteristics—yet the old reputation clings and persists, though it is no longer accurate or fair.

Today eight out of ten persons displaced by urban renewal are helped, or help themselves, to move into decent, safe and sanitary housing. Urban renewal today upgrades the quality of housing for the vast majority of those who originally lived in the slums and blighted areas involved. Of course, many people understandably resent being forced to move, regardless of what their conditions, or dissatisfactions, were before. That is one reason why we now stress rehabilitation rather than demolition. And today there are more dwellings scheduled for rehabilitation than demolition in the urban renewal process.

Last year a score of mayors and other officials helped us re-examine urban renewal. One result is that many of these cities have said that rebuilding their pockets of poverty will be their highest priority. Another result is that HUD adopted a new policy that says specifically that our urban renewal aid must advance these goals:

1. It must conserve and expand housing for low- and moderate-income families.

2. It must develop new employment opportunities for the unemployed and the underemployed.

3. It must emphasize renewal of urban areas that have the most critical needs.

This does not mean there will be no more central business district redevelopment or no more high-income housing redevelopment. Many cities must upgrade central business districts to provide a viable economic base. Some blighted areas should be redeveloped for higher-income occupancy. But this new policy means that every city must provide a balanced program—and the first priority must go toward rehousing the lower income segment of the population.

Culture is essential to an exciting city. Thus there will continue to be civic centers and university extensions in urban renewal areas. But they must concentrate first on housing those who need it most.

I think FHA suffers a similar reputation lag as has urban renewal. FHA is accused of having concern only for the suburbs, or upper-income groups in the central city. It is charged, with some justification, of having been a principal instrument in the spread of racial, residential segregation in the past. It continues to be labeled by many as unconcerned about housing the poor and those who are the victims of discrimination.

But what are the facts about FHA today? It is a principal source of mortgage financing for existing homes purchased by nonwhites across all of the urban complex. It has lifted the barriers that once prohibited insuring mortgages in changing neighborhoods. It is taking positive steps to finance the rebuilding of blighted areas in the central city. It is increasingly involved in building and rebuilding housing for low- and moderate-income families. Indeed, today FHA is an effective instrument that is providing opportunities to nonwhites in all parts of the urban complex.

I take pride in what Dempsey J. Travis, president of Chicago's Sivart Mortgage Corporation, wrote in the July issue of *Ebony*. He said: "I think FHA policies have made a 100 percent about-face since Weaver's coming."

Let me mention two other developments. In recent weeks, FHA initiated a pilot effort in five cities to counsel low-income, minority, veteran, elderly and other families in securing housing.

The FHA counselor interviews prospective buyers and renters. He helps them determine their financial capacity. He tells them about all FHA-acquired or insured housing that is covered by the President's Executive Order on Equal Opportunity in Housing.

Through the interview, families select properties they like, and they are assisted in getting appointments to see them. All of this has several results.

It directs families to properties they like and can afford. That avoids useless explorations.

It alerts owners, managers and real estate firms that FHA will insist on open occupancy practices in its programs.

It provides machinery for seeing to it that those who are required to follow open occupany practices are in fact doing so.

A second development, equally significant, is FHA's recent instructions to field offices requiring them, in accordance with new legislation, to insure mortgages in riot-torn areas, or areas threatened by riots. Thus FHA today is operating in many ways in the slums and blighted areas of our cities.

VI

At the outset, I said this was a symbolic occasion for the Rent Supplement Program. Today we can see tangible evidence of this program becoming the most imaginative and significant effort to house low-income families that this Nation has produced in the last 30 years.

With appropriations now available, we shall house some 34,000 families in developments similar to this.

But that is not enough. It does not even approach the need. Therefore all who are concerned with people must feel the enormity of the failure of the House of Representatives to appropriate the $40 million to expand Rent Supplements.

We are now attempting to restore this appropriation in the Senate. As you know, President Johnson has repeatedly urged such action. What we can see here today speaks eloquently of the need of the funds that the President urgently requests.

In recent days, the President has also had to ask the Nation to accept a tax increase—so that we can get on with many urban jobs long unfinished, and to support our armies abroad. I believe this Nation will accept both challenges—and the sacrifices they require.

For more than six years, it has been my principal goal to make HUD programs more responsive to the needs of people. Urban renewal has, I believe, turned the corner. And FHA is well on the way. The latter agency *is* in the business of augmenting the supply of decent moderate- and low-income housing.

I have always believed in FHA's potential for assisting a wide spectrum of income groups. Even years ago, when I was one of the agency's most severe critics, I wrote of that potential.

More recently, with the full cooperation of Commissioner Neal Hardy and today of Assistant Secretary Philip Brownstein, and many of their associates, we are beginning to realize that potential.

There is always a need for informed criticism but that criticism must be rooted in facts.

The central fact today is that this Nation needs all of the tools and weapons it can muster to meet the urban problems that affect all of us. FHA is such a tool. Our continuing need is to find the ways to make it increasingly effective.

Today, in this development, and in the nearby moderate-income projects now in existence, we can see what can be, and is being, accomplished. Let us build on that solid foundation.

Results of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take note of the cooperation of the residents of my district in responding to my annual questionnaire. This year over 35,000 replies were received. I want to thank all those who have participated in their Government this way, and to report here the results of the questionnaire for the first session of the 90th Congress:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No answer
1. Do you support U.S. military activity in Vietnam?	74.7	21.9	3.4
2. Would you favor prohibiting wiretapping and bugging in all cases except national security?	57.4	39.2	3.4
3. Do you favor the current war on poverty?	23.0	73.4	3.6
4. Should the United States increase trade with Communist countries?	23.6	71.6	4.8
5. Do you support foreign aid?	28.2	61.6	10.2
6. Would you support a program to improve health, education, and housing for migrant farmworkers?	74.0	21.4	4.6
7. Are you in favor of increasing social security taxes to provide increased social security benefits?	54.5	42.5	3.0
8. Do you favor "open housing" legislation?	18.0	73.0	9.0
9. Would you favor a constitutional amendment to prohibit Federal control of school curriculum and teacher qualifications?	73.9	24.4	1.7

Congressman Horton's Concern for the Ukraine Lauded by Congressman Findley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the plight of small nations which have been forcefully put beneath the Communist yoke grows more serious each year.

Unfortunately, there is too often a tendency for some to forget the millions in those nations who yearn for their lost freedoms.

But there is one among us who never fails to express his conviction that we should do everything in our power to strengthen the forces which would free the captive nations.

I refer to our colleague, Representative FRANK HORTON.

Mr. HORTON spoke eloquently on the subject recently at Benjamin Franklin High School in Rochester, N.Y., during the observance of the 50th anniversary of the Ukrainian National Revolution.

I would like to share his address with you and with our colleagues at this time:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANK HORTON

Perhaps some of you will recall that in July of last year I spoke to a Captive Nations dinner audience. At that time I opened my remarks with a quotation from the work of Taras Shevchenko, the reknown Ukrainian poet of freedom. The passage I used was from "My Testament" and was this:

Oh bury me, then rise ye up
And break your heavy chains
And water with the tyrants' blood
The freedom you have gained

The passage of time has only made his words more appropriate as we today pay tribute to the courage of those people of the Ukraine who fifty years ago rose up to throw off the oppressive chains of the then newly constituted Kerensky government of Russia. Unfortunately the freedom for which your forefathers fought so valiantly was soon lost. In 1921 the Polish government and the rulers of Communist Russia signed a Treaty under which they agreed to dissolve the Ukrainian National Republic and divide between themselves the territory of this once sovereign state.

The stranglehold of Communism that was then imposed on the Ukraine has since been forced upon many additional millions of peoples as the list of Captive Nations has grown ever longer.

As all of you know, I have long decried the continued growth of the Captive Nations "roster" and I have employed every means at my command to awaken the Administration to the real magnitude of the Communist menace. Today more than 20 countries comprise that roster and range from the once proud nations of Eastern Europe with their rich cultural heritages to the beleaguered island only 90 miles off the shores of America whose people have suffered so greatly since the establishment of a Communist government. Today we also witness the loss of many thousands of American lives in Asia where we seek to frustrate the most recent effort of the Communist World to expand its empire.

When I look back over the record of American efforts in the defense of freedom during the last fifty years I am deeply saddened. The fundamental American faith in the honesty of all men has caused this Nation to frequently forfeit at the conference table, and elsewhere in the sphere of international politics, many of the victories which we have achieved on the battlefield at such staggering cost. Unlike Winston Churchill who perceived so clearly the fall of the Iron Curtain, American statesmen continue to be naive about the intricacies of international politics.

For example, I have repeatedly called for a strengthening of the NATO alliance as well as our own defensive posture. The Administration, however, appears more concerned with achieving an East-West detente and a vast expansion of trade between the two worlds, financed with American credit. I am compelled to conclude that the priorities of the present Administration are confused when goals such as these are promoted while we are engaged in armed combat with a nation receiving vast amounts of aid and arms from the Soviet Union.

In my judgment the first order of business is to strengthen our great European alliance and our own defensive capability before we embark on programs to ease the tensions of the world. We should attempt to further international cooperation and understanding only after our national security and sovereignty are assured.

Organizations such as the United Ukrainian Committee and people such as Bill Andrushin have a vital role to play if the government of this country is to be made fully aware of the threat which the Communist menace poses to our continued national existence. I am hopeful that through your dedicated educational efforts the true nature of the menace will be exposed.

Port of Oakland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished Senator from Alaska, the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, addressed the Intermodal Transportation Symposium at Oakland, Calif., on September 14, 1967, in connection with the 40th anniversary of the inception of the Port of Oakland. Senator BARTLETT is most knowledgeable in the affairs of our merchant marine and particularly in the phase of its operations treated in his remarks on that occasion.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the following speech of Senator E. L. BARTLETT:

REMARKS OF SENATOR E. L. BARTLETT, CHAIRMAN, MERCHANT MARINE SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE, INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION SYMPOSIUM, SEPTEMBER 14, 1967, OAKLAND, CALIF.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Honored guests at head table, ladies and gentlemen.

Let me be candid.

I come before this symposium with mixed emotions.

My emotions are mixed not because I am hesitant to address this group or because I have doubts about the value of intermodal transportation systems. To the contrary, I believe that tying all modes of transportation into one system is the most exciting concept to come down the turnpike, the ways or landing strip in decades. Rather, my concern is that this concept will not be allowed to become all it is capable of becoming. However, I hasten to add the proper use of containers is not the sole mixer of my emotions in the transportation picture. I will briefly outline the sources of my discontent.

Last year Congress authorized the creation of a Department of Transportation. On the basis of time lapsing between the proposal and the passage of the act, the Transportation Department set a record for becoming a cabinet-level organization. Such haste on the part of Congress, a body not always know for moving swiftly, would seem to indicate that the nation's lawmakers felt strongly about the need to bring some order to our transportation system, to develop a balanced system which would move people and goods quickly, efficiently and on that mode of transportation best suited to a particular trip. I am sure everyone in this room applauds, as I do, the philosophy behind the new department.

However, that philosophy can become policy only if the Department of Transportation has the backing within the executive branch to make changes in bureaucratically set agencies, to make decisions for the good of the entire nation and not just for the benefit of a particular department.

If, indeed, the Secretary of Transportation does not enjoy the standing within the executive branch that many of us envisioned, it won't be the first time the Executive Department has ignored congressional intent.

As a matter of fact, if any of the administrations since 1936 had implemented the Merchant Marine Act of that year, this country would not be losing its position as a great maritime power.

I recently completed rather extensive hearings on the present state and future of the United States Merchant Marine. There was unanimous agreement that our old fleet was getting older fast and that if something were not done soon, the United States, for all intents and purposes, would cease to be strong in its maritime power at a time when the Soviet Union, among other nations, cognizant of the value of sea power, had launched programs designed to make it the ruler of seas, militarily and commercially.

Believing that necessity is the mother of invention, I was hopeful, but not very, that such widespread concern would lead to development of widespread support for a new maritime policy. Apparently, necessity is not the mother of unanimity, for, as everyone in the room knows, each segment of the maritime industry put forth different proposals for meeting this great national need. The diversity was and is so great that our Secretary of Transportation has yet to come up with a public policy on this question.

Further, we witnessed a distressing happening in which the Department of Defense, in pushing for a pet project of its own, not only overstated the strength of our reserve fleet, but expressed no interest in the relation between the merchant marine and our national security other than in our fleet's rather uncertain ability to supply troops around the world.

In addition to hearings on the merchant marine, I also recently concluded an investigation into standardization of containers. As I indicated previously, I believe development of the container conception can revolutionize the transportation industry. I know from first-hand knowledge in Alaska that the use of containers can cut costs. I was, therefore, dismayed to learn that an industry already stifled by over regulation was about to embark on a policy with government support which might well stifle development of a new and promising concept. This "stifling" would, in effect, discriminate against ship owners

who did not choose to go along with industry-set standards. The stifling would mean rigid use of certain size containers which might prove to be less satisfactory than other sizes, thus leaving our merchant marine or transportation industry in a very uncompetitive position.

I have no objections to private industry setting standards, but I do object and object strongly when a government agency acts to impose those standards on everyone. I object strongly to such actions: particularly when there is no economic justification for the standards.

Particularly when use on the open market—remember free enterprise?—is the best way to determine the best standards;

Particularly when two firms which pioneered the concept and made an "unsubsidized" go of it would be penalized;

Particularly when the standards would not work as advertised—for example 20-foot containers must be specially strengthened when coupled, and uncoupled 20-foot containers cannot fit into 40-foot container cells.

And particularly when it is easier for cranes to adjust from 20-foot to 24-foot containers and from 30 to 35-foot containers than from 20-foot to 40-footers, the two sizes which are the most popular among the standards.

It must also be noted that two-thirds of the containers in the world are 24 feet or 35 feet long, neither of which is "standard."

So these are the causes of my mixed emotions. On this hand, we have a Department of Transportation, on the other, it is not yet clear that the new department has sufficient muscle within the executive branch to do the job which must be done.

On the one hand, all are agreed our merchant marine is sinking fast, but no one agrees on how best to keep it afloat.

An intermodal transportation system holds great promise for the future, but there is a move afoot to tie that future to the present.

In each case, hope is balanced by concern, good reason for mixing something for the emotions.

Now I am certain, or at least I hope, that you do not think I flew to Oakland just to unburden my emotions in a group therapy session. No, if you will pardon the expression in an "emotion" ladened speech, there is a method to my madness.

I have no intention of extolling the virtues of intermodal transportation system to this audience. If you didn't appreciate the value of the concept, you probably would not be here. If you happened to wander in uninitiated in the fine art of containerization, I suspect the views of a legislator would have little impact in convincing you that containers are the wave of the future.

Rather, for the next few minutes I want to return to the mixers of my emotions to outline briefly the role that this legislator believes legislation can play in helping to develop a modern, efficient and competitive transportation industry.

Frankly, I am not sure what else Congress can do about giving the Department of Transportation added muscle. Perhaps it is only a matter of time before all the organizations now lumped together in the new department accept their new status in life. Congress can help by appropriating adequate funds and I think, judging from the haste in which Congress approved the new department, Capitol Hill will supply the needed capital.

Turning to our merchant marine, there is something Congress can do, and that is to establish a merchant marine program, with or without proposals from the administration. Of course, if Congress does take the initiative in enacting a program, there still remains the question of whether the administration will implement a program with which it does not agree. However, I can report that chances have brightened in recent weeks that a new maritime policy will be placed before Congress during the 90th Congress. I have discussed the question of a new merchant marine program with many persons in and out of Washington, and that includes the man in the White House. While these discussions have not brought concrete results, they are the basis for my somewhat optimistic statement of "brightening changes."

Let me emphasize though, that whatever the chances, I believe in face of the conditions of our merchant marine, it is incumbent upon the national legislature to propose and enact a program whether or not the administration acts. This legislator is one among several who intends to put forth such a program with or without administration support, though, of course, I would much prefer that we have assurances that the program will be implemented.

Certainly Congress does have a key role to play in efforts to revitalize our merchant marine.

Similarly, it will be up to Congress to decide the final resting place for the Federal Maritime Administration, and I use the phrase "resting place" with some malice of forethought. It is quite clear that a "wrong" decision on relocating the Federal Maritime Administration could make my phrase only all too accurate. There are those who believe that the administration would be subordinated to the needs of other agencies if it were moved to the Department of Transportation; and there are those who argue that an independent administration would lack the necessary muscle when it sought appropriations from Congress.

While I am not about to predict the outcome of the debate, I will venture a guess on what will be the determining factor in settling the question. If the administration proposes or supports an adequate merchant marine program, many persons will be convinced that the Federal Maritime Administration will receive a fair shake in the Department of Transportation. If the administration turns thumbs down on all meaningful maritime proposals, many persons will fear for the future of the Maritime Administration if it is turned over to a department which cannot or will not take a lead or even support efforts to build up an important segment of its responsibility.

I would like at this point to express a hope—a hope that all those persons who agree that our merchant fleet is sinking will agree to put a substantive program ahead of politics if and when a program is forthcoming.

And now I come to containers and what legislators can do to help this idea develop as it should. As you no doubt surmised, I do not intend to stand idly by while the federal government uses its power incorrectly, in my judgment, to stifle a concept that, left to flourish in the open market, will benefit the transportation industry and those the industry serves.

However, Congress must do more than that if containerization is to live up to its promise.

There are numerous problems to be solved before the full effect of containerization can be felt. Some of the problems are mechanical and some are what might be classified generally as regulatory. It is in the latter area that Congress can and must act.

There is the problem of regulations requiring custom officials to open and inspect containers en route, thereby negating in part the value of containers in reducing handling costs and pilferage.

There is the problem of adopting the various liability regulations now applied to different modes of transportation to the concept of containers moving unopened over land and sea and in the air.

And finally, there is the most important problem of establishing through bills of lading providing through routes and rates.

Unless these problems are solved the mechanical benefits of containerization will not be translated into economic incentives and savings which will encourage widespread use of containers.

Inasmuch as these rules are man-made, there should be no reason why man cannot find ways to change these rules to fit this new development.

I say that mindful of the difficulties already alluded to in getting changes in man-made rules governing the merchant marine.

However, I think that Congress will be receptive to proposals to alter our rate-setting environment to permit full use of this new technology.

As in the case of our merchant marine, there is need for haste in developing a new rate-setting environment. Containerization is coming faster than anyone imagined, or for that matter, hoped. The rush is on to get in on the ground floor of containerization, or perhaps I should say, the rush is on to catch up with those few firms which already are on the ground floor.

Let me briefly review some of the efforts now underway in the Department of Transportation to facilitate intermodal transportation.

In order to make maximum use of through shipments, especially with containers, cargo must be documented at the originating point so that it can be moved via various modes of transportation without the expense of redocumentation for each mode.

Efforts to develop such documentation in the United States parallel work that is underway in the Economic Commission for Europe. A Working Party on the Standardization and Simplification of External Trade Documents of the Committee on the Development of Trade is working toward through documentation for the European countries. The United States is a member of the Economic Commission for Europe and is participating with the European countries to align the United States' documentation for cargo with that of the European nations. This effort will be expanded to the Far East, African, and Latin American countries who have recently requested the Technical Adviser of ECE to help them standardize their through documentation projects. The objective of these programs is to develop an international bill of lading.

The United States is working with other members of the United Nations through the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization to standardize entry and clearance documents. The Senate has ratified the two maritime conventions—the Convention of Mar Del Plata and the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization Convention—proscribing a minimum number of documents that will be required to enter and clear vessels at any of the member country ports. The documents required will be: a general declaration (to enter and clear the vessel); a cargo declaration; ship's stores declaration; crew's certificates declaration; crew list; passenger list; universal postal convention document for mail, and maritime declaration of health.

Work is underway to design the forms and determine what items will be contained on those forms to cover the above items. When these forms are put into effect, the paperwork and procedures for entering and clearing vessels will be greatly simplified and standardized.

Legislative changes to permit through documentation, simplified and standardized entry and clearance procedures and documents will require changes in existing laws.

Legislative changes will be required to permit development of through rates and rates. A number of proposals, ranging from creation of super regulatory agency to establishment of joint boards involving the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Boards, to development of a new type of freight forwarder, have been made in the past.

Obviously, any such major change in our present rate-setting environment requires considerable study and experimentation. It may well be that the pressure of the container revolution will not permit us to wait for such major changes. At present, none of the three regulatory agencies, with certain exceptions, accept rate filings for routes which extend beyond their areas of authority. Perhaps the best approach at this moment would be enactment of permissive legislation to allow the regulatory boards to accept through-route, single-rate filings. If this approach were taken, then those members of the transportation industry which want to take full advantage of containerization would be allowed to do so, subject to rate approvals from the proper regulatory bodies.

Clearly the days ahead will require close cooperation between private industry and government if we are to be successful in making the legal adjustment necessitated by the container revolution. Regardless of what proposals eventually come forth, the various segments of the transportation industry must be prepared to face the fact that in their dealings with the regulatory agencies, business will not be done "as usual."

A few minutes ago, I expressed the hope that if and when a maritime program is proposed all interested parties will value the establishment of a sound merchant marine program more than making political points. In the same spirit, I hope that when changes in our rate structures are proposed, all interested parties will submerge any narrow interest to the greater good of making the containerization revolution as successful as possible.

And now, I want to thank you for this opportunity to discuss my "emotional" state. I suppose the persons who suffer most from the malady of mixed emotions are those who find themselves unable to do anything about what is bothering them. As I review my remarks to you, I find that happily I am not in such a predicament. For you in the business end of transportation and for me in the legislative end, this is indeed an exciting era. The problems are not insoluable, and by solving them we will help make the world a better place in which to live. No man, mixed emotions or not, can ask for a better opportunity than that.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1967

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

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

O Thou Lord of life and light, who art the center and soul of every sphere.

Turning aside, for this hallowed moment, from the violence of these embittered days, we would hush the words of the wise and the prattle of the foolish.

In the silence of this Chamber of governance, we would hear the ancient assurance, "Be still and know that I am God."

We ask not that Thou will keep us safe in these dangerous times, but that Thou wilt keep us loyal to the starry ideals of this dear land of freedom.

By a vision of Thy eternal kingdom whose sun never sets, give us the inner strength to serve the present age.

"To be true to all truth the world denies,
Not tongue-tied by its gilded lies,
Not always right in all men's eyes,
But faithful to the light within."

For Thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 29, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT, APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 28, 1967, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1657) to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HAYDEN ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Today is a very special day for the Senate.

Today marks a milestone in the life of one of our most distinguished Members. I refer to the 90th birthday anniversary of the senior Senator from Arizona and our beloved President pro tempore.

CARL HAYDEN has achieved a great many personal milestones since entering pubic service: treasurer and later sheriff of Maricopa County in his home State when a sheriff was the law; Arizona's first Representative to Congress when it received statehood in 1912; a U.S. Senator whose 40 years of service is a record for this body and whose combined House-Senate term of 55 years is a record for Congress.

Now he has reached another milestone. I know that he would rather that the day pass quietly and with no recognition. But the veritable army of friends of CARL HAYDEN will not let it pass without some expression of affection for our senior colleague.

History will record that we do not honor Senator HAYDEN simply for his longevity. Age is a neutral quality. Rather we honor him for what he has done with the many years allotted to him. We honor him for remaining humble, compassionate, and kind when he could have been otherwise. We honor him for the selfless example which he has shown for more than half a century. Above all, we honor him for being a truly great U.S. Senator and a close personal friend.

Happy birthday, CARL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I thank the majority leader for his very kind words, and I hope to be around when he attains my age. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Arizona has just indicated what I meant. I thank the Chair.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I endorse everything the majority leader has said about the Senator from Arizona this