Congressman Daniels Hails Freedoms Foundation Winner, George Toripow, of Kearny, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1967

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, last week winners of a special contest sponsored by the Freedoms Foundation, of Valley Forge, Pa., were taken as guests of that organization on a trip to historic sites connected with the establishment of this Nation.

Two members of the student-faculty group were residents of the 14th Congressional District of New Jersey, Mrs. Grace Kelaher, a member of the teaching staff of the Kearny, N.J., school system and a very outstanding eighth grade student at the Lincoln School in Kearny named George Toripow, who lives at 51 Johnston Avenue in Kearny. George, by the way, is a young man who was born in Poland and was selected as a result of both his academic background, leadership, and citizenship. Clearly, he is an example for all young people to emulate.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great source of regret that the press of business here in the House prevented me from being able to have lunch with this fine teacher and this very exemplary young man. However, my legislative assistant, who was with them, reported to me that they were recipients of every courtesy from several Members of the other body, notably the beloved senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], with whom Mrs. Kelaher and George had lunch, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], as well as the chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Doctor Frederick Brown Harris. To all of these fine men I would like to extend my personal thanks.

Mr. Speaker, Freedoms Foundation deserves the thanks of this House for this very fine program and, speaking for my constituents involved, I can report that it was a great success.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1967

(Legislative day of Monday, October 2, 1967)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Dr. Ralph John, president, Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou in whose providence we find the time and substance of life, and before whom the nations rise and fall: Prompted by those who have gone before, and compelled by our own needs, we look to Thee for wisdom and strength sufficient for the demands of this place and age.

Frequently frustrated by the complexities of a world which recurrently defies simplification, and with hearts burdened by the errant impulses of a humanity which has not caught the vision of its common ground in Thy love, we ask Thy guidance for the living of these days. Make us perceptive in appraisal, courageous in advocacy, and above all, committed to Thy will and way. So may we claim our destiny as a nation, and Thy Kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 2, 1967, be approved.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2388) to provide and improve the 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. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how does the time stand?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is divided between the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. DIRKSEN. And how much time remains?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An hour on each side.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri on a nongermane subject.

A PROPOSAL LOOKING TOWARD PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday, for some hours, there was discussion on the Senate floor about the war in Vietnam, with many Senators on both sides of the aisle recommending that the United States cease the part of the war in which this country has definite superiority; but no recommendations with respect to that part in which our superiority is clearly more in question.

In the Washington Post this morning, an editorial entitled "The Lesson of Con Thien" is especially interesting to me because I was in the Con Thien area a few days ago.

The editorial illustrates only too well "the perils and pitfalls and hard disciplines of limited war," now limited to the point where the already heavy casualties to U.S. forces are increasing; limited to the point where the prestige of this country is being affected, all over the world.

Nevertheless, as evidenced yesterday, some are now demanding that the war be still more limited.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have just returned from a trip to the Far East, Middle East, and Europe, having visited Japan, Hong Kong, South Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Israel, Greece, Italy, and Great Britain.

A report of findings and conclusions will be made shortly to the chairmen of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. In the meantime, however, one can only view with increased apprehension both the nature and the extent of the current worldwide commitments of the United States.

In Vietnam the pot has boiled over. In other countries where we have binding commitments, however, the water also is becoming very warm indeed.

In this connection, one notes the strange paradox of the brilliant military victory recently achieved by Israel against sophisticated Soviet weaponry nevertheless resulting in a much improved Soviet position in the Middle East; because both the United Arab Republic and Syria were left so weak militarily they can only hope to be rearmed by the Soviet on the latter's terms—said rearmament is proceeding rapidly, to the point where 70 percent of their air equipment losses have now been replaced.

The Soviet position is also improving steadily in the western Mediterranean. Today Algeria is probably the strongest Arab country in their orbit; and if there is any truth in the rumor that General de Gaulle plans to turn over to Algeria the great naval base of Mers el Kebir, the Soviets will obtain further significant leverage in that part of the Mediterranean.

Such a development would, in effect, turn the southern flank of SHAPE; and the original concept of NATO, already heavily damaged in the center by the withdrawal of France, would be weakened still further.

The resources of any country, even those of the United States, are not inexhaustible; and therefore these developments in the Middle East and Europe should also be considered as we in turn consider future policies incident to Vietnam.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

I have presented for many months my conviction that the United States is overcommitted and overextended on a unilateral basis. We need a great deal of money to handle all these foreign commitments along with our growing problems at home, and we do not want to jeopardize the integrity of the dollar.

In addition, and most important, is the matter of American lives. In this latter connection, the campaign here to cease air attacks against North Vietnam is receiving full attention in the other countries. But all civilian and military people abroad confirm the sworn testimony before the Committee on Armed Services. All those with whom I discussed this matter warn that another cessation of the raids against North Vietnam would guarantee additional casualties in South Vietnam—13,500 Americans have already been killed, 85,000 wounded.

Instead of only another cessation in the air attacks against North Vietnam, therefore, I propose that this Government announce, as of a certain date, the cessation of all military action in South Vietnam as well as over North Vietnam; and also announce that there will be no reinforcements into the theater.

The Government would announce that these policies were being undertaken in earnest hope that their adoption would result in prompt and meaningful negotiations in the interest of a just peace.

At the same time, the United States should also announce that, if after this cessation of all military action in South Vietnam, as well as North Vietnam, the North Vietnamese, and Vietcong nevertheless continued hostilities, then the United States would feel free to pursue this war in any manner of its own choosing.

It would appear that the political objectives of the United States have now been achieved through the creation, by means of free elections, of the present Saigon Government; and the military objectives of this Government have never included the invasion of North Vietnam, the occupation of Hanoi, or the taking over of the Government of North Vietnam.

Concurrently with the above proposed announcement of U.S. policy, the Government of South Vietnam should announce its willingness to negotiate with anybody, and offer amnesty to members of the Vietcong.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 3, 1967]

THE LESSON OF CONTHIEN

The story of Conthien is the story of the Vietnam War. There is the same sense of stalemate and seemingly senseless bloodshed, the grinding attrition to no apparent or decisive purpose, the cruel inhibitions on our fighting men. And there are the same, perfectly normal, strictly conventional military reflexes at work—reflexes which have confounded so much of the conduct of this essentially abnormal and unconventional conflict. Indeed, the story of Conthien is not just in the spectacle of brave men dug in under a heavy handicap. It is in the spectacle of a limited war threatening to become a wider war because of a temptation to forget that our war purposes are limited.

This is the lesson of Conthien. It is not Dien Bien Phu, or the Chosin Reservoir, or Verdun. Like almost everything else about Vietnam, it is without precise precedent. We can abandon it (which the French could not at Dien Bien Phu). It is not, by most estimates, of critical military significance. If it is rapidly acquiring political and psychological significance, that is in large part because we ourselves are making it a symbol of something—our resolve, our military prowess, our courage—which it need not be. All these have been amply attested to in Vietnam, and will be soon enough again. Nor does the honor of the United States Marines need vindication at Conthien. In a war of attrition, to use General Westmoreland's phrase, Conthien has played its part, for the Marines have taken the enemy's worst and returned it manyfold.

Can it be that the sticking-point is mere territory? To accept this is to renounce a large part of what we have learned in the hardest kind of way in Vietnam about the conduct of "counter-insurgency" war. We are fighting to destroy enemy main forces, to help clear areas of guerrilla units, to expand security in populated areas—in short, to prevent the freedom of choice of the South Vietnamese from being foreclosed by force. None of this obliges us to conquer and hold a particular desolated strip of unpopulated territory.

A very good military case can be made, in fact, for the Marines pulling their base camps and prepared positions back out of range of heavy Communist artillery all across the DMZ. If the North Vietnamese bring their guns and rockets down into South Vietnamese territory, they can be dealt with on the ground without adding the new dimension to the war of a ground invasion of North Vietnam.

There is another compelling argument for doing so. Where the United States troops, and those of South Vietnam, take their stand in the northern slice of South Vietnam will very much determine where the so-called "barrier" against infiltration will be built. There is some military logic in having this defensive position also out of the range of Communist artillery over the border in North Vietnam.

Psychologically, this would seem to surrender a slim strip of South Vietnamese real estate to the North. In effect, however, we have been surrendering large chunks of the highlands and the War Zones to the enemy at one time or another all along. Search and destroy operations against mass concentrations of enemy troops and small patrols would still continue north of whatever positions the Marines might pull back to.

To state the case for pulling back is not to say flatly that this must be done. It may be that the Marines can hold out indefinitely and reduce their casualties by more effective counter-battery fire or deeper entrenchments. What would be indefensible, however, would be a prolonged defense of Conthien at the cost of heavy losses out of misplaced pride. Worse would be a stubborn defense finally impelling a ground attack over the border that would remove one more inhibition against a wider war.

If Conthien is to be a test of anything beyond the gallantry of our fighting men, it should be a test, not of our resolve, which does not need such testing but of our restraint. The lesson of Conthien lies in what it tells us of the perils and pitfalls and hard disciplines of limited war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to come out of neither side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, rather fortunately this amendment has been pending for some time and my basic statement has been available to Senators in their offices and on their desks. I realize that at this unusual hour, with committee meetings and other responsibilities of Senators, what I am saying here is largely for the RECORD.

I have offered this amendment because I am interested in the untrained having an opportunity for training and becoming productive members of our society. I believe that what I have proposed will do a far better job than the Job Corps.

My amendment is easily understood. It would repeal the Job Corps. In lieu thereof, we add $195 million to the authorization for vocational and technical training under the 1963 act. This would double the amount of money going to each State for this purpose, if the amount provided in my amendment is authorized and appropriated.

Now, it stands out clearly and without dispute that this proposal would save $100 million annually. In addition, the cost of operating the Job Corps is excessive. I think it is not subject to dispute that training in a vocational and technical school which is run by a State can be given at far less cost. I have estimated that it costs 2½ times as much to keep an enrollee in the Job Corps as it costs to keep a young man or young woman in a vocational or technical school that is a part of the State educational system.

When the Federal Government spends money for vocational education under the 1963 act, the States and localities have to match it; so for every sum of money spent increasing vocational and technical training by the Federal Government, as compared with the same amount of money given to the Job Corps, this expenditure would reach five times as many people.

Mr. President, here is a chance for the Senate to get rid of one bureau, reach five times as many people with better training, and save $100 million annually.

One argument that pops up is: The very, very unfortunate people who are recruited for the Job Corps will not be reached by the State vocational and technical training courses. I say that argument is without foundation. I say they are not being reached by the Job

Corps. The Job Corps is picking up a few people here and there, flying them all around the country, flying them home for Christmas, flying supervisors here and there, and that is where the taxpayers' money goes.

Can anyone here tell us what happens to 75 percent of those enrollees when they leave the Job Corps? The fact of the matter is that the Job Corps is not making a dent in the problem of unfortunate people who are untrained and who live in undesirable areas, whether we call those areas slums or ghettos.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, what greater incentive could Government provide than to have well-run vocational and technical schools right in the midst of the ghettos? Can Government set a better example? They cannot. This is the right way to do it.

In addition, Mr. President, there is a part of this problem that is beyond the Government. Government must provide the schools, but the character within the people to want to be self-sustaining, to want to provide for their families, to want to amount to something, cannot be accomplished by appropriations or by the passage of a law. We will have to turn to the spiritual institutions and character-building institutions of the country in order to carry out that function.

I point out that whenever State and local people are brought into an operation of training the untrained, we get some forces that cannot be supplied by a bureaucracy running the whole show.

Mr. President, it is shameful the way in which bureaucracies are lobbying to perpetuate themselves. The time and energy high people in this agency are spending to promote the perpetuation of their own empire is shameful.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Let us take a look at what it would do.

The Curtis amendment would repeal outright the present Job Corps establishment without making any provisions for its orderly liquidation. This would mean that $144 million in facilities would be abandoned, with no opportunity to work out in an orderly way what is to become of them. It would mean that $18 million in corpsmen allotments to their families—mothers, wives, sisters, and brothers—would not be sent home because they would not have the money out of which the allotments could be paid.

It would mean that $23 million in conservation work would go undone. This, I think, is of as much significance to States in the East, such as Pennsylvania, where we have untold work which can be done in the Allegheny National Park, in Fairmont Park in Philadelphia, and State game and fish lands, as it is to a State like Montana. The present occupant of the chair is well aware that there are inadequacies in appropriations for our national parks and national forests and an enormous amount of useful conservation work which has been backlogged for many a year.

Adoption of the Curtis amendment would mean that 80,000 deprived youth would not be served.

These are poor people. It would mean that the economic impact on 123 communities in 38 States where centers are operating and bringing money into communities and increasing the wealth of the inhabitants, these benefits would be lost. It would mean that over 125 million dollars in contracts with private industry would be terminated.

For, let us remember that a substantial part of the Job Corps' operations is under contract to private industry which is doing it for profit. Lytton Industries, Packard Bell, the brains of private industry in the management field, have been brought to bear on the Job Corps under a profit arrangement. All this would be lost in order to terminate the Job Corps program and substitute for it a middle class program, a program for the children of individuals who, in the ordinary course of events, are able to provide for their boys and girls, to send them to vocational educational schools, and see to it, if necessary, that they have the money for dormitories and food away from home.

But this program is directed to the poor, not to the middle class. This is a poverty bill. This is not a bill to improve the educational opportunities of middle-class American boys and girls.

That is taken care of in the Primary, Secondary, and Higher Education Act.

This is a bill for the poor.

This amendment would strike at the heart of one of the most important and one of the most successful programs to take young boys and girls off the streets and bring them into a healthy environment, to give them medical and dental services, to give them the kind of character building training which will turn potential juvenile delinquents into useful citizens.

This is a program which did, I will admit, have a shaky beginning, but now most of the bugs have been removed and 42,000 young people are benefiting from the program, with 70 percent of them getting jobs when they complete the program. All this would be cut away, at one fell swoop, if the Curtis amendment should be agreed to.

Mention is made of the fact that the Curtis amendment would cut costs.

Of course it would cut costs. Why would it not? It deals only with the training aspects of the rehabilitation program. Most kids who go to a vocational school do not need any particular extra training in character and in attitude. That is where at least 50 percent of the money spent on the Job Corps goes, to make good citizens out of disadvantaged youth.

Thus, necessarily, if we dismiss the whole problem of character and attitude, as my friend from Nebraska has done, surely, it will save costs. But the problem will remain. Is it not worth the cost to redeem the youth of this country through service in the Job Corps in 38 States—coming from all 50 States? Is this not well worth the cost which, to be sure, is not low?

The program suggested by my friend from Nebraska is aimed at only half the problem, as I just said, and hence requires only half the cost. But what lies at the heart of the poverty program is the total rehabilitation of these youngsters. This is basic economics. It must also follow that we will have available for each of the young persons only one-half of what needs to be done, if the Curtis amendment should be adopted.

Why did these young people not respond to vocational schools in the first place?

They had the opportunity if they had the money—and all too often they did not have the money—to go to school as part of their secondary education, but they did not respond because they needed something else. In many cases, they needed a full stomach, a warm room, an understanding person to direct them toward the right way to achieve the good things in American life which they are being denied today. It was to give them these services, not as a matter of charity but as a matter of right that the Job Corps was established, in the first place, to give the youngsters a different environment. That is why the Job Corps fixed their teeth, gave them comprehensive physical examinations, performed hernia operations, put glasses on their eyes when they could not see, and provided a healthy diet to renew a body too long victimized by poor nutrition.

None of this can be done by turning half the money over to vocational schools. Not until these things are done can a young boy or girl begin to concentrate on a vocational career.

Human renewal is not cheap. Those of us fortunate enough to provide for our children from the moment they are born, through college and sometimes to graduate school, know the expense involved. To take a youngster who has not been so fortunate as ours and try to make a contributing citizen out of him is expensive.

It is also claimed that the local community from which a Job Corps youngster has been recruited seldom benefits from the time, money, and training that has been afforded the individual enrollee. May I suggest we take a look at the record.

Here are some figures about the Job Corps as of June 1967—about 3 months ago—the figures would be higher now.

There are 11 States in which Job Corps centers to this date have not been established. That means that there are Job Corps centers in 39 of the 50 States.

Although no Federal funds have gone into these States for construction and maintenance of Job Corps centers, these States have benefited from the allotments to dependents and readjustment allowances which are brought back with the Corps member to the State from which he was recruited.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield at that point for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What are the 11 States which do not have Job Corps centers?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be glad to obtain that for the Senator a little bit later. I do not have it on the tip of my tongue.

Mr. President, in this respect, the State of Louisiana has benefited to the extent of $2,114,583; the State of Mississippi to the extent of $1,783,507; Alabama by $1,988,480; Georgia by $2,357,997; and South Carolina by $1,833,766. And these figures reflect only the monetary benefits, above the training and new skills which the Corps members bring back to their States.

The goal of the Job Corps is to prepare young men and women for jobs in which they can earn a decent living and through which they can become responsible citizens.

To illustrate my point, let us talk for a moment about the typical Job Corps enrollee.

He has had 8 years of school but he reads only at the fourth-grade level. That is because he has not been able to absorb his education properly—frequently because his ghetto school is no good.

Forty-seven percent of the males failed the induction eligibility test for the Armed Forces—33 percent failed for educational reasons; 60 percent from broken homes; 63 percent from homes where the head of the household is unemployed.

Almost 40 percent come from families on relief, and 80 percent have not seen a doctor or dentist in the last 10 years. What chance would these youngsters have in a vocational educational system? I suggest none. That is why the Curtis amendment is not a program for poor people. It is a program for middle class children, a program for children who have already had most of the amenities of life.

We know that for every 10 months spent in the Job Corps, the average Corps member gains 1½ grade levels in reading. This is over twice the gain he showed in public school before he dropped out.

Seventy percent of all Job Corpsmen obtain jobs, or reenter schools, or qualify and enter the military service. Those who have jobs receive wages of $1.71 an hour. If we assume this youngster works at $1.71 an hour for 40 years with no increase in earnings, he will return to the Government in income tax payments alone over $11,200.

To talk of the Job Corps as a vocational program is just not to understand the average Job Corpsman whom I have just described. He could no more go to a vocational school, live independently in a dormitory, pay for his room and board, read his vocational manuals, than he could enter college. A vocational program alone is too far above him educationally and emotionally, and, I would say, culturally. This youngster needs complete human renewal, and that is what the Job Corps does.

So I think in essence the question in determining the vote on the Curtis amendment is: Do we want a poverty program or do we want to put more money into middle class education? We are putting plenty of money into middle class education. I have supported it in many bills of which I have been proud to be a cosponsor.

Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has used 12 minutes of his 60 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I will yield myself, again, such time as I may require.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to say a word about Job Corps costs, and here I refer to the committee report, page 14, which states that the committee has conferred with a number of Job Corps contractors, including those from industrial firms which have had long experience in cost-cutting methods. They conclude that costs are reaching rock bottom and cannot be further lowered without seriously impairing program quality. Center managers have expressed shock on learning the depth of disadvantage of the youths who enroll in the Job Corps.

Mr. President, mark this well: Remedial medical and dental services alone cost $360 per enrollee. That is because these youngsters have not had a chance to have adequate medical and dental care because of the cost involved.

The seemingly high costs are necessary to remedy 16 to 20 years of neglect by local schools—whether they be in the humanities or technical or vocational schools—neglect by health agencies, and other community service organizations, and to overcome the handicaps of broken families and disrupted neighborhood life.

Indeed, costs are high, but the needs are great. Yet the committee is convinced that, in the long run, the Government will be fully reimbursed for these expenditures through the taxes derived from the corpsmen's subsequent greater earnings, not to speak of the savings to the welfare and correctional systems of the country as these youngsters are assisted in finding productive roles in society.

A comment was made, in the course of the debate, that—

> Nationally, the Job Corps is in disrepute. It does not have the confidence of the American people. These weaknesses and failures are common knowledge and they have been well documented over the months.

I categorically deny that statement. There is not one word of truth in it. Of the more than 400 witnesses who testified before the subcommittee, only two advocated the abolition of OEO and the transfer of its functions, including the Job Corps, to other agencies. These witnesses included key representatives from such important national organizations as the following:

National League of Cities.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors.

National Association for Community Development.

National Urban League.

League of Women Voters.

National Council of Churches.

National Council of Jewish Women.

National Conference of Senior Citizens.

National Council of Catholic Women.

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.

And the American Bar Association—surely not a radical organization.

All of these groups have supported the maintenance of the Job Corps within OEO, and, in fact, many have recommended an expansion of the program.

In addition, the business community has become increasingly more receptive toward the OEO programs, and the Job Corps in particular, and plays a leading role in the operation of the Job Corps camps, as I noted a moment or two ago.

My friend from Nebraska said:

> Nobody has an accurate check as to what happens to the Job Corps enrollees after they leave the Job Corps.

There is not a word of truth in that statement. Let me read from the committee report, at page 13:

> Based upon sample studies conducted for OEO by Louis Harris & Associates, the Job Corps estimates that 70 percent who have left the Job Corps are working, in the armed services, or enrolled in school. The remaining 30 percent were unemployed, out of the labor force (such as young women who married), or whereabouts unknown.

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

Mr. CLARK. Yes, I yield. Before the Senator begins, may I say to him that I can give him the list of States where there are no Job Corps camps. I asked my staff to get that information.

Mr. CURTIS. I am neither offended nor stirred over the fact that the Senator stated that the statements in my speech were without a word of truth in them. Of course, nobody believes that absurd and ridiculous charge.

Mr. CLARK. I yielded for a question, if the Senator wishes to ask a question.

Mr. CURTIS. I told the Senator that I interviewed three of the top leaders of the Job Corps and I asked them what happens to people who leave the Job Corps and they told me that they had no way of finding out because they write them at the address when they enrolled, and when they are gone from there they have no check on any of them, but about 25 or 30 percent——

Mr. CLARK. Is the Senator referring to the Job Corps center in Nebraska?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Because the information is here in the National Office of OEO.

It may be that they do not have the information in Nebraska. In fact, when we talked to them the other day they seemed to be singularly confused. These are figures we got from Mr. Shriver.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Shriver is fighting the battle of his life to save his bureaucracy. I challenge Mr. Shriver to give a list of the figures based on Government figures showing where they are working right now.

Mr. CLARK. May I read into the RECORD the list of States where there are no camps?

Alabama, Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Rhode Island, and South Carolina.

Mr. President, studies made by Louis Harris, to which I referred a moment ago, are in the House hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967, part I. The hearings were held from June 12 to 16. I hold in my hand a copy, which I shall be glad to furnish

to the Senator from Nebraska if he cares to look at it.

Mr. CURTIS. That is an opinion poll; is it not?

Mr. CLARK. No; it is a check, to see where they are. It is not an opinion poll.

Mr. CURTIS. It is merely a poll taken by a pollster.

I still challenge Sargent Shriver to tell what happened to the people who were trained in the Job Corps. He has no record of them.

Mr. CLARK. All I can say is that if the Senator from Nebraska does not believe Sargent Shriver, perhaps he will believe Lou Harris.

Mr. CURTIS. No, I did not say I do not believe him; I said he did not have the information.

Mr. CLARK. He told us he did.

Mr. CURTIS. Why does he not present it?

Mr. CLARK. He did before our committee. I just read it to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. No; he gave a pollster's opinion.

Mr. CLARK. I cannot agree with my good friend from Nebraska. What was given us was an analysis made by his own assistants.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska commented about Job Corpsmen being flown all over the country and taking over hotels. The answer to that criticism is that during the early years of the Job Corps, it was the custom of the Job Corps to fly enrollees from their reception centers, where they were gathered, out to the conservation camps in the West. This was felt to be the most economic way to handle them, but Congress did not like it, so in 1966 Congress added an amendment to require trainees to be assigned to their own region, and the present bill requires assignment to the center closest to the residence of such enrollee.

If there is any puddle-jumping flying still being done—I do not think there is—it is because it has turned out to be the cheapest way to get the corpsmen to the centers where they are to be trained.

With respect to taking over hotels, it is true that in the early days certain hotels which were pretty much on the ropes—I can say from my own experience that the ones I saw were rather second-class hotels—were picked up at bargain rates in order to provide trainees in the Corps with the facilities where the corpsmen could be trained in urban centers.

I saw one such hotel myself, in Albuquerque, N. Mex., where there was a Women's Job Corps camp. I can attest to the fact that the Packard-Bell Co., which is the contractor operating that Women's Job Corps center, had really made a good and shrewd purchase—it may have been a lease, I do not know: I think it was a purchase—of a facility which was extraordinarily well planned for the conduct of a Women's Job Corps camp. The fact that it happened to be a hotel seems to me to be relatively unimportant.

Of course, the initial investment in capital facilities for the Job Corps is now over, because the committee bill, in accordance with the action of Congress last year, fixes the number of enrollees at somewhere in the neighborhood of 42,000; and we do not want to see that number extended any further. The present facilities are entirely adequate to receive and continue the training of that many persons.

Let me not be too dogmatic about this. There are weaknesses in the Job Corps. There have been failures. My own view is that since Mr. Kelly took over as Director of the Job Corps, there has been an almost spectacular improvement in the caliber of its administration; and I must say, from what we see and what we have heard, including testimony from Job Corps graduates themselves, I am of the view that on balance, with some mistakes and some weaknesses, and at a cost which is high, the Job Corps program has done well and should be continued.

The Job Corps is a vital resource for the Nation. I believe it is doing as much as any other one of the poverty programs to insure that a substantial segment of disadvantaged youth shall be given the training which they require.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. I ask how much time I have remaining.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania has consumed 25 minutes, and he therefore has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. May I ask whether the 5 minutes I yielded to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on a nongermane matter have been charged to me? In other words, I wonder whether I really have 35 minutes remaining.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. He has 30 minutes remaining. He has consumed 25 minutes, and the Senator from Missouri consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and, with the concurrence of my friend from Nebraska, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be charged to neither side.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will withdraw that request, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the previous order, that the remaining time be limited to 14 minutes, to be equally divided between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, and that prior thereto, we have a live quorum, with the time not to be charged to either side; in other words, that we have a live quorum, then 14 minutes of debate, and after that we vote. There will be a request for a rollcall vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall not object, but before we proceed with that, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the pending amendment concerning the Job Corps, prepared by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], who is necessarily absent, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

JOB CORPS STATEMENT, OCTOBER 2, 1967

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

Since the beginning of our national effort to eliminate domestic poverty, no program has been as misunderstood and as unfairly treated as the Job Corps. Adverse reaction and political attacks, reported in the press and broadcasting media, have clouded the dramatic successes achieved by this imaginative program.

As part of its review of the effectiveness of the poverty programs, the subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty this spring visited the Camp McCoy Job Corps Center at Sparta, Wisconsin. I had the honor of chairing those hearings and of visiting with camp officials and enrollees.

I was deeply impressed by the accomplishments of that center in its few short months of operation.

As with any new program of such magnitude, its development was not without problems. Initial difficulties with individual Corpsmen and with administrative procedures are being resolved.

The Center is being run by the Office of Extension of the University of Wisconsin and the Radio Corporation of America. The program and work of the Camp McCoy Center are typical of similar camps throughout the country.

From 1965 to the present time close to 100,000 young men and women have been enrolled in urban and conservation camps. These young people are the most severely disadvantaged of our society. They are school dropouts, many Armed Forces rejectees and people who have had trouble with the police.

But they are still young. Society could permit them to continue to drift and to be a burden on the taxpayer, whether on welfare or in jail, for the rest of their lives. Or we can make an effort to bring them into society, to enable them to become productive citizens and taxpayers. The Job Corps chooses the second path, and has proven itself successful. There is no question that severe difficulties have existed in forming this program. The young people we deal with have been alienated and ignored by society all their lives. Repressive disciplinary action alone cannot solve the critical problems caused by the living conditions of these enrollees.

The Job Corps is not a welfare or handout program. It trains men and women to work and to earn a decent wage.

Mayor Jerome Cavanaugh of Detroit cited before our subcommittee here in Washington the benefits derived from OEO training programs. He said, "For the most part the dollars spent through local programs are investment dollars." The Mayor cited an adult and youth employment project which cost $788,000 and assisted 1417 persons. These people, once jobless, now earn $4 million a year in wages and pay $650,000 a year in taxes.

Seventy percent of those who have completed the Job Corps courses have since been placed in jobs, school or the military. Those who are working earn an average $1.71 an hour.

Not all those who enter the centers complete their training. But few people realize that close to fifty percent of those entering college fail to complete their degree requirements. Yet this does not reflect on the quality of American universities. Nor can it be denied that the experience was of great value to those who did not graduate.

This must be kept in mind when making a judgment on the Job Corps, which begins with young people who are, in effect, dropouts from the mainstream of our society.

We have in the Job Corps a unique example of cooperation between government and private industry in an effort to show America's poor that they can be helped through our existing institutions.

This effort has just begun. My greatest regret is that the program is so limited in scope. We are reaching only a small number of those who are in need of the Job Corps.

Tragic events of the past summer should alert us to the folly of abandoning the small starts we have already made in providing a chance for America's poor and disadvantaged.

Passage of the pending amendment would further erode the remaining confidence of America's poor in our commitment to help them.

Unemployment figures have taken on new and dramatic meaning in recent months. The rate in America's slums is three times the national average. Unemployment among Negro teenage boys is 31% and among girls it is 46%. Yet a recent survey revealed that 67% of unemployed slum residents are willing to take on-the-job training.

With the Job Corps a commitment was made to these young people. Today we are faced with a choice, to accept our responsibility and to continue that commitment or to attempt to turn the clock back. Reversal of the trend of these past three years is not possible. It can be undertaken only at a tremendous future cost to the United States and it cannot succeed.

Mr. CLARK. There may be other Senators who wish to put in statements also.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the New Statesman of London, September 1, 1967, had an interesting article on the Job Corps Center at Camp Kilmer, N.J., run by the Federal Electric Corp., a subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.

In these days when we hear much carping criticism about the Job Corps and indeed the whole poverty program, it is gratifying to read observations by outside observers which recognizes the value of this concept of job training. Indeed, Nora Sayre the author of "Jobs for the Dropouts," perhaps summed up in one phrase the true story of the whole Job Corps concept when she said:

The Job Corps has the simple evidence of success: thousands are now working who would probably have been on relief.

Mr. President, as we study the various aspects of the poverty program let us not lose sight of the basic fact that there are thousands upon thousands of American citizens who are ill prepared to take part in today's society. For some reason our past efforts have not reached the so-called hard-core poor. Since enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 these people have been reached. For the first time in our governmental history instead of applying palliatives to the problem of poverty, we are utilizing curative methods which, if given time and support by this body, can truly break the cycle of the poor.

I believe this article contains some interesting observations and without objection would like to have it printed in today's RECORD.

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

JOBS FOR THE DROPOUTS

(By Nora Sayre)

From fire to fire the riots flare across the summer, while many liberals automatically deduce that the Anti-Poverty Programme is a failure or an irrelevancy. Yet, sifting the ashes and the shattered glass of riot sites, while counting the dead, should clinch the conviction that the Job Corps should be urgently expanded. Currently, there are 122 centres in the U.S. Camp Kilmer, in New Jersey—a former army base that once held Italian prisoners of war and, later, Hungarian refugees—has placed 2,039 of its 2,377 graduates in jobs. Staff members stressed that these particular young men might otherwise have been burning, smashing and dying. Aged 16 to 21, these school drop-outs are damaged goods when they arrive—but all have come voluntarily. Conspicuous for self-contempt and uncertainty, they are selected according to need: poverty, bad family life, minimal education. Records of delinquency do not disqualify them, although "major criminal offenses" aren't acceptable, nor is retardation. At Kilmer, 70 percent are Negro and Puerto Rican. They receive $30 a month, and average nine months' training; they can stay for a maximum of two years. On finishing they get $50 for each month "satisfactorily completed." The Kilmer management is contracted to the Federal Electric Corporation, a subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation.

The Corpsmen's reading and mathematics are improved so that they can receive the equivalent of a high-school diploma, and the choice of vocational programmes includes electronics, trucking, mechanics, carpentry, painting, cooking and offset printing. (At women's centres, the courses range from secretarial training to cosmetology.) Vocational counselling is intensive; a boy who's determined on electronics but has no ability is carefully guided to a related field. Another is advised against office machine repairs if he's going to return to a hometown of 200 inhabitants without a single typewriter. It's admitted that the kitchen is an inflammatory place, and that a nervous, irascible boy shouldn't become a short-order cook subjected to yells, heat and inevitably short tempers. They are trained in on-the-job behavior, dress and hygiene, and how to act during interviews and towards an employer ("Keep to the point, he doesn't want to know about your sex-life. Watch the hep talk.") and how to budget their salaries. City drop-outs are nocturnal creatures; they tend to sleep all day and roam at night, hence many are shocked by the requirements of punctuality. The intention is to raise them to a very strong apprentice level and to provide every graduate with a letter of introduction to a specific company. Industry and corporations have responded admirably, and Job Corps centres concentrate on encouraging firm representatives to visit the camps and inspect the professional level. Thus the Job Corps has the simple evidence of success; thousands are now working who would probably have been on relief.

However, personal rehabilitation is as crucial at Kilmer as the level of future employment. Counsellors and group-leaders stimulate Corpsmen to ventilate all their problems, including racial tensions (which do exist, but have not been serious), plus the numerous manifestations of homesickness. (They come from all over the U.S. Many miss their neighborhoods or city blocks, rather than their families.) There's an emphasis throughout on expressing feelings—which must be a fresh and startling experience for many, since impoverished parents often stress silence, especially by shouting at their offspring to shut up. Today it's quite astonishing to realize that a large group can be good for its members. While armies, offices and school dormitories deaden and deflate so many psyches, it's evident that Corpsmen thrive on mutual exposure and on their eventual concern for one another. There are nightly group meetings: quite often these focus on a boy who wants to leave, while the others try very hard to persuade him to stay. They say that they feel like failures when they can't convince a classmate to remain (incidentally, anyone can leave whenever he wishes.) But the group aura is far from militant; Corpsmen say that they appreciate being allowed to work at their own different speeds, and the lack of competition. The staff is frank about intrinsic problems; one is the diversity of intelligence—mingling those who read like eight-year-olds with some who are college material. Discipline is naturally quite intense; fighting or returning drunk from a weekend results in menial tasks or fines. But, talking to Corpsmen, one learns that they are very concerned about the Corps' reputation—and that they want each other to keep it clean. The verb 'to blow' is often heard at Kilmer; there are many references to blowing your job or your salary, as well as your cool. But repression isn't an albatross and griping is considered healthy.

Asked about their complaints (apart from the absence of girls, whom they do see on weekends or at many social events), Corpsmen were critical of the outside screeners who had glamorised the camp: 'They promise roses and cream. Hence some are disappointed. Still, the national drop-out rate is less than 19 per cent. Over a canteen lunch of fried chicken and limitless gravy, three students of heavy trucking were indignant about the costs of the space programme, and very well informed about its budget in contrast to Anti-Poverty funds: 'So go to the moon. Later. Not now. We know too many people who need what we're getting here.' However, they (and others) seemed to have little feeling about Vietnam; the army is still considered good employment, and a fair number of Corpsmen later enlist. They said that there hadn't been much 'interest' in the recent riots in New Jersey or elsewhere. One behemoth added: 'I used to be a . . . [careful pause] . . . hell-raiser. Then I got sick of standing on the corner with the wine.' They all agreed that their previous lives had been boring—'with your mother on your back all day long too.'

Since the US school system caters for the middle-class, it has already failed to serve anyone who is eligible for the Job Corps. Tangible results are important for morale at Kilmer, from the tools and machine parts which a Corpsman can keep when he's completed them, to the final diploma. A librarian remarked that there's a fierce determination to own things—that Corpsmen are pleased by the fact that everyone's given his own paperback dictionary. Noting that thousands of wooden pencils vanish from the library, he suggested that 'there must be something symbolic about owning them', and, since the camp is strewn with a host of broken pencils, he thinks that many must snap them in half during spasms of momentary frustration.

There has been ample hostility to the Job Corps, plus many tinted distortions by the press. It's true that the first applicants were not so carefully selected as they are now and that discipline has been accelerated. But the arrest rate among Corpsmen is less than half that for their age group throughout the US. Antagonism probably springs from envy of the swimming pools and other recreational amenities that nearby townsmen lack, homespun racism and the educated whites' fear of competition from Negroes with good vocational training. Also, rescuing people isn't cheap. Since it costs about $6,950 a year to maintain one Corpsman, there's a lot of rhubarb about 'the taxpayer's dollar'—ignoring the fact that Corpsmen themselves pay taxes. Even among liberal New Yorkers there's a lax readiness to believe that Job Corps centres are festivals of delinquency. Hence visits should be compulsory for every critic. Energy and professionalism make their own testimony. At Kilmer's driving school vast trucks weave slowly between orange barrels in a serpentine obstacle-course; in an auto-service station, Corpsmen's bodies dangle or protrude from capsized cars, amidst Plotonic showers of sparks an Irish instructor lyrically extols the poetry of welding and his students' exceptional 'feel' for the medium; the dilemma of perfecting a pumpkin pie absorbs a crew of intent cooks. The Corpsmen hardly wear halos, but there are cordial and courteous, greetings to any stranger. Numerous back pockets bulge with paperback books. Seeing so many alert and intelligent faces, it's hard to remember that many were almost illiterate not long ago.

Despite its achievements, the Job Corps'

budget has not been enlarged. The President is never shy of asking Congress for fresh funds for Vietnam; his requests for Anti-Poverty money are punctual but less passionate. This particular Congress may be remembered for its anti-riot bill, cutbacks in aid to the poor, and a recent vote for an elegant $10-m. Washington aquarium that few natives are said to desire.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 271 Leg.]

Aiken	Fong	Metcalf
Bartlett	Griffin	Monroney
Boggs	Gruening	Morton
Burdick	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Murphy
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Pell
Carlson	Inouye	Prouty
Case	Jackson	Randolph
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Clark	Jordan, Idaho	Talmadge
Cotton	Lausche	Yarborough
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Ellender	McGee	
Fannin	McGovern	

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair). 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:

Allott	Hayden	Percy
Anderson	Hollings	Proxmire
Bible	Hruska	Ribicoff
Brooke	Kennedy, Mass.	Scott
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smathers
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith
Dodd	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dominick	McCarthy	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Symington
Ervin	McIntyre	Thurmond
Fulbright	Miller	Tydings
Hansen	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Muskie	Williams, Del.
Hartke	Pearson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. Who yields time?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes. Let me say to all Senators now in the Chamber that we will vote in 14 minutes.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to state what the amendment is about.

The amendment would repeal the Job Corps. It would double the money for vocational and technical training under the 1966 act.

If any Senator wishes to see how much money his State will get now and how much it would get if the full amount were authorized and appropriated; it is shown on tables 1A and 1B which are printed on pages 3 and 3A of my statement which is on the desk of each Senator.

Here is what we propose to do. By repealing the $295 million item, we can double the money for vocational and technical training, save $100 million annually, and reach five times as many people with training.

The cost as I have estimated it in my statement to operate a State vocational educational school, including dormitories and meals, this is far less than the Job Corps. The Job Corps is two and a half times as costly as a State or locally operated school would be with Federal funds.

When we consider that a Federal appropriation under the 1963 program must be matched, we would reach five times as many people. Here we have an opportunity to double the vocational and technical education money going to the States, eliminate one bureau, reach five times as many people, and save $100 million annually.

The question has been raised that there is nothing in the amendment to provide for a tapering off. Yes, I am asking the Senate to vote on the general policy involved. Should the amendment carry, it will be a simple matter to implement it with additional amendments as may be necessary.

I contend that the present Job Corps method of taking a handful of people here and there, flying them across the country, then flying them home for Christmas, taking over hotels, is wasteful. It also sets a poor example.

Let us build vocational and technical schools right in the slums, right in the ghettos, so that all the people may see an example of education at its best where individuals can attend and graduate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 4 minutes of the Senator from Nebraska have expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote for the Curtis amendment. If adopted, it will increase from $225,000,000 to $420 million the money available for vocational training of the youth of our Nation. The vocational training program has been an efficient and constructive instrumentality in vesting our youth with vocations fitting them for employment.

Its cost will be far less than the cost of $6,950 per pupil in the Job Corps.

The cost of training a dropout in the Job Corps is at least twice as much as it costs to send a youth to our institutions of higher learning in Ohio.

Dropouts are brought in for enrollment from one section of the country to another at great and unjustified cost to the taxpayers.

Enrollees are hauled from one section of the country to another for the purpose of get-togethers at home, and are then returned to their original base. Vigorous complaints of misconduct keep cropping up from around the country, misconduct of the worst kind which has taken place in some of these institutions.

My vote will make available $195 million more for vocational training where the job can be efficiently done.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I reserve the remaining minute and a half of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I recall, Senators who were Members of this body when the Job Corps was first advanced opposed it far more vigorously than I did. I felt then that there were many problems we had to anticipate, and I regret to say that many of my fears have been realized. The proposal which is now being put forward by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is a step in the right direction, but I believe it is premature and that this is not the time to adopt it.

We must remember that we have a tremendous capital investment in Job Corps camps around the country. We must remember also that drastic changes have been made in the Job Corps program under the new Director, Mr. Kelly. Also, certain amendments which I offered and which were adopted in committee and on the floor of the Senate have, I think, strengthened the program immeasurably.

We must remember also that a number of contracts are outstanding for the operation of Job Corps camps, including those operated by big business. Many of them would be invalidated, and we would be faced immediately with a chaotic situation if the camps were closed. Furthermore, it is not possible for the vocational education personnel to take over those camps now. Perhaps in the future, they might.

Mr. President, I say regretfully to my distinguished friend from Nebraska that I cannot support his amendment now. If he offers it next year, or some similar proposal, I may have a different view of it then.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I want to read, from the report, the statement of the committee's consultant on the Job Corps:

The record of the Job Corps is clear: it tried to attract youth who had difficulty finding employment even in a tight labor

market. Two of every five enrollees in May 1967 had completed 8 years of education or less. And actual educational achievement was much lower than the formal education would indicate. Reading and arithmetic comprehension for half of the enrollees was at about the fifth grade level (or below). Nearly one of every three was unable to read a simple sentence or solve a second grade arithmetic problem. Two of every five came from a broken home, and two of every five from families on relief.

The difficulty will be that these young men are going to need special training. It is not really going to do any good to try to return them to vocational schools. Studies have indicated that vocational schools are unable to deal with the peculiar and particular problems that these young men and women are facing. It is only through institutions such as the Job Corps and programs such as the Job Corps program that they are going to be able to improve their education and be enabled to later become members of the labor force and contribute to their own families and to the community.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. It is not just a question of reeducating or moving people from the unemployable level to one that will enable them to have jobs. There is an additional problem in the spectrum of employment; namely, the middle area, from which one can get from lower status employment to more technical employment which has been largely removed by virtue of automation. So it is a problem that encompasses not only those not sufficiently educated or those who are borderline, but also the whole spectrum of employment. I think it is vitally important that we continue this program.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Job Corps camp at Camp Gary at San Marcos, 20 minutes away from my home, was the first established camp under this program. It trained thousands and has been one of the most efficiently operated camps in the country. It would be tragic not to continue it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

What would the Curtis amendment do?

One hundred and forty-four million dollars in facilities would be abandoned.

Eighteen million dollars in Corpsmen allotments would not be sent home.

Over $23 million in conservation work would go undone.

Eighty thousand deprived youth would not be served.

An economic impact on 123 communities in 38 States where the centers are operating would be felt.

Over $125 million of contracts with private industry would be terminated.

We would substitute a middle class program and a vocational education program for a program to help the poor people of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 1 minute and a half remaining.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, has all time been used except the 1½ minutes remaining to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Nebraska except 1 minute and a half has been used.

Mr. CURTIS. Has all time except the 1 minute and a half remaining to me been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I agree that the Senator should have the concluding argument, so I yield back my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, let me again state we are voting on a policy question. Are we going to bring the States and localities into the program, to save money, and to bring the schools where the poor people are? If this proposal carries, there can easily be a detailed amendment on the tapering off. No one has risen to defend the Job Corps during this debate. The charge that they have been flying around, taking over hotels, is true. One of the first things that occurred at the hotel in Omaha was that they removed the Gideon Bibles.

Government can provide the schools, but flying people around or a law cannot meet the character question that causes people who want to learn to do something and be self-supporting. The only way to encourage people to do that is to establish a good school in the poor areas, and not by getting people to go away from home and nobody knowing what happens to them after they leave. I daresay very few return to improve their own surroundings. There is something about a partnership between individuals and the State and local governments that brings to people those things that make such training a success.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. The bureaucracy is making the fight of its life to stay in office. I ask for the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HOLLINGS (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LAUSCHE (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is necessarily absent and his pair has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. If present and voting, the Senator Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would note "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 272 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Allott	Ervin	Morton
Boggs	Fannin	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Murphy
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Percy
Cooper	Holland	Sparkman
Cotton	Hruska	Spong
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Dominick	Jordan, Idaho	Talmadge
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	Miller	Williams, Del.

NAYS—49

Aiken	Hartke	Pearson
Anderson	Hayden	Pell
Bartlett	Inouye	Prouty
Bible	Jackson	Proxmire
Brooke	Kennedy, Mass.	Randolph
Burdick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ribicoff
Cannon	Kuchel	Scott
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Case	Magnuson	Smith
Church	Mansfield	Symington
Clark	McCarthy	Tydings
Dodd	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McGovern	Yarborough
Fulbright	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Mondale	
Hart	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—21

Baker	Hatfield	Morse
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Moss
Bennett	Hollings	Muskie
Brewster	Javits	Nelson
Dirksen	Lausche	Pastore
Gore	Long, La.	Russell
Harris	Montoya	Tower

So Mr. CURTIS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT AND WASHINGTON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the past 2 weeks I have been in Southeast Asia, by leave of the Senate. This ancient land has, for a long time, been the scene of recurrent strife among the many peoples who have come there over the centuries. In the past generation, that strife has largely degenerated into fratricide, terror, and bloody war, in which the forces of fading colonialism, expanding Asiatic communism, and national independence have been contending. For almost all of my 15 years in the Senate, our own country has become increasingly involved. And from the very beginning, that involvement has produced some contrary views.

In the past few weeks, the American press, and—I can personally testify—the press in Asia, have reported an intensification of the debate here at home. Free and constructive debate, of course, is vital. The American people need to know the truth, and Members of the Senate have a duty to seek it out.

Last May, I said in the Senate:

> The larger Communist powers must be on notice of the determination of the government and people of the United States to bring an end to our effort by negotiation, if possible, but by military force, if necessary.

Those remain my views now.

I cannot say that a fortnight abroad qualifies me as an expert. The fact is that, as with all human problems, there are currents and crosscurrents, good and bad, some full of hope, some full of despair. There are no clear-cut, guaranteed answers; and no catch phrase, however artful, can help guide us in this time of crisis. The views I express are my own, and represent my best judgment of the general situation.

Mr. President, as I see it, the American people face two basic issues in this tragedy. One is Communist aggression against South Vietnam and, less visibly, against Laos and Thailand. The other is more directly in the sphere of the Senate and the Congress, as a matter of national policy. It is the question of the continuing commitment of the United States and its overwhelming might to collective security of free peoples in Asia.

In Vietnam our leaders, both civilian and military, believe they see a dim light at the edge of a distant horizon. There are visible signs of progress in allied military operations, and in political development, as well. Even America's severest critics recognize that our Armed Forces have destroyed Communist hopes for military conquest of the south.

Land communications among cities in Vietnam have been expanded and secured. Villages, long out of touch with major cities, have resumed nearly normal contact. In Pleiku, I spoke with Montagnard tribesmen, some of whom had not in decades had any relationship with the central government in Saigon. They are now learning that they are part of a large nation. Many of them are fighting for their homeland. In the Mekong Delta, waterways between the tributaries of that great river have been made secure for the passage of trade. Sampan operators have been quick to exploit this situation and, incidentally, to express their gratitude for protection against Vietcong extortion and terror. These roads and waterways continue to require vigilant patrol which they are receiving. But the access they give is vital to the health and progress of South Vietnam.

The allied military effort is now supported by a vast complex of port and airfield facilities. Our forces are no longer dependent solely upon the congested harbor at Saigon. Our air forces have been deployed widely over the entire countryside. They are able to respond rapidly to any call for air support. In military terms, the essential logistic elements are in place. The capital investment in our military effort has been made.

While our communications have become more secure, the Communist enemy has been pushed out of most of his base areas. Under continued pressure from the air, land, and sea, his units are forced to keep moving. Enemy casualties have been high, possibly higher than the Communists can replace at present rates of recruitment and infiltration.

In the northern provinces the war on the Communist side has passed largely into the hands of regular units of the North Vietnamese Army—so severely have the Viet Cong been decimated. In these areas, the initiative remains largely with our forces. As one officer said to me, "When you have difficulty getting a fight, you know the enemy has problems." The enemy seems to have many problems. Only when he can operate out of sanctuaries, such as the demilitarized zone along the border north of Con Thien, does he seek to engage our forces on a large scale.

I do not pretend to pass judgment on military developments, except to note these points which were confirmed by a number of sources, both civilian and military, both American and South Vietnamese. It is clear that a base for progress has been laid. The tide of battle has long since stopped running in favor of the Communist Vietnamese. This is an enormous tribute to the thousands of American youth in uniform now serving in Vietnam. I spoke freely with them at every opportunity, from aboard the aircraft carrier *Coral Sea* in the Tonkin Gulf to a bivouac at Jackson Hole on the Cambodian border. Their morale is high. They have no fear. They believe in their mission. One-half million gallant Americans are participating in the defense of South Vietnam and the greater effort of knitting together the fabric of her nationhood. America is particularly fortunate to have the services in this struggle of Gen. William Westmoreland. His grip on the complexities of this unprecedented conflict has marked him as an outstanding military leader in our time. Without attempting to name them, our military personnel, from Admiral U. S. Grant Sharp to each of our enlisted men, and our civil servants, from Ambassador Bunker, and the other excellent ambassadors representing this country in that area, to our young advisers in the hamlets and in the villages, represent the finest kind of our fellow Americans.

The Communists now know that they cannot win on the battlefield. Their hopes lie in diplomacy and political action designed to divide and conquer the Vietnamese people. Here, our counter has been a determined effort to improve the life of the village people of South Vietnam and to free them from the yoke of Vietcong intimidation extortion, and terror.

This program is making slow but steady progress. In Quang Tri Province, only a few miles south of the battle at Con Thien, I was able to see the work of a revolutionary development cadre in bringing renewed hope to a small village by building a new school, providing medical facilities and instruction, and by organizing self-government. I saw a similar process in the Mekong Delta, a village which only two weeks earlier had been under Vietcong domination and control.

Vietnamese villagers seem to respond readily to the offer of new life. Wherever security can be provided, the possibility for political stability is apparent. But, after decades of struggle, villagers are not always convinced that the central government's forces will remain. Some fear the day when the Vietcong may return. In the pacification effort, security is vital, and it must be sure.

Pacification is a crucial part of the struggle. The late President Kennedy called it "another type of war, new in its intensity, ancient in its origin—war by guarrillas, subversives, insurgents, assassins, war by ambush, instead of by combat; by infiltration instead of aggression, seeking victory by eroding and exhausting the enemy instead of engaging him."

This kind of war requires an intimate understanding of local conditions. It must, therefore, primarily be the mission of the Vietnamese Armed Forces and the Vietnamese people.

The Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam have taken large casualties in its national cause—over 100,000 total casualties and over 49,000 killed since 1961. Allied troops fight by their side against North Vietnamese regulars in

the provinces north of Saigon. In the populous delta in the south, they have the primary role. Their determination to continue to fight the war by ambush is essention it seems to me, to the success of the pacification effort and to the eventual freedom and independence of South Vietnam. They have undertaken this role, different from that assigned to the U.S. forces, by general agreement among military and civilian leaders in Vietnam. American commanders see clearly the need for this division of responsibility. They recognize that they can far better discharge the role of separating the Vietcong from the people as a whole. This is a military judgment and a military decision, and it makes sense to me. Without this work, the Communist Vietcong will continue to hold in thrall many areas of South Vietnam, particularly in the rice-rich delta region, where 40 percent of the South Vietnamese population resides.

South Vietnam is now at a critical juncture. The constitutional process is moving forward. The armed forces are ceding their authority to representatives of the people. Their willingness to prosecute the war will be increasingly susceptible to political pressures, both from within South Vietnam and from the world outside, particularly from the United States. God knows their score is not perfect. I visited a delta hamlet where a supposedly crack South Vietnamese unit did not, perhaps was not willing to, assume the initiative to protect the villagers.

I spoke at length with President-elect Thieu about the work of the army in the pacification program. He is dedicated to civilian rule and civilian control over the armed forces. He also recognizes the vital role of the armed forces in the pacification program. I believe he sees, as do our military and civilian leaders, that the gains of the past few months will be meaningless unless that program goes forward. Any untoward political development, any unreal psychological victory for the north, or a tragic reversal in the progress already made in the constitutional process could severely weaken the determination of the South Vietnamese Army to take on this important job.

This delicate situation must not be affected by any failure of understanding on our part. Collective security inevitably involves commitment. There can be no effective alliance without mutual and reinforcing support. The question of unilateral cessation of bombing and our nation commitment in Southeast Asia must be seen in this perspective.

Mr. President, while in Southeast Asia, I read statements by a number of my colleagues calling for a unilateral halt to the bombardment of North Vietnam by air as a means of opening peace negotiations. I also listened yesterday to some of my colleagues for whom I have the highest respect, as they spoke on this subject. So far as I know, the objective of these negotiations has not been specified beyond an expressed desire for peace.

The point I wish to try to make, Mr. President, is that a unilateral halt in bombing would be of great value to the North Vietnamese. Five times in the past we have undertaken a cessation of hostilities in the hope of reaching the conference table. Each time the north has used this pause as a means of stepping up infiltration into the south and of resupplying its forces. Following the stand down for the Tet holiday in February, the Communists were able rapidly to expand their operations as a result of the respite from our attacks on their lines of supply. Many American lives were lost in later months because our open-handed action failed.

A tabulation of what the marines of the I Corps area euphemistically call "incoming" shows how important these resupply operations were to the enemy. "Incoming" is the name applied to inbound artillery, mortar, and rocket shells fired against South Vietnamese and American positions. As the American press has been vividly reporting in the last few weeks, this bombardment, largely from the sanctuary of the so-called Demilitarized Zone, north of the Ben Hai River, has accounted for a high percentage of our casualties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks that a tabulation of incoming mortar, artillery, and rocket shells fired on American position in the I Corps area since July 1966 be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, the tabulation will be printed in the RECORD.

The tabulation is as follows:

INCOMING MORTAR, ARTILLERY, AND ROCKET SHELLS

	Mortar	Artillery	Rocket
1966—July	1,135	--------	--------
August	647	--------	--------
September	859	--------	--------
October	510	--------	--------
November	498	--------	--------
December	1,425	--------	--------
1967—January	690	--------	--------
February	1,177	--------	51
March	6,268	150	219
April	3,848	850	40
May	5,140	1,346	353
June	1,906	1,950	153
July	3,641	3,134	190
August	3,095	2,406	75
Total	30,839	9,836	1,081

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to refer to the tabulation, which is a tabulation prepared by fellow American citizens wearing the uniform of the U.S. Marine Corps, covering the period from July 1966, to August 1967. It demonstrates incoming mortar, artillery, and rockets from the demilitarized zone and from the southernmost portion of North Vietnam against our position and the position occupied by the Army of the Republic of South Vietnam in the First Corps area.

Mr. President, let those figures speak for themselves. It seems to me that they are convincing proof that during the unilateral bombing pause by the allies, the North Vietnamese were feverishly building up their positions in order to strike with greater force against our allies and our own American military personnel.

The tabulation shows at least a five-fold jump in mortar fire after the Tet stand-down. It shows the first appearance of artillery and rocket fire immediately after the pause. There can be no doubt that this stepped-up action resulted from improved supply to the enemy's forces.

There are those who argue that the Communist North requires only a "face-saving gesture" in order to accept reasonable terms at the conference table. But the logic is far more persuasive that North Vietnam hopes to gain both military and political advantage by cynically exploiting the worldwide yearning for peace. Is there any one in this Chamber who is willing to contend that North Vietnam is not the aggressor?

The American bastions at Con Thien and Gio Linh, south of the demilitarized zone, have been taking hundreds of incoming shells fired from the DMZ and from North Vietnamese territory. A principal defense of those bastions has been aerial bombardment. At this stage, the loss of these allied positions would be a tremendous psychological victory for the north. A unilateral bombing halt would deny the Marine garrison at Con Thien now a vital air cover, and leave it open to massive ground assault.

On September 22, I saw Con Thien and Gio Linh. I talked with the men of the 3d Marine Division at Dong Ha. In the course of that trip, I observed a B-52 raid on entrenched artillery positions of the enemy in the demilitarized zone. The men of the 3d Marines live with a daily rain of incoming shells. I cannot understand how any fairminded approach to honorable negotiations would deny them their principal means of defense through air power while they are under attack. Nor do I believe that we can ever be expected to declare a unilateral stand-down that would permit the North Vietnamese unilaterally to improve their positions in this now critical area—the only place in Vietnam where regular Army units of the Communist north have been on the offensive in recent months.

Mr. President, Americans believe in peace. That is why we joined the United Nations. Americans abhor aggression in any form. That is why collective security has been basic to our foreign policy. Our presence in South Vietnam is earnest testimony of our adherence to those deeply held views. In our zealous quest for a speedy end to all hostilities there, we must not be blind to the indispensable necessity that the peace we seek to achieve must be both just and enduring. In May, I said in the Senate:

> Whether we like it or not, the United States is committed today in Viet Nam. The issue before us now is not the origin of our involvement in the conflict but bringing it to a conclusion, honorably, and, hopefully, peacefully.

I like what J. R. Wiggins, the distinguished editor of the Washington Post, wrote a short time ago:

> The scale of the Viet Nam war already has demonstrated that the price tag on such wars of national liberation is higher and the risk greater than the hawks of North Viet Nam must have anticipated. If there occurs in Viet Nam a demonstration that such wars involve an unendurable risk and an unbearable cost and are not likely to succeed, prospects for peace in the future will be increased.

Mr. President, I believe in the validity of that statement.

That the risk to the Ho Chi Minh

regime arising from her aggression is unendurable, and that the cost to her is unbearable is being made clear, and must remain clear.

Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore said a few days ago that he would like to see the U.S. military forces withdraw from South Vietnam, but not too hastily, and only if the peace formula insured that the same thing would not be repeated in the other Southeast Asian countries.

The wrong kind of conclusion to the war in Vietnam—

He was talking about the possibility of an American military pullout from Southeast Asia—

can absolutely unscramble the whole lot of us in Southeast Asia.

The Prime Minister of Japan, Eisaku Sato, has repeatedly said, in recent days, as he toured Southeast Asian nations, that a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war was of the "utmost urgency," but that an end to American bombing of the North alone would not be enough to end the war. Before stopping the bombing, Sato said:

The United States must have some assurance there will be a settlement.

He added:

If you say the right side is bad and the left side is good, you will never achieve peace. There is military infiltration from the North, and there is bombing of the North from the South. Somehow, only the bombing is considered as "bad," but the combat on the ground continues.

Last week, I flew to Vientiane, Laos. I spoke with Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma. His country's borders have been repeatedly assaulted by the North Vietnamese. Laos is perhaps next on their timetable. Small wonder that he ardently hopes that his nation will be left in peace. Among the free peoples of Asia there is a general hope that the cost of Ho's aggression will continue to be made so unbearable that they may have a better hope of living in a decent peace. Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Korea, Japan, Taiwan, and the Philippines all agree.

Mr. President, domestic American politics does not offer a satisfactory basis for a winning strategy in world affairs. North Vietnam, unable to win a military victory, seeks, as I say, a political one. She counts on our moral paralysis in the face of mounting pressure for peace of almost any kind in connection with next year's elections.

I speak both as an American and as a Republican. What this administration does to demonstrate to the Vietnamese, both North and South, that America's commitment is enduring, will have, I sincerely believe, the support of the American people, and surely, of this U.S. Senator. It is far too late in the day to throw away what free people have fought valiantly to achieve in Southeast Asia. America must not now sully her commitment to the security of free Asia to which she pledged herself by groping for a nameless settlement. We seek an end that will leave the people of South Vietnam in lasting freedom and independence. This represents, it seems to me, the difficult path which leads to the best hope for just peace and stability in Southeast Asia and throughout the world.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is this going to be a colloquy?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator will withhold just a minute, I just want to say that the senior Senator from California has really made a very special speech today. It deserves examination and reexamination by every Member of the Senate and every Member of Congress, and I hope, sometime in the course of the day, to re-echo some of these sentiments, if I can find the time in the course of the debate. But I congratulate the Senator on the fruitfulness of the observations which he has made on his recent trip to Vietnam. He has been diligent about it. I think he has rendered a service to the Senate and to the people of the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am profoundly grateful for what the Senator has just said. His is a powerful voice for national unity in time of crisis. I have followed his vote these 15 years on this subject, and I was glad to receive his encouragement for the 2 weeks in Southeast Asia which I have just concluded. I thank him very much for his words. I look forward to being present when, during his busy day, he will have an opportunity to speak on this subject.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I want to commend the able Minority Whip for the clarity of his remarks in identifying the key issues involved in the terrible struggle in Southeast Asia. The able senior Senator from California has put this problem in the context of Asia. It is in that context that we must look at the problem in Vietnam.

I compliment him for an able—yes, a brilliant—speech in connection with his trip to South Vietnam.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend very much.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to add to what has been said that I think the Senator from California has made a profound contribution to this whole matter. We can have our differences, but I think the great contribution he has made today is his honest attempt to put these questions in proper perspective. I compliment him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able colleague.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to join in the congratulations expressed in this Chamber to my senior colleague. I have had great regard for him over the years. I have never had more respect and regard for him than I have at this moment for the concise, simple, and knowledgeable statement he has made within the past 15 minutes on our problem in Southeast Asia.

One of the things that particularly impressed me was the fact that he pointed out, clearly and distinctly, that there is no one in the Senate Chamber who does not want peace. There is no division in the Senate Chamber on that one basic desire. There is a division of opinion on the method of achievement of that desire, but the actual facts, in our eagerness to achieve that objective, become clouded and confused, and maybe we get into partisan attitudes when we should not.

I am so pleased that my distinguished colleague has laid before us, concisely, practically, and exactly, the position of this great Nation; our commitment, the reasons for this commitment, and the prospects for the future.

He has pointed out one thing as important as any other—that any open, obvious, and protracted disagreement as to the methods has aided, is aiding, and will aid the determination of the enemy to continue to fight.

As I said yesterday, there are two things our military people have suggested for a long time to stop the ability of the enemy to continue to fight: to stop the physical ability of the enemy to fight by cutting off his supplies; and, second, to make it impossible for him to believe psychologically that, somehow or other, there is a great division in this Nation; that we will falter in our purposes, that we will go back on the promise made by four Presidents of the United States, that, somehow, they can divide us and win a victory by default.

I congratulate my colleague for his clear statement.

During my trip, I saw people who walked miles to vote. When a bomb exploded among the people, injuring 39 and killing three, 20 of those 39 went to the hospital and then walked back to vote. These people have a determination for democracy the like of which I have never seen demonstrated. It is beyond belief that this great Nation, which has made democracy the foundation of our way of life, would ever walk out on those people.

I congratulate my colleague. I am so pleased about his report on the trip he has just made.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my good friend and colleague from California for his thoughtful comment.

He has put his finger on one of the profound truths of the election process in South Vietnam where almost 85 percent of those eligible voted. My friend was in that group of distinguished citizens representing all American points of view who were there and found that the election was valid.

I recall a rather interesting fact, which I am sure my friend knew, but I did not, that in the First Corps area, there was an 85-percent turnout.

Mr. MURPHY. We who sat there and watched the election tried to figure out mathematically how it would be possible for all those people to be processed through the polling places, with all the safeguards they had built in. We were amazed to find that in some of the northern voting places some 30 percent of the people had voted in the first hour in their eagerness to vote.

One other point I am glad to hear my

colleague mention that we did not discuss before he left was the example of the determination of these people and the will they had, which is sometimes misunderstood. This is not an emerging nation. This is a nation that has been in being for many, many centuries. This was one of the most attractive localities in the whole of Southeast Asia, starting in about the 1550's. First it was under the domination of the Chinese; then under the Japanese; then under the French. Now they see their opportunity to have their own nation—something they have sought for hundreds of years.

I met an old gentleman in Vietnam who said, through an interpreter:

> We must have now a military government because we are at war, but as soon as we achieve peace then we will have a civilian government.

I am glad to hear that my colleague found exactly the same reaction on his trip. I sincerely congratulate him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the able Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I certainly wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from California for having made this very worthwhile factfinding trip to South Vietnam, and for coming back and reporting to us in the Senate and to the American people his findings in South Vietnam.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question or two concerning what he has said on the floor of the Senate today.

My first question has to do with his statement, in colloquy with the junior Senator from California a few moments ago, relating to the validity of the South Vietnamese elections. If I remember correctly, the distinguished Senator stated that all of the people found that the elections were valid.

Very frankly, Mr. President, I was discouraged when I read only this morning that in the Constituent Assembly, when it was called upon to vote on the allegations of irregularities in the elections in South Vietnam, 58 members voted for the validity of the elections, and 43 voted that the charges of irregularities were substantiated.

Of course, the majority ruled, and the elections were upheld. But it was discouraging to me that 43 members did find sufficient evidence to merit their voting against the validity of the elections.

My question to the distinguished senior Senator from California is; Did he look into the charges of irregularities in the election proceedings in South Vietnam, during the course of his trip?

Mr. KUCHEL. First let me express my thanks to the Senator for his kind personal comments.

When I was in Saigon, there were articles in the local newspapers indicating that an attempt would be made to invalidate the elections in the Constituent Assembly, when it would meet, as it did meet, by law, yesterday.

I had a long talk with our own Ambassador Bunker and with people on his staff, with respect to the election and the allegations of fraud and illegality.

There were undoubtedly some instances of illegality in the election process; but surely not sufficient to require its invalidation. As the Senator will recall, for example, the winning ticket received roughly some 35 percent of the vote; so it could hardly be alleged that there was any attempt at controlling the ballot box.

The Senator will recall also that in Saigon, one of the defeated candidates ran strongest. Beyond that, there have been, regrettably, some very bitter religious problems in the whole South Vietnamese community.

To sum up and to answer the question, I think that, without any doubt, there were instances of illegality in the election. I personally am most grateful, as an American, that those instances of illegality were not found to have been sufficient cause by a majority to invalidate the process, because it would have been, as I am sure the Senator would agree, a highly regrettable situation had the Constituent Assembly found that fraud had vitiated the elective process.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I have often said that we could not expect perfect elections in South Vietnam. Unfortunately, we do not have perfect elections here in the United States of America in all instances; and the South Vietnamese people have certainly not had much opportunity to choose their own form of government and to participate in the democratic process.

But I was disturbed by the vote in the Constituent Assembly, and I repeat that I feel that 43 is a particularly large number of members to feel that there was sufficient evidence to invalidate the election proceedings. I had expected that an overwhelming number of the members of the Constituent Assembly would have found insufficient evidence to invalidate the election proceedings. I wondered if the distinguished senior Senator from California had some explanation as to why the number was so large.

Mr. KUCHEL. Without wishing to inject any unhelpful comments on the political life in South Vietnam, I do wish to say this: A number of members of the Constituent Assembly were candidates for the Senate, and, of course, a number of them were defeated. They became greatly aggrieved at their defeat; so much so that it was suggested that in some instances that bitterness, resulting from defeat, might have affected their judgment.

I simply indicate that to suggest that we cannot, from this distance, say that each of the 43 who cast a negative vote did it because he found that fraud had actually vitiated the process.

I have tried to say in one sentence that this is surely not all good or all bad. Many problems occur in the building of a nation, both civilian and military sectors. I am persuaded that the President-elect will have a civilian government and not a military government. I am persuaded that his Cabinet will reflect the influence of civilians in his Government. To that extent, on balance, I say as an American that I am glad that there were more votes in favor of finding the election valid than of those who found otherwise.

Mr. BROOKE. Does the Senator have any assurance that there will be Buddhist representation in the Cabinet of the President of South Vietnam?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am not so sure that I should make a comment on that, other than to say that in my judgment, a sincere attempt will be made to find competent civilian Vietnamese who will give a broad representation to the various elements that make up the South Vietnamese society. Vice-President-elect Ky, of course, as the Senator knows, is a Buddhist.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, that brings me to my next question.

As the distinguished Senator remembers, upon my return from South Vietnam—and I talked then at great length with the distinguished Senator from California—I reluctantly concluded that our course of action in Vietnam was the only course which we could take at that time. I based this conclusion primarily on my failure to find sufficient evidence to support the contention that Ho Chi Minh would come to the conference table if we ceased bombing in the north.

I did say at that time, and I still say, that if it ever appeared certain that North Vietnam would negotiate upon a cessation of bombing, our Government should cease bombing in the north and attempt to bring a negotiated end to this disastrous war. Since my return from Vietnam, the two main alternatives which had been considered have been rejected by our Government and, I think in the main, by the American people.

One alternative was, of course, a further escalation of the war, whether by means of an invasion of North Vietnam or by the addition perhaps 1 million American troops. There are still some people who say, "Get it over with; knock them out, and win the military war."

However, our Government has consistently said that it is not our purpose to win the military war or to take over and occupy Vietnam. We are in Vietnam for two purposes. The first is to prevent the spread of the Communist regime by force and by terror. The second is to allow the South Vietnamese people an opportunity to choose their own form of government in freedom and security.

It would appear that we have achieved to some degree, both of these purposes. We have prevented the further spread of a Communist regime by force and by terror. And we have given the South Vietnamese people an opportunity to try to choose their own form of government in freedom and security. They have chosen the executive branch of the Government and they have chosen a Senate. And on October 22, they will choose a House of Representatives.

As the distinguished Senator has said, even though there were criticisms—and some of them very valid criticisms—of the election, this is the first time that the South Vietnamese people have chosen their own leaders. To the extent that they have been able to do so, we have achieved the second of our stated purposes in South Vietnam.

The other alternative to further escalation and an all-out war is withdrawal

from Vietnam. This has been a devastating war. We have had over 100,000 casualties and have suffered the loss of more than 13,000 lives. It is a war which is costing almost $3 billion a month and which may necessitate an increase in taxes. Some people say this is too high a price to pay, and that we ought to just pick up and walk out of Vietnam.

The arguments against this proposal have been very clearly stated. It has been pointed out that we cannot do this. For one thing, the word of the U.S. Government is at stake. For another, we cannot leave the South Vietnamese people to the mercy of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

But there is a third alternative: a negotiated peace. This is where it appears that we get into very difficult ground. Some people, even on the floor of the Senate as recently as yesterday, have expressed the belief that we should cease bombing in the north in order to bring about this negotiated peace.

Our Government, speaking through Ambassador Goldberg—I think while the distinguished Senator from California was in Vietnam—asked the question whether Hanoi would assuredly come to the conference table if we ceased bombing in the north. We have not yet received a favorable reply to that question.

The next step, and the only step remaining if the Hanoi Government does not answer that question affirmatively, would be to cease bombing in the north to find out whether Hanoi would come to the conference table and negotiate a peace in Vietnam.

The question which remains uppermost in almost everyone's mind about the cessation of bombing in the north is, What will be the effect on American troops in Vietnam if we cease bombing in the north? As I understand the speech of the distinguished Senator from California, the statistics which he has given indicate that past bombing halts resulted in a buildup of North Vietnam's fire power and troop power, and that our forces suffered as a result of the cessation of bombing in the north in these periods.

I am not asking the distinguished Senator to look into a crystal ball. But did the Senator find that today, if our Government ceased bombing North Vietnam, we would have sufficient military strength, both in groundpower and airpower and seapower, to protect the American forces in Vietnam so that during this period of the cessation of bombing our ground forces and troops in Vietnam would not suffer thereby?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I want to make several points in answering the question which my able friend, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, raises.

First, I am completely persuaded, from the discussions I have had with our fellow citizens who hold the responsible military commands in South Vietnam, that we are winning the war in the south, at least against the Army of North Vietnam. Also, many of the areas controlled by the Vietcong during the past 2 years have been relatively cleansed. While there has been no flat interdiction, surely the flow of supplies from the north to the south has been greatly impeded.

I think there is unanimity of feeling by both our military and civilian representatives in Southeast Asia that a unilateral cessation of bombing now would result in grevious harm to our men fighting at Con Thien and Gio Linh.

I think that point must be underlined. And I have tried to do so in my comments.

The fact is that it would have been far better yesterday if my able friends who take a different point of view had been able to excise out, in their urging that bombing be stopped unilaterally, the area which now is being used as a sanctuary, and from which our troops are being shelled.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that militarily we are dependent upon bombing of this area in the DMZ from which fire is being directed against our troops? Are we not able, with superior artillery fire, effectively to protect ourselves from this artillery bombardment that comes from the DMZ?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I repeat to the Senator what the military personnel there told me, that our area bombing of the DMZ, occupied by the North Vietnamese regulars, and the southern portion of North Vietnam constitutes a powerful defense for our Marine Corps personnel stationed at Con Thien and Gio Linh.

Mr. BROOKE. Is the enemy artillery in the DMZ superior to the artillery which we have on the southern side of the DMZ?

Mr. KUCHEL. I have listened to the military personnel talk about the strange manner in which this war is being conducted, in that one rarely sees the enemy. The enemy burrows and makes holes and has its artillery positions underground. He brings the artillery up suddenly and opens fire and then immediately withdraws, or moves it to another place.

Our military people feel that the B-52 strikes and the carrier-based strikes against that area have been highly successful. And, according to the press, the amount of fire coming into the south has decreased tremendously in the last few days.

Mr. BROOKE. Admittedly, air superiority is excellent to have, and we have air superiority in Vietnam. Also, it must be recognized that air superiority is a great benefit to the morale of our troops in Vietnam. These are all arguments on the side of not ceasing the bombing in the North without a commitment from the North Vietnamese. But if we are to make a decision as to whether we should cease bombing in the North in order to stimulate or to bring about a negotiated peace, it would seem to me that we must also look on the minus side of the ledger to determine not only what are the assets, but what are our liabilities.

On the liability side, obviously, we would lose the benefit of air bombardment of the DMZ. But are not our artillery pieces able effectively to protect our troops from the artillery fire that comes from the DMZ?

Mr. KUCHEL. I can only say again—and then I wish to make two more points in this answer—that from General Westmoreland down, it is felt that it would be a self-inflicted guarantee of higher casualties were that decision—to stop bombing unilaterally in this area—carried out.

We have unilaterally had a cessation of hostilities on five past occasions, with no indication that we had come any nearer to a conference table discussion.

I was most interested in reading in either this morning's press or yesterday's that Pham Van Dong suggested that the National Liberation Front—with which, of course, he contended there was no guidance from the North—had the great stake in this controversy. In other words, the North may well, at some point, in the negotiating process take the position that it is not solely competent to make peace—and that another set of conditions would have to be met by the free world in order to come to terms with the NLF.

I simply wished to make that point in our discussion.

Mr. BROOKE. Then, the best information that the Senator from California possesses is that if we were to cease bombing in the north unilaterally, the casualties inflicted upon our troops in Vietnam would be exceedingly high, and it is a risk which we should not take at this time. Is that the conclusion that the distinguished Senator has made?

Mr. KUCHEL. If I may paraphrase some of the words that the able Senator from Massachusetts has used, the answer is "Yes." I believe that our military commanders are correct when they indicate that a unilateral decision to halt bombing now would result in additional casualties to our own personnel.

Mr. BROOKE. And if the distingushed Senator rejects withdrawal and rejects further escalation of the war and rejects cessation of bombing unilaterally in the north, is it his conclusion, as a result of his trip, that we are compelled at this time to continue the war in the same manner in which we have been conducting it, until such time as the enemy hurts to the degree that he will come to the conference table and negotiate?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am not so sure that this conflict will ever result in a conference and formal negotiations. It could. As does the able Senator, I hope there will be a mutual cease-fire soon. However, the pacification program in South Vietnam is proceeding. One by one, hamlets will be secured. That program is underway, with all the difficulties that are involved.

With respect to our military operations, I repeat that, after a year in which General Westmoreland, given this responsibility, was able to build up our strength there—to establish new ports along the South Vietnamese border; to erect great, new airbases in the various areas; to organize a so-called riverine force, which would make commerce in the Mekong Delta and the Mekong River and its tributaries safe and potentially profitable—he then began to have the ability to seek out and to destroy Vietcong Communist units where they were hidden.

This must be made very clear: The only fighting that takes place is south of the 17th parallel, in South Vietnam—except, of course, for the bombing of the north.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, this

brings me to the final question. I have been discouraged by what appears to me to be an absence of total commitment on the part of the South Vietnamese people. I had hoped that after the election, the South Vietnamese Government would move with all dispatch to unite the South Vietnamese people behind the war effort. But we have received reports that the South Vietnamese Government—namely, President Thieu and Vice President Ky—have continued censorship of the press, and that, in addition, they have arrested some of their political enemies.

This is not the only time a plurality government has been elected; we have had them in the United States on three or four occasions, and we have had them in France and in Germany. But it would seem to me that since the present Government in South Vietnam won only a plurality of the popular vote, they would move immediately toward a coalition government, so that they could get the support of the people behind them. Censorship of the press and the arrest of political enemies is not the way to unite the people.

Did the distinguished Senator from California see any encouraging signs during his trip that President Thieu and Vice President Ky were going to move in the direction of uniting the people of South Vietnam, so that it would become their war and their effort, as we understand is being done in North Vietnam? Are they doing anything to strengthen their own army, and to conscript more men into the military?

As the distinguished Senator knows, they only draft men in the army in Vietnam at 20 years of age, while we in the United States are drafting young men at 19 years of age.

In addition they have never had more than 700,000 men in the South Vietnamese Army. What, if anything, is this Government doing to unite the people to a strong, well-trained army, and to bring about a total commitment of the South Vietnamese people?

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to give the Senator the comments of both President-elect Thieu and General Westmoreland in answer to the question. General Westmoreland tells me that in his judgment the South Vietnamese troops are becoming an effective fighting force. He made a comparison between the South Vietnamese personnel in uniform and those who were representing South Korea in the early days of the struggle there. In Korea, there was considerable difficulty in creating a fighting force in the Republic of South Korea, which, as the Senator knows, in later months became a highly effective organization. Incidentally, its units in South Vietnam are highly effective there.

He believes that the same development and progress is now commencing to show among the members of the South Vietnamese Army.

I talked to General Thieu about the time that a couple of people in the government were removed summarily for the commission of illegal acts, people who had been politically friendly to him, which I thought was an excellent sign.

I think we have to concede that the history of this government has not been perfect. We will both concede that sometimes in our own country we have ugly instances of failure of servants of the people to devote themselves to the public trust. But without any hesitation at all, this fairly young man with whom I did have an opportunity to speak at some length, told me that it was his earnest desire to build his country and to unite.

I can only say to the Senator that I hope and believe that he reflects his own passions for his people in doing so.

Mr. BROOKE. Is there censorship of the press in South Vietnam at the present time?

Mr. KUCHEL. It is true, and the record must show that the military junta has from time to time closed down newspapers, and that, to our Western eyes, is surely wrong. However, I think that it is only a part of the complete picture.

Mr. BROOKE. Are political enemies being arrested at the present time in South Vietnam?

Mr. KUCHEL. I think there have been instances of that. As I left, one so-called or alleged political prisoner had been released. I think there have been some very unfortuniate and regrettable examples of that.

Mr. BROOKE. Did President Thieu, when the distinguished Senator discussed the matter with him, say at any time that the government was going to cease censorship of the press or cease the arrest of political enemies?

Mr. KUCHEL. I did not specifically ask that question, so that I cannot, in all truth, tell the Senator. He did tell me he wants to build a viable democratic state, and that he wants the people and the representatives of the people to rule. It surely is true that there are great difficulties, but I doubt they are insurmountable, which must be overcome in order for any government to reach that point.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from California for this very informative discussion. I thank him for being so kind as to answer my questions, which I think need to be answered by one who has recently been on the scene in Vietnam. We are happy to have the Senator back home.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. I listened to and carefully read the conclusions the Senator from Massachusetts made after his fact-finding trip. I think that the questions he raised are all relevant and some are very piercing. But we discuss them freely, and although there are not happy answers to some of the questions, nevertheless, these are the views that must be expressed.

Mr. BROOKE. I trust the senior Senator from California understands the purpose of what he said has been a piercing inquiry of several areas pertaining to Vietnam.

Mr. President, the decision our Government will have to make, and make sometime soon, as to what the next step will be in Vietnam is, of course, a very crucial one. If we do reject the alternatives of withdrawal and further escalation of the war, and if the Hanoi government, in its lack of wisdom, does not say to the American Government that if we cease bombing they will come to the conference table and negotiate, it seems that, short of a miracle, our Government will soon be called upon to make the decision whether it can afford to take the risk and cease bombing in the North unilaterally, to see if the North Vietnamese Government will come to the conference table.

It is a risk more and more Americans every day are calling for us to take. It is a risk which more and more mothers and fathers and sisters and wives are asking us to take as so many more people are becoming involved in the war. Each year as more young men come of draft age, we will hear more people calling upon us to take this risk. I do not believe anybody in the country would ask us to take this risk if they thought it would be to the great detriment of our American fighting men in Vietnam.

Whenever it can be ascertained that we will not suffer immeasurably from taking the next step of cessation of bombing in the north to see if negotiations would take place then, it seems to me, at that time we must take that risk. Most of our allies have asked us to take that step. Most people across the world have asked us to take that step. Of course, they are not as informed about the military situation as are our military men in Vietnam. But their opinions and interests count, and it is a question that should be explored to its fullest. It was for this reason that I asked the distinguished senior Senator from California, who is our most recent colleague to have been in Vietnam, those questions. And it is for that reason that I am very grateful to him for having answered those questions based on his own factfinding on the scene in Vietnam. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, first I commend the Senator from California for his diligence in making a trip which must have been physically and emotionally very tiring and a great strain. I think he has made a great contribution.

I think he has been most eloquent today and, may I say, most patient in answering the questions of his colleagues.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has covered many of the points I had in mind.

I merely want to clarify one thing: Obviously, I am one of those to whom the Senator referred—and I say this in all kindness—when he said that he read statements which were somewhat disturbing to him while he was on the scene in Vietnam.

On page 10 of the prepared statement of the Senator from California, he mentions Con Thien, as follows:

> On September 22, I saw Con Thien and Gio Linh. I talked with the men of the Third Marine Division at Dong Ha. In the course of that trip, I observed a B-52 raid on entrenched artillery positions of the enemy in the Demilitarized Zone. The men of the Third Marines live with a daily rain of incoming

shells. I cannot understand how any fair-minded approach to honorable negotiations would deny them their principal means of defense through air power while they are under attack.

I concur. I certainly did not mean to imply by my suggestions that we were not going to give air support to our troops wherever they might be.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is most important. I think the Senator knows of my high respect for him. That is most important from the standpoint of clarification of what we are talking about.

Mr. MORTON. I am sure that the colloquy which developed in the Chamber on yesterday, as a result of the speech made by my senior colleague, in which most of us engaged—and I am sure I speak for him as well as for myself on this—did not mean to imply otherwise.

What I suggested was a two-way thing: reappraisal of the bombing, one; and, two, withdrawal to that 20 percent of the land where 80 percent of the people live. In other words, to abandon the hunt-and-destroy method and again take up the offensive which has been very costly.

I sometimes question why we have this enclave in the desolate and unpopulated northern area at Conthien, but I know that there are probably good military and strategic reasons for it.

I did want to make that point, because the questions I intended to pursue were most eloquently developed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

I appreciate this opportunity to respond to the Senator from California.

If the Senator would permit, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post this morning, entitled "The Lesson of Conthien," the lead editorial which deals with this point.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes indeed. I thank my able friend from Kentucky.

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

THE LESSON OF CONTHIEN

The story of Conthien is the story of the Vietnam War. There is the same sense of stalemate and seemingly senseless bloodshed, the grinding attrition to no apparent or decisive purpose, the cruel inhibitions on our fighting men. And there are the same, perfectly normal, strictly conventional military reflexes at work—reflexes which have confounded so much of the conduct of this essentially abnormal and unconventional conflict. Indeed, the story of Conthien is not just in the spectacle of brave men dug in under a heavy handicap. It is in the spectacle of a limited war threatening to become a wider war because of a temptation to forget that our war purposes are limited.

This is the lesson of Conthien. It is not Dien Bien Phu, or the Chosin Reservoir, or Verdun. Like almost everything else about Vietnam, it is without precise precedent. We can abandon it (which the French could not at Dien Bien Phu). It is not, by most estimates, of critical military significance. If it is rapidly acquiring political and psychological significance, that is in large part because we ourselves are making it a symbol of something—our resolve, our military prowess, our courage—which it need not be. All these have been amply attested to in Vietnam, and will be soon enough again. Nor does the honor of the United States Marines need vindication at Conthien. In a war of attrition, to use General Westmoreland's phrase, Conthien has played its part, for the Marines have taken the enemy's worst and returned it manyfold.

Can it be that the sticking-point is mere territory? To accept this is to renounce a large part of what we have learned in the hardest kind of way in Vietnam about the conduct of "counter-insurgency" war. We are fighting to destroy enemy main forces, to help clear areas of guerrilla units, to expand security in populated areas—in short, to prevent the freedom of choice of the South Vietnamese from being foreclosed by force. None of this obliges us to conquer and hold a particular desolated strip of unpopulated territory.

A very good military case can be made, in fact, for the Marines pulling their base camps and prepared positions back out of range of heavy Communist artillery all across the DMZ. If the North Vietnamese bring their guns and rockets down into South Vietnamese territory, they can be dealt with on the ground without adding the new dimension to the war of a ground invasion of North Vietnam.

There is another compelling argument for doing so. Where the United States troops, and those of South Vietnam, take their stand in the northern slice of South Vietnam will very much determine where the so-called "barrier" against infiltration will be built. There is some military logic in having this defensive position also out of the range of Communist artillery over the border in North Vietnam.

Psychologically, this would seem to surrender a slim strip of South Vietnamese real estate to the North. In effect, however, we have been surrendering large chunks of the highlands and the War Zones to the enemy at one time or another all along. Search and destroy operations against mass concentrations of enemy troops and small patrols would still continue north of whatever positions the Marines might pull back to.

To state the case for pulling back is not to say flatly that this must be done. It may be that the Marines can hold out indefinitely and reduce their casualties by more effective counter-battery fire or deeper entrenchments. What would be indefensible, however, would be a prolonged defense of Conthien at the cost of heavy losses out of misplaced pride. Worse would be a stubborn defense finally impelling a ground attack over the border that would remove one more inhibition against a wider war.

If Conthien is to be a test of anything beyond the gallantry of our fighting men, it should be a test, not of our resolve, which does not need such testing but of our restraint. The lesson of Conthien lies in what it tells us of the perils and pitfalls and hard disciplines of limited war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] raised the question he did. I am happy to note that now, at least so far as the record is concerned, the situation relative to a cessation of the bombing is clarified, period.

The distinguished Senator from California has made an excellent speech. I commend him for it. He recognizes that there is room for disagreement. Disagreement is one of the strengths of a democracy. If a person disagrees with a certain policy, what has that to do with aiding the enemy?

If we are all to be robots, we might as well abolish the Congress of the United States, because when we are sent to Congress, we are sent here to express the opinions we hold, in accordance with our conscience.

That is exactly what the distinguished Senator from California has done, and I commend him and congratulate him for it. What he has done is to make a worthwhile trip to Vietnam and then return with an honest appraisal. He has made his report to the Senate on his views. There were no ifs, ands or buts in it. He laid them out. That is as we all should do.

Getting back to what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] said, he did clarify something which I am sure has been bothering the distinguished Senator from California and, as he seemed to indicate, some of the men fighting in places like Con Thien.

The Senator from California stated earlier during the course of this debate that he wished, when the matter of bombing was discussed, when it came to the 17th parallel, particularly Con Thien, that this situation could have been "excised out."

I think the formula of concentration and consolidation which the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has advocated is a cessation of the bombing in North Vietnam, but not along the 17th parallel, or along the Ho Chi Minh trails extending into Laos, so that our men—and that is what the other Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has said—would be reinforced with the aerial protection necessary. It would be given them no matter where they might be in South Vietnam. To the best of my knowledge, the only area in which Americans are fighting on the ground in Vietnam is in South Vietnam at the present time.

Thus, I am delighted that this part has been straightened out so that the viewpoints of the two distinguished Senators from Kentucky can be made a part of the RECORD and so that our men at Con Thien and elsewhere in the 1st Corps will be aware of the fact that so far as some of the suggestions are concerned, they do not mean in any way, shape, or form, insofar as I am aware, that they will be denied this valuable support when they are under attack or when they are subject to attack.

The distinguished Senator from California has made a most worthwhile contribution in giving us—as soon as he returned—the benefit of his honest views.

I commend him for a fine report to the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the majority leader very much. I join him in being grateful for the clarification of the cleavage which exists among us.

As I have pointed out, I am persuaded that our air arm has been of significant importance to our effort and our commitment.

With the clarification that my good and distinguished friend from Kentucky has just made to me, I think that debate and dialog on this subject should continue.

I want to make another comment but am wondering, first, whether the able Senator from Kentucky wishes to enter into colloquy at this point.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator from California. Let me add one point: I

appreciate very much the words of the majority leader.

One other point is of significance. We have debate and dialog in this body. There is also debate and dialog in the other body on this matter. But when it comes down to the logistic support of our boys in South Vietnam, regardless of our agreement or disagreement on policy, 97 or 98 percent of the Members of the entire Congress have voted to give that support. This fact should be made known to our forces in Vietnam. I also think that the government of Hanoi should be—and is—sufficiently sophisticated to evaluate that point regardless of any discussion we might have in Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator's comments are much appreciated. I thank my friend.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I wonder whether the Senator from California has considered why North Vietnam, with 16 million people, is able to keep South Vietnam, with 15 million people, on the defensive, when we have been in there for the past 13 years with practically unlimited military support and psychological support and every kind of buildup. We have given the people of South Vietnam everything; 500,000 American troops are now there. Why is it that South Vietnam cannot defend itself? Why is it that South Vietnam will not fight for itself?

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. We live in an age where we can see the frenetic and dedicated zeal with which some nations have attempted to take over neighboring societies.

I rather think that the good people of the United States who love the American way of life and who would defend that way of life, still, day in and day out, do not have that extreme single-minded and highly emotional regard for their ends—and they are honorable—that Ho Chi Minh and his people do have for their ends which are not so honorable. I know that militarily our people have respect for General Giap and the means by which the Vietnamese achieved, in the struggle against French colonialism, an important victory at Dienbienphu, which was a harbinger, in my opinion, to what then happened to the government in Paris.

This is a type of conflict that the late President Kennedy said is ancient; yet, the means by which it is accomplished in Southeast Asia is new.

I do not understand the Red Chinese regime. The other day I noticed in the paper that Red China abruptly closed its Embassy in Tunisia and, at the airport, this group from the Chinese Embassy gathered around the picture of Mao Tsetung and began to read out of the red book, chanting what he said and waving the book in the air to make their points. We do not understand that human activity. We perhaps do not understand the dedication by which the Communist regime in the North intends to take over the South. But the fact is that they are losing. I am convinced of that, Senator, and I am convinced that the people in the South have an expanding opportunity to create a viable state in Southeast Asia in exactly the same fashion that the Republic of Korea came from almost nothing into a viable state.

Mr. HARTKE. What I want to know is whether the Senator has ever considered why the 16 million people of North Vietnam, with the dedicated zeal to which the Senator referred, are able to keep South Vietnam, with 15 million people, on the defensive, even though the latter have, in addition to their own people, 500,000 of the best troops in the world, with the best military equipment in the world, with the most sophisticated weapons, and with airpower which the enemy does not have. Why are they not able to protect the south? Why is there not that dedicated zeal among the 15 million people in the south, that there is in the north with 16 million people? We have given the south military equipment. We have given them advisers. President Kennedy said, 3 weeks before he died:

> We will give the help, but, after all, they will have to do the fighting.

Why are they not doing the fighting? Why do they not have the zeal? What is wrong? Have we made mistakes in our policy? What is it?

Mr. KUCHEL. I think I ought to observe that the Creator has endowed South Vietnam rather lavishly with resources. Rice crops are easy to raise. The ground is fertile. There is no problem of lack of rainfall. The people there are a peace-loving people. They have not been placed under the yoke of communism—nor do they want to be.

North of the 17th parallel is a dominant leader. He is a Communist, but he is a leader, Ho Chi Minh. The people in the north, I think it quite fair to say, are held subservient in complete political control.

The South Vietnamese people should not be denounced, Senator, because they are free from any desire to commit acts of aggression.

Mr. HARTKE. I am not talking about acts of aggression. I am asking a simple question: Why will they not defend themselves? Why does even General Ky say "We want the Americans to do the fighting"? Why do they not defend themselves? Where is the great leader in the south? The Senator says there is a great leader in the north. Is there no great leader in the south?

Mr. KUCHEL. The South Vietnamese have lost almost 50,000 male human beings killed in action, in uniform. I think it is a poignant and an eloquent testimony to their desire to save their homeland from Communist aggression.

I say this further to the Senator, because I think I sense part of what troubles my able friend. That is the Army of the Republic of Vietnam taking over the prime obligation of the war by ambush. This was a military decision which was made with the concurrence of our American commanders, for a number of reasons. Theirs is the rotten war. Theirs is the war of ambush. That is the war of the Vietcong coming into a village at night and slitting the throat of the head of the hamlet, of extortion from the citizens, of kidnaping and mayhem.

I think it is an additional tribute to the South Vietnamese that they have assumed the primary responsibility for the pacification of these hamlets at the same time that they stand by their ally in confronting the regular units of the North Vietnamese Army near the demilitarized zone.

Mr. HARTKE. I say to my distinguished friend from California that I think the American people, with this total commitment of $70 billion for the military and a war which is costing about $4 million an hour, a war in which we have suffered close to 100,000 casualties, can ask, Did we not train these people well? Can we not train 15 million people well enough to defend themselves against the 16 million of the north? Our boys are dying in the south, not in the north. What have we failed to do?

The Senator said there are reasons why the military made up their minds that we should take over the fighting and give the job of pacification to the South Vietnamese. Does the Senator know what the reason is? Is it not true that the military said the South Vietnamese could not do the fighting in the manner which is most effective?

Mr. KUCHEL. No. Perhaps when I used the word "pacification" I was not complete enough in my answer. The pacification program includes as the first requisite the security of the hamlets and the villages of South Vietnam.

There are two kinds of war taking place in South Vietnam. One is that in which regular North Vietnamese units are fighting against South Vietnam and her allies near the DMZ. The other is a strange war, in which the shadows and the foliage and the jungles are ready havens for the Vietcong who have been recruited in the south and the northern guerrillas who have infiltrated down through the demilitarized zone and down through Laos and Cambodia.

As I say, I am not going to make it my judgment that the conflict against the Vietcong and the northern guerrillas in the south is the filthy, nasty, rotten conflict. I am going to accept that description by the American commanders with whom I talked.

I accept equally their belief that that kind of a conflict ought to be combated by indigenous South Vietnamese people.

So I say to the Senator that, for the reasons I have already stated—and I shall not repeat them, except to indicate that I think the casualty lists are a pretty fair supporting argument for the views I have expressed—I think the South Vietnamese are becoming, as General Westmoreland has said, an effective defense force for their territory and their people.

My able friend from Indiana has said nobody is fighting in the North. Precisely. The fighting is in the South. As I asked in my comments, does any Senator deny that the North is the aggressor? I think the answer is "No." Nobody denies it.

Mr. HARTKE. I say to my friend from California that that is exactly why I was driving at the point so hard. It is well known that the invasion plans for invading the North have been drawn up for

a long time. Whether they will be implemented is another question; but everyone knows those invasion plans are ready.

I ask my friend from California, is that what he was advocating? Is he advocating, as the military clique of this country has been advocating, that North Vietnam be invaded? Is he advocating, that by these little hints and innuendos, such as we have heard before every step of this escalation as it has gone forward? First comes the hint. Now we have the statement of the former Ambassador to South Vietnam, Mr. Lodge, speaking in Pittsburgh, seemingly sending up another trial balloon. Is that what the Senator from California is telling the Senate, that now we must be prepared to take on the aggressor in the north, in his own territory?

While 15 million people, with the help of the most powerful nation on earth, cannot defend themselves on their own territory is the Senator saying, by inference, that we should invade the north?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall not ask the reporter to read back all that I have said during the last 2 hours, but I do ask the Senator from Indiana to take a look at the RECORD tomorrow, and examine the words and phrases I have used, based upon which he can answer that question for himself. Meanwhile, I shall merely state that the answer is "No."

Mr. HARTKE. As I read the statement of the Senator from California, he says that as far as they are concerned, if they cannot achieve victory, "America must not sully her commitment to the security of free Asia by groping for a nameless settlement." The Senator says we must hold for a military victory until we have attained it.

I have repeatedly asked the Senator why those 16 million people of North Vietnam are able to keep the 15 million people of the South on the defensive, when they have 500,000 Americans over there fighting and dying. Why are they not able to protect themselves? I leave that question with the Senate.

Mr. President, I think this is a serious question. I think this is why so many Senators are concerned today. We seem to be hearing hints that there is about to be another turn of the escalation screw, such as we have heard before every one of these turns. Again we hear it said, "We are into it now, and we cannot withdraw."

All I can say is, I hope we never take that next turn of the screw, that we do not move again up that escalation ladder, from which there seems to be no return. The bombing of the north, the Tonkin Gulf resolution—each one of those things was a gradual step which followed little hints, little side statements, little inferences, with denial after denial that the situation in which we find ourselves would be the result.

I say to the Senator from California, before we invade North Vietnam, before that course is taken, the administration ought to think twice, three times, four times, or as many times as necessary, before it takes us down the road to utter ruin.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I most sincerely suggest that my able friend block out a couple of weeks and visit Southeast Asia, and take a look for himself.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are approaching the 80-day mark in the major work stoppage in the copper mining industry. It has been apparent for some time that there is evidently no real desire, or at least no effort, on the part of the unions or the management involved to get together to bargain in good faith and to reach an agreement which might bring this situation to an end. In this respect both labor and management are at fault because up to this time both of them are not even paying lip service to the free collective bargaining process.

Both labor and management ought to, even at this late date, get down to hard discussions about ways and means by which this strike could be settled. At the instigation of various Members of the Senate from copper-producing States, Secretaries Wirtz and Trowbridge did call to Washington representatives of unions and companies during the first part of September. There was no progress reached toward a settlement at that time, and following this meeting both Secretary Trowbridge and Secretary Wirtz stated that the situation was hopeless.

I do not agree. I think we ought to give consideration to the miner and the smelterman who is out on strike, because his purchasing power is being diminished. The many needs to look after his family and his obligations are not now being met. Many of these people are seeking part time or other forms of labor in other fields. Many members of the craft unions in Butte, Anaconda, Great Falls, and elsewhere are moving to other parts of the Nation to find employment, and many of them will not return to Montana. The States affected are losing revenue at an alarming rate.

I am today requesting the President to appoint a study committee to assess the effects of the strike on the national defense effort. I am also requesting him to look into all the available means at his disposal to bring this matter to a head. I am hopeful that he and his advisers can come up with the means to cope with this long-drawn-out strike to which there is no end in sight. But, in all candor, the only authority I know of that the President has is the invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Frankly, I do not think that Taft-Hartley is the answer, because it would cover only a period of 80 days, and then if no settlement were reached the strike might well begin again in the middle of the winter when conditions would be worse for the miner and the smelterman and their families. I am not at all certain that legislation similar to that which now covers the railroad shop crafts difficulty would be the answer either. I do believe, however, that if collective bargaining in good faith is not undertaken in the immediate future by the companies and the unions that other ways and means will have to be considered in the interest of the economies of the States affected by the strike as well as the Nation as a whole.

May I say that I deplore the trend toward Government intervention in these matters—a trend encouraged by both labor and management—because it degrades the principle of free collective bargaining and it places in the hands of the central government powers it should not have and does not want.

I, therefore, request the unions and the companies involved to meet on this matter, and I would hope that consideration would be given to the possibility in Montana as it has already been given in Utah, of the Anaconda Co. and leaders of the respective unions getting together to discuss the matter as it affects my State.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, very few legislative items which reach the floor of the Senate raise such high emotion and feeling, year after year, as does the poverty bill.

And with good reason. The programs in the poverty bill are different in concept and in execution from ordinary Federal programs—and they are different because they are aimed at no ordinary problem. They are aimed at the problem of loosing the bonds of poverty.

For some people, these differences mark a bold and needed departure from traditional notions of Federal assistance programs. For other people, however, the differences pose a threat—the threat of the unfamiliar.

I find it strange that those who criticize the Government for not doing anything, or of not doing enough, for the poor, are very often the same ones who cry out that the poverty program should be rendered asunder, and that its component programs be transferred to old-line agencies—those same agencies criticized, out of another side of the mouth, for doing nothing.

I am one who sees the poverty program as a bold and needed departure. Innovation should not be restricted to private enterprise—whenever a severe challenge is being faced, then Government, too, should not rely upon old established patterns, but should construct a new organization reflecting modern

ideas and techniques. Only then can we be sure that our response to a complex problem will be sophisticated and effective.

That, I submit, is what OEO is doing. Those who took part in the creation of OEO in 1963 and 1964—within and without the Government and in both the legislative and executive branches—seized upon the single most important concept for breaking the bonds of poverty—the concept of opportunity. OEO was to be a way station for those Americans trapped by their heritage in the hopelessness of poverty. OEO was—and is—only designed to get these individuals to the bottom rung of the ladder, at which point the standard institutional structure of schools, jobs, and health services will take over.

For some 30 million poor Americans, hard as it is to believe, the pathways to advancement simply are not open. For these 30 million poor people, opportunity is something other people have, and which the poor cannot get.

The poor do not have the opportunity to get other than menial jobs, because they dropped out of school and cannot meet the educational requirements. The advertisements for jobs which fill the classified pages of our newspapers are, for the poor, cruel reminders of what other people can have.

The poor cannot keep up with their first-grade classmates, because no one has ever read to them, they have never seen a doctor or dentist, and have lived on bad food. Forty percent of poor children, for example, have identified a picture of a teddy bear as a picture of a rat—for they are more familiar with the rodent than with the toy.

The poor cannot hold jobs, because they are sicker more often and when sick, are sicker longer because they cannot afford medical treatment. Influenza, tuberculosis, dysentery—these are illnesses poor Americans live with.

The elderly poor often live out their years in loneliness and frustration, not knowing what is available for them in benefits and services. The unheated interiors of dark rooms are the last horizons of far to many of our elderly poor.

The poor never know what jobs are open, and that job training is often available as an assist in getting the jobs. The poor are simply outside the stream of communication and information most Americans take as universal.

OEO's programs are an attempt to change all this—an attempt to open up broad new avenues of opportunity to advancement.

The remarkable successes of this bold attempt are a matter of record. This record is, unfortunately, obscured all too often by wild charges and accusations—but it nevertheless is there.

I want to cite just a few examples of this impressive record, compiled in just two and a half years.

JOB CORPS

More than 70,000 young men and women have been enrolled in the Job Corps since its inception, in either the 83 conservation centers or the 26 urban centers. Of the total enrollees, including those who did not complete the course, fully 70 percent are placed in jobs, schools, or the military. This is an astonishingly high figure, when one takes into account that the Job Corps works on the hardcore, poor unemployed youth of America. In carrying out the tough task it has set for itself, the Job Corps has made extensive use of private industry. Of the 26 urban centers, for example, all but four are actually operated by some of America's largest industries, such as IBM, Ford, Xerox, and Litton Industries. In the instance of the Job Corps, OEO is a catalyst—it has provided a mechanism for our unemployed youth to reach the bottom rung of the ladder of advancement, and in doing so has opened the doors of employment in some of our most modern industries.

HEADSTART

In 1967, Headstart will involve nearly 700,000 four- and five-year-old children. For these children, Headstart means a medical examination, it means a hot meal a day, and, most important, it means educational preparation for entering the regular school system. Most children of poor families begin school with two strikes against them; Headstart is an attempt to eliminate this penalty.

NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH CENTERS

By the end of fiscal year 1967, OEO had funded 35 neighborhood health centers, bringing to those neighborhoods in which the centers operate a revolution in health care.

The poor simply do not get even the rudimentary health care most Americans take for granted. Fifty percent of poor children, for example, do not receive adequate smallpox and measles immunizations. Sixty-four percent of poor children have never seen a dentist. Forty-four percent of all women who have babies in public hospitals have no prenatal care. For poor people, the chance of dying before reaching age 35 is four times higher than for better-off Americans.

It was knowledge of this situation which led me last year to propose the amendment to the OEO bill which authorized the neighborhood health center program within the framework of the community action program. I have been gratified by the response my amendment has generated, because I have seen what the centers have been able to do for poor Americans.

Let me cite a few examples.

In families with incomes under $4,000, less than 60 percent sought out a doctor even once during the last year. But in Denver, where a neighborhood health center is operating, 85 percent of the people in the target area saw a doctor, and in Boston, where a center is located in the Columbia Point public housing project, 92 percent of the people saw a doctor last year. These same results carry through to more specific aspects of health care. Ninety-seven percent of low-income mothers in Columbia Point, and 85–95 percent in Denver, now receive prenatal care—contrasted with the only 44 percent of poor mothers nationwide. Less than 11 percent of poor children under 15 years old, nationwide, saw a pediatrician last year. But in Boston and Denver, as a result of the neighborhood health center, 95 percent and 85–95 percent, respectively, saw a pediatrician.

There is one other noteworthy aspect of the impact of neighborhood health centers. Poor people, with no access to family physicians, use the emergency rooms as a family clinic, which, as many hospital administrators have testified, is a disruption to the ordinary hospital services. The dramatic impact on this use of the emergency rooms in New York City, in the vicinity of the Gouverneur Health Center, is illustrated by a series of statistics: in 1961, emergency room visits totaled 26,000; in 1962, 30,000; in 1963, 31,000; and in 1964, 32,000. Then in 1966, when the health center began operation, the emergency room visits began dropping, and in the first full year of operation, 1966, was down to 26,000. This indicates to me that the neighborhood health centers, while bringing a new order of life to the poor, have the side effect of improving the operation of our hospitals.

The guidelines and regulations for the neighborhood health center program were available only in mid-February of this year, which means that they have been circulated for only 6 months. Yet more than 100 formal applications for neighborhood health centers have been received in OEO's office. Unfortunately, OEO has programed only $15 to $20 million for the inception of 10 to 15 new centers in fiscal year 1968, the remainder of the $60 million being used for refunding of existing centers. While we all know the pressures of the Federal budget, we will surely have difficulty justifying to the doctors and mayors who want to get health centers why they must be turned down—and justifying to the poor why they must continue to be denied the rudiments of medical care.

It has also been gratifying to see the support and involvement of the medical profession. Dr. Harold Marguilies, assistant director of the AMA's Division of Socioeconomic Activities, said this about the health centers:

> I think it is eminently correct that this be part of the OEO program. . . . This is something which the AMA looks to with great warmth, to which the AMA is pledging full cooperation, and for which we think there is a very good future.

Last year's AMA president, Dr. Charles Hudson, also supported the health centers, and these two doctors stand out in contrast to this year's president, Dr. Milford Rouse. It is Dr. Rouse who made the incredible statement that health care is not a right, but is a privilege for those who can afford it. I think we can all be sure that Dr. Rouse did not speak for a majority of American doctors when he said that.

For example, in California, the medical and dental societies actually operate two health centers; in Chicago, three health centers are being operated by community hospitals, whose policies are determined by the local board of health and the doctors who comprise the staffs. And there are many other examples of the close involvement of the medical profession with this program.

Further, OEO, the Surgeon General, and the Public Health Service work jointly on the program, and it has the

enthusiastic support of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In short, the neighborhood health center program has, like Headstart, filled a void in opportunities available to the poor. This month OEO announced that a health center would begin operation in Watts, to serve 30,000 people out of the 350,000—half the population of San Francisco—who live in Watts. The Neighborhood Health Council has indicated that it wants to begin with other health centers very soon, because people from other areas of Watts want the same opportunity to have their illnesses treated. The need is vast—but the available funds are few. This is in no small way one of the reasons for the unfulfilled expectations of so many of the people living in poverty, in our urban ghettos and in our rural areas.

There are many other aspects of the poverty program which have made important inroads into the lack of opportunities open to poor Americans. The migrant worker programs, the work experience programs, the legal services program, VISTA—all these and more have brought the new light of hope to dim lives.

The Employment, Manpower, and Poverty Subcommittee, chaired by the distinguished and hard-working senior Senator from Pennsylvania, has undertaken an extensive and comprehensive examination of all phases of the poverty program. Senator CLARK's presentations to the Senate have detailed the scope of this examination, and I will not repeat it except for his conclusion: That the examination has shown the need to continue OEO in existence, while working some changes in the statute. That is what the bill before us does: Works the changes the examination has shown need to be made, while continuing the poverty program in existence for another 2 years.

It was my privilege to chair 2 days of hearings in Massachusetts, as part of the nationwide examination being carried out by the Employment, Manpower, and Poverty Subcommittee. In those 2 days, we heard from witnesses in Boston, Springfield, and New Bedford, as well as inspecting the Rodman Job Corps Camp outside New Bedford. To be sure, we heard criticism of the poverty program during the nearly 15 hours of testimony—but the criticism was directed not at the concepts governing the design of the component programs. Neither was it directed at the operation of OEO. What it was directed at, in general, was the disparity between the tremendous needs of the poor and the funds available to operate OEO programs. This can hardly be called a criticism of the poverty program, as we have it before us in this Chamber.

But there are areas in which legislative changes are needed, areas in which the committee has acted on the basis of its thorough examination.

There are three basic areas of change I want to discuss briefly, as most others have been thoroughly covered either by the distinguished floor manager of the bill, or else by other Senators.

These three areas are health of the poor, the elderly poor, and neighborhood organizations.

HEALTH OF THE POOR

The existing legislation authorizing neighborhood health centers has, as I have pointed out, generated an overwhelming and enthusiastic response from communities across the country. I think it unfortunate that this demand cannot be satisfied, but we have at least made a beginning.

I have already cited many of the deficiencies in health services available to the poor, the deficiencies which neighborhood health centers are designed to overcome. But there is another and critical deficiency in health services for the poor—the availability of health personnel skilled in the special needs of the poor. To overcome this deficiency, I introduced an amendment to the bill in committee, which now appears as section 221(b)(3)(B).

This amendment authorizes the provision of financial assistance to public agencies and private organizations, and to individuals, for programs and projects designed to develop knowledge and to enhance skills in the provision of health services for the poor.

There is an acute shortage of doctors and other qualified health professionals trained for and concerned about the provision of health services to the poor. Experience with the promising development of neighborhood health centers, located in areas populated largely by poor people, has revealed a need for more qualified personnel. The basic purpose of the amendment is to induce a many-sided effort to help overcome this shortage.

The testimony given to the subcommittee, during this examination of the poverty program and the needs it is designed to fill, confirm the need for this specialized training. For example, Dr. Joel Alpert, medical director of the Family Health Care program at the Harvard Medical School, said this to our subcommittee:

> I do not believe that we presently possess the necessary body of knowledge that enables us to deliver care in the community. I hope that the patient care field would have the same characteristic development of fellowship programs as has characterized [other health specialties]. Fellowship training provides the physician with the opportunity, beyond residency, or in place of residency, to acquire the needed skills. . . . I say this because at the moment, members of various programs being developed under the Poverty Program require staffing by physicians who are not presently available, let alone specially trained or appropriately trained to provide this care. I plead for the development of fellowship programs which would not only enable physicians to acquire these necessary skills, but would serve as a focus to attract physicians to the provision of patient care as an exciting and appropriate career.

This testimony I found compelling, persuasive, and, when joined with other material, amply sufficient to justify the Amendment I offered.

The problem of providing health services for the poor involves four related issues: First, developing institutional arrangements and services which would be more responsive to the needs of the poor; second, training personnel equipped to help develop programs for reaching the poor with health services; third, training health personnel to serve in such programs; and fourth, developing educational facilities to provide such personnel with specialized training.

The connection between poor health and poverty is now beginning to receive the active attention it has long warranted. The relationship between poverty and lack of education is acknowledged, and is being acted on in various ways. It is my belief that the provision of health services to the poor requires special, new approaches, just as education for the poor does. Education and good health are utterly fundamental to all change of social and economic status. This is true of the less-developed countries of the world, and it is true of the less-developed areas of our own country. Without this fundamental equipment, there is no opportunity for the poor to gain full membership in our society.

The overall objective of the amendment, therefore, is twofold: First, to encourage the entry of larger numbers of people into the health science professions from among the most deprived sections of the population; and second, to help in their training by improving and expanding existing training facilities, with special emphasis on preparation for the provision of health services to the poor.

In order to recruit students for the health science professions, a series of intensive educational measures must be taken. With rare exceptions, the poor cannot now qualify adequately for professional schools because family background and previous educational experience do not prepare them for the demands of the school work, or for sustaining the necessary motivation.

While medicine, dentistry and nursing have been classic fields for social mobility in this country, this situation is changing, especially among the Negro population. Negro students can now choose among many vocations offering quick changes in economic and social status, as compared with the longer training required for such professions as medicine and even dentistry. Although the number of Negro physicians increased by 37.6 percent between 1950 and 1960, the representation of Negroes in the medical profession actually fell in comparison with their representation in other professions. In 1950, Negro physicians constituted 2.0 percent of all Negroes in the professions; by 1960, this figure had fallen to 1.7 percent.

Any program to increase the number of health professionals drawn from the ranks of the poor, Negro and white alike, must deal with the problems in depth and will probably require a commitment to upgrading educational opportunities offered Negro and other deprived students at all levels, especially at the high school and college levels. This amendment authorizes a beginning of such efforts for poor students intending to enter the health professions.

Such a program requires financial support both for institutions and individuals. It should be a flexible, pioneer-

ing program, putting emphasis on these four factors; training people to participate in organizing new and more effective means of delivery of medical services for the poor; recruiting and training health personnel for such services; assisting institutions in which personnel can be trained to enter and to work in the field in a variety of capacities and at variety of levels; providing a stimulus to advanced training, and to research in all aspects of the problem.

The amendment would authorize OEO to take the following steps:

First. To provide by grant, contract, or otherwise for educational exchanges, and for studies, research, and instruction and for other educational activities intended to develop knowledge or skills in the field of health services for the poor. Provision could be made to support research and development in methods of delivering health services to the poor; to assist in the establishment, expansion, and maintenance of educational and training courses concerned with community health care, with special emphasis on health care for the poor; and to foster studies through professorships, lectureships, institutes, conferences, seminars, and courses in such subjects as are necessary to encourage concern with and improve knowledge of the health and other disciplines associated with the provision and delivery of health care for the poor.

Second. To initiate a series of stipends or fellowships designed to encourage and support both prospective and senior health professionals in obtaining education, experience and training in the area of the health sciences. A first concern would be with regard to students who would prepare to enter the stream of education leading into health professions. For professionals, the primary concern would be to provide practical experience specifically in the innovative forms of delivery of health services to the poor, which would be augmented by academic studies in a professional school affiliated with such services or in one which offers courses relevant to the field experience undertaken.

Third. Funds available for programs under this amendment would be available for orientation courses or other appropriate services and materials for poor persons intent upon entering fields related to the purposes of this amendment, whether or not they are receiving other financial support from the Government; and to provide or continue services to increase the effectiveness of the programs following the completion of the fellowship term.

Fourth. For the purpose of assisting recipients of stipends to make the best possible use of their opportunities and assisting them in directing their talents and initiative into channels which will make them more effective leaders, teachers, advisers, and workers in the field of health care for the poor, suitable arrangements may be made for the establishment of an adequate counseling service at training centers and appropriate colleges and universities.

Fifth. The stipends or fellowships could be financed, administered, and awarded by OEO with private organizations, notably foundations and academic institutions. Private organizations, firms, licensing boards, professional associations, agencies, international organizations, foundations, academic institutions, and private individuals should be encouraged to participate to the maximum extent feasible in carrying out this amendment, and to make contributions of funds, property, and services which would be acceptable to be utilized to carry out the purposes of this amendment. And, of course, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to work closely with OEO in the administration of the amendment.

Sixth. Stipends would be of several varieties related to the educational and experimental status of the candidate. I would contemplate that the varieties would include: First, one category of stipend for students undertaking education in disciplines leading to professional training in the health science professions. The second category for students in professional schools who would be preparing for service in the health professions. I hope that recipients of these stipends would spend a period of weeks, or months, up to 1 year—with the approval of professional schools—in a community health service. The third category would be for students who have just completed their medical or other graduate health professional training; the stipend would be for 1 year of service in a community health facility augmented by academic work in a recognized medical professional school. A fourth category would provide fellowships for graduate physicians or other health professionals at the point in training where resident specialties are undertaken, and in this instance the training would be equivalent to specialization in community health work, would be for longer than 1 year, and would include tours of duty in neighborhood health facilities in both urban and rural settings, in Job Corps camps and in VISTA centers. A fifth category would be for physicians or others with experience in private practice who would undertake 1 year's work in community service augmented by academic work. A sixth category would be for members of medical or other health related disciplines who would do research in, or widen their experience of, or give technical assistance to, community health facilities.

Seventh. Categories would vary, as would the stipends, depending on time involved, educational and professional status and experience, numbers of dependents, cost-of-living factors, and so forth.

OEO and the Department of HEW are directed to work closely together in the development of this new program. It involves expertise common to both agencies, and both have indicated to me their willingness to begin in this fashion, with OEO given the main responsibility because of its expertise in the specific field of health care of the poor. In testimony before the subcommittee on the poverty legislation, the HEW spokesman, Assistant Secretary Lisle Carter, spoke of the close working relationship between HEW and OEO in the respective health programs of each, and cited numerous examples of joint funding and supervision.

In the health area, at least, there is close cooperation and coordination among the Federal agencies, a development calculated to bring better care to the poor. I applaud the personnel involved in making this cooperation effective.

The amendment grew out of the experience of OEO in funding summer projects involving health care for the poor in three areas across the country: California, Chicago, and New York City.

The three programs represent the most ambitious activity to date of a growing sector of the health student community: The Student Health Organizations. Student Health Organizations—SHO—have appeared over the past 3 years in major cities across the Nation. Composed of students from all of the health sciences, and seeking the advice of prominent professional and community leaders, the organizations have carried out numerous projects designed to foster leadership through service, experience and education. The SHO's have introduced the notion that the health science student, during his educational tenure, is an untapped resource for alleviating the health manpower shortage crisis in the United States. The possibility and desirability that health students might actively participate in community services while they receive their education has been a major SHO contribution. The SHO's have emphasized the importance of mobilizing students to explore creative and flexible new roles in conjunction with the public and the professions.

The value of such an approach was clearly demonstrated in the student health project of 1966, a program funded by OEO and jointly sponsored by the USC School of Medicine and the Student Medical Conference of Los Angeles. Through the 1966 project, 90 students of nursing, medicine, dentistry, dental hygiene and social work from 40 institutions in 11 States served in various capacities in poverty areas across the State of California. Each student consulted directly with a preceptor who was involved in some way with health concerns and disadvantaged populations. Students were joined in their work by 15 community workers, individuals with marginal incomes who received the same stipend as the students.

The success of the 1966 project laid a firm foundation for the program planned for summer 1967, which has been an even greater success than the 1966 project. One hundred fifty students from all health disciplines were joined by 50 community workers and teenage health "interns" in placements throughout the State of California. Student fellows were placed in one of three areas in California. Those in the northern and southern parts of the State worked in poverty-stricken urban communities. Students in the central part of California were placed in rural settings. The project fellows worked in interdisciplinary teams combining students to medicine, dentistry, nursing, social work, and other

health-related fields. Project fellows concentrated in well-defined communities in order to maximize their impact upon the community and to insure, as far as possible, that the life of the programs they developed lived beyond the summer's end.

It is against this background that the 1967 Chicago student health project was constructed.

The Chicago project focused on the problems of health and health care among the urban poor. All 100 students—including medical, nursing, dental, social work and law—worked within the city of Chicago. Placements were in Negro, Puerto Rican, Appalachian white, and Mexican-American areas. The assignments ranged from community organization around health issues, with local groups in the city's most troubled areas, to university research positions studying patterns of delivery of health care to these same regions. There were placements with Headstart schools, Chicago Board of Health facilities, Neighborhood Health Centers, university and city outpatient departments and private physicians.

In addition to the 100 health science students, the project included 50 salaried interns—16- and 17-year-old high school students from Neighborhood Youth Corps programs in areas in question. The interns worked alongside the health science students, in the same placements, as integral parts of the team.

The New York City project, operated in the South Bronx, is similar. In this area 50 health professional students and 10 community workers were concentrated this summer from June 27 through September 1. The group was drawn from the nursing, medical, dental and social work disciplines. They worked to encourage and support community efforts to deliver better health care and to effect a substantial change in medical service. The idea of maintaining continuity, that is, of training residents of the South Bronx to fill the jobs created by student fellows during the summer, was paramount in the project's outlook. The sponsors of the project, Albert Einstein College of Medicine and Montefiore Hospital, were instrumental in assuring the broad based community support.

An article in the September 25, 1967, edition of the AMA News contains a vivid description of the accomplishments of these summer medical students projects "in improving the health conditions in ghetto areas of cities." I commend this article to those who wonder about the AMA's position on this amendment.

In short, the amendment will supplement and complement the great success of the Neighborhood Health Centers and can help make Aristotle's statement in "Politics" an American boast:

> Health of mind and body is so fundamental to the good life that if we believe that men have any personal rights at all as human beings, then they have an absolute moral right to such a measure of good health as society and society alone is able to give them.

ELDERLY POOR

The elderly poor is the second major area I want to discuss.

The elderly poor, as a group, have been least affected by the general economic progress made since 1959—the earliest year for which we have comparable data. For example, in 1959, there were fewer elderly poor individuals than there are now: 2.5 million then, versus 2.7 million now.

Today, about six out of every 10 unrelated aged are poor. Today, one out of every five seniors living in a family is poor. But only one out of nine persons age 18 to 64, in families, is poor. Thirty percent of all the elderly in the United States are poor, in contrast to 17 percent for the total U.S. population. The problem is particularly acute in rural areas. Eighty percent of the poor living alone in rural areas are over 55, as opposed to 68 percent in urban areas.

We, as a nation with a gross national product approaching $800 billion, should simply not tolerate poverty among our senior citizens. For one thing, most senior citizens have played their role in building our society—and they should have recognition for this from us, the beneficiaries of their efforts. For another, we can ease the pains of poverty and the loneliness it brings to seniors without a massive financial expenditure.

Strong evidence that this is so is readily available. In 1966, hearings in the Federal, State and Community Services Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, of the Special Committee on Aging, reviewed the successes of the OEO-funded medicare alert program, under which 12,000 seniors in 466 different projects sought out other seniors and informed them of their rights under the recently enacted medicare program. The subcommittee issued a report recommending that the program be continued and expanded, building upon the enthusiasm of medicare alert. The National Council on the Aging responded, applying to OEO for funding of what it called Project Find, and OEO has, happily, funded the project.

What these two efforts have discovered is that the hundreds of thousands of seniors who have been reached by the projects care about such basic human services as nutritious food, better housing, regaining contact with a society which has passed them by, learning about their rights under Federal, State and local aid programs, employment, recreation and other aspects of American life. They care about them because they are not presently receiving them. The projects have also successfully demonstrated that seniors themselves can plan effective and efficient roles as staff workers in the projects, operating under specific plans of action.

The testimony presented to the subcommittee confirms this. Representatives of many organizations spoke before the subcommittee, but few were as eloquent or as compelling as those from organizations of seniors.

Jack Ossofsky of the National Council on Aging said, for example:

> But what of those fathers of generations past? They, the poor who have grown old and the old who have grown poor. They, too, need the chance for a better life embodied in the promise of the War Against Poverty, and this need is urgent, for their future is now.

John Edelman, president of the National Council of Senior Citizens, said:

> The report [on Project Find] showed that among the 388 older persons interviewed, thirty-six percent were entitled to public assistance they were not getting, forty-seven percent were entitled to United States food stamps they were not buying, and forty-eight percent appeared eligible for Medicaid but had no information about this benefit.

And William Hutton, executive director of the National Council for Senior Citizens, said:

> We should also make available to seniors a variety of other options, like the opportunity to continue working, to launch upon a second career, to engage in part-time or full-time study, or simply to continue working at a gradually decreasing work schedule in a gradual transition from full-time production to leisure.

The testimony of these three gentlemen does not come from studies or intuition. It comes from working with older Americans, day after day and year after year. They know what the elderly poor need and they know what the elderly poor want, and it has been my experience that they reflect accurately the hopes of the many millions of seniors they represent.

For these reasons, I proposed that a national emphasis program, somewhat similar to Project Find, be adopted as part of the OEO legislation. OEO has only reluctantly, despite consistent prodding from myself and from other Members of Congress, moved toward adopting any programs designed for the elderly poor. Figures submitted to the subcommittee, at my request, clearly indicate that the funds OEO has allocated for the elderly poor are disproportionately low. This led to one of the findings of the committee:

> Once again, the Committee must report an inadequate performance in programs for the elderly, and urge OEO to take immediate steps to remedy this deficiency.

It is my hope that a national emphasis program for the elderly poor can work a dramatic change in this orientation.

My amendment, appearing as section 221(b)(6), is designed to encourage local community action agencies to develop local programs employing seniors to reach out and assist other seniors, those isolated from the currents of everyday life and unaware of what health, legal, housing and other services are available to them. I have high hopes for the success of Project Find, and know that these hopes are shared by all those closely familiar with the fears and the needs of the older, retired, or widowed American.

There are a number of other changes this legislation effects which will have a salutary impact on the needs of the elderly poor. In the VISTA program, for example, OEO is directed to raise the participation of older volunteers and to develop more projects which serve the needs of older persons. Today, only 16 percent of VISTA volunteers are over 60 years of age. This is, in my opinion, a grave mistake: seniors are available, willing and able to serve; they need only to be organized and recognized. Other amendments direct that older persons should be made members of the govern-

ing board of the local community action agency and that older persons should be employed as staff members of local agencies.

In short, we have only begun to move toward doing for our elderly poor what we should do. OEO has not yet implemented the requirement in a 1966 amendment, which I offered, requiring special studies and programs for the elderly poor, but I intend to see that the studies are begun shortly and that program recommendations are forthcoming soon. Then, and only then, can we be sure that retirement years for seniors are not empty, but are full of meaning and enjoyment.

NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS

Neighborhood organizations are the third major area I want to discuss. I introduced two amendments relating to neighborhood organizations: section 233, which authorizes the development of neighborhood centers; and section 219 (b), which authorizes the development of housing development and services organizations as specific delegate agencies.

Neighborhood centers are fast becoming the keystone in the arch of local antipoverty efforts. My purpose in proposing that the authorization for neighborhood centers be put into the statute is to encourage their widespread development in all communities and rural areas.

In 1968, OEO plans to fund, through local community action agencies, something on the order of 1,000 neighborhood centers, 700 urban and 300 rural, serving roughly 4 million people. These centers reflect a wide variety of forms: some are comprehensive service centers, some are referral centers, some are one-stop service centers, and some are small storefronts. But whatever the form, there is one central feature common to all: each center reflects the actual needs of the neighborhood, as expressed by the residents of the neighborhood. Thus, in some areas, legal services are in demand, and they can be made available through the center. In other areas or neighborhoods, conversely, day care or job referral may be in demand, and these services can be provided. It is this wide choice of services, a choice exercised by neighborhood residents which marks OEO's centers as distinct from those established by other agencies with a more restricted mandate.

The concept of neighborhoods as the focus of social action is deeply woven into the fabric of American urban and rural life. In the early days, life centered around the neighborhood or town churches, and later, when immigration mushroomed, it grew to include the social club.

The depression and the consequent proliferation of health, welfare and educational programs, on local, State and Federal levels, changed all this. The churches and voluntary agencies became more specialized, as public programs entered the arena, and consequently the consumer of services was forced to become quite sophisticated as to the existence and location of the private and public agencies, often spread at random throughout the community.

The need to return to a neighborhood-based, comprehensive service organization has only recently been recognized. President Johnson, in August of 1966, asked the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set as his goal "the establishment—in every ghetto in America—of a neighborhood center to service the people who live there." In June of 1967, a group of Federal agencies announced pilot neighborhood center projects in 14 cities, in response to the President's speech.

America will not—and need not—wait for the funds to be made available to construct brandnew centers in every ghetto. OEO has encouraged the rental of space, as opposed to costly new construction, in an effort to get the centers in operation as soon as possible.

I think the foresight of OEO in this matter is great, and the success story of these centers should be widely told. I visited two centers in Roxbury, a ghetto area in Boston, and when the rioting broke out during the summer in Roxbury, these two centers were spared, while buildings close on either side were burned out. The reason, I think, is that those centers were a visible indication that someone cared about the people of Roxbury, and cared enough to ask the people what they needed and wanted.

This program, it is important to note, does not in any way compete with that authorized by section 703 of the Housing Act of 1965—the neighborhood facilities grant program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Rather, OEO's neighborhood center program supplements it. OEO can provide the funds for planning and operating a center; HUD supplies the construction funds. Thus, the two programs dovetail neatly.

The second amendment relating to neighborhood organizations is the inclusion, within the section encouraging the use of delegate agencies to carry out the components of the community action program, of one specific type of delegate agency—housing development and service organizations.

In the last 5 years, a number of new kinds of housing programs have become available. These programs, administered by the Federal Housing Administration, provide interest-rate subsidies for the provision of low- and moderate-income housing, and rent supplements for the provision of low-income housing. These programs require a sponsor which is either a nonprofit or limited-dividend corporation, or a cooperative organization. The sponsor itself organizes and manages the project. FHA processes the application and provides direct assistance under the program.

The results of these housing programs are paradoxical. On the one hand, the amount of money available is small. But on the other hand, available funds have not been fully utilized. The administrative and financial skills required, and the seed money needed, have simply been too much for most nonprofit groups to muster. Well intentioned and energetic though they may be, these groups have just not been able to hire the personnel or raise the money needed to bring such projects successfully to conclusion through the regulations and complications which the programs require.

Housing professionals generally agree that an upgrading of the nonprofit sponsor is necessary if such programs are ever to work. The nonprofit housing development corporation is a device often mentioned in this context. OEO has been experimenting with these corporations—through section 205 community action grants and section 207 demonstration grants—in a wide variety of situations, from the neighborhood level on the one hand, to the semiregional on the other. The housing development corporations, at the city, metropolitan, and semiregional levels, are concentrating on the "packaging" problem.

To date, OEO has funded 11 of the Housing Development Corporations, in New York City; Durham, N.C.; Cleveland, Ohio; Washington, D.C.; Baltimore, Md.; St. Louis, Mo.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Denver, Colo., and Whitesburg, Ky. OEO's financial involvement in the seven corporations which, to date, have had their mortgages committed, is $1,900,000; the value of the housing being constructed is $68,900,000. This is, to my mind, dramatic evidence of the multiplier effect of OEO's seed money in this area, and it convinced me that this tentative, experimental program should be made a specific part of OEO's legislation.

For housing development, these corporations bring together the lawyers, architects, real estate and construction specialists needed to prepare applications for the Federal Housing Authority and to shepherd them through the processing stages. Equally important, they provide entrepreneurial drive which the private market has yet to supply for low-income housing. Both these functions require skill and access to capital, capital which can be recovered when permanent financing is secured, but without which projects are impossible to develop. By aggregating such resources, the development corporation becomes a new base of support for other institutions. The existing nonprofit groups—churches, labor unions and civic associations—can draw on these new institutions for talents which they have been unable to muster themselves, and they in turn become the formal mortgagor entity envisaged by statute.

As one specific example of the success of OEO's experimental efforts, consider the case of the Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation in Philadelphia. OEO made a grant of $160,000 to the Corporation, which in turn generated a $2,000,000 revolving fund. This revolving fund then generated $10,000,000 in mortgages in process, which translates to 850 low-income housing units actually under construction. The importance of the $160,000 initial grant lies in the very high "front-end" cash cost which must be laid out before a mortgage can be obtained. Many Federal housing programs are so complex that architects, real-estate experts, lawyers, administrators, and finance men all must be consulted before an application can even be drawn up. This front-end cost has forced many nonprofit sponsors to shy away from using the low-income housing programs. But when the front-end cost can be ob-

tained, then these local sponsors have little difficulty in borrowing the remaining costs.

My amendment, then, simply encourages the creation of the local institutional structure with which the Government can deal. In his testimony, the Director of OEO, Sargent Shriver, described the need for this local structure in these terms:

Our government and society is so set up that unless a fellow has got the right kind of a catcher's mitt, he cannot even get the ball the other guy is throwing.

Now, with this amendment, catcher's mitts will be available.

In short, what I have tried to do is to strengthen the role of the neighborhood-based organization in the poverty program. The neighborhood is the right place, in my mind, for services for the poor—who only rarely have transportation—to be made available. It is my hope that the progress OEO has already made in this direction will be accelerated.

INCREASE IN COMMUNITY ACTION FUNDS

I would like to explain, briefly, one other amendment. The committee added a number of new programs to title II of the OEO legislation, including Project Find. It is my belief that the authorization should consequently be raised to reflect the addition of these new items, and not held down to the level requested when these programs were not part of the legislation. Consequently, I offered an amendment to raise the authorization for title II by $40 million.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

I consider the Emergency Employment Act of 1967, recommended by the committee, landmark legislation. We now have, as the lucid two-page statement in the report accompanying the bill indicates, the opportunity to vote on a measure recommended by three different Presidential commissions, by the urban coalition, and endorsed by almost seven out of 10 Americans. If the need for this measure is so clear to Presidential panels and to the American public alike, I fail to see how the Senate can, in conscience, do anything but accept it.

Can we be so indifferent to the call of need? Can we ignore the lessons of the past two summers? Can we be unmindful of the pressures operating in our slums?

I believe that the perspective of history will reveal the vote on the Emergency Employment Act as a measure of the concern of the U.S. Senate for the well-being of our national life. I also believe that those who vote against it are voting against the best interests of the Nation and of its people. There can be no viable American society so long as jobs, and the income they produce, are denied to those men and women who want to work.

I would also make the point that this is an authorization bill and not an appropriations bill. Consequently, voting to accept the Emergency Employment Act as recommended by the committee will not cost anyone so much as a dime. What it will show, however, is that the U.S. Senate is not unaware or unmindful of the recommendations of some of this country's best minds, as well as 70 percent of its people.

When riots occur, the national conscience is shocked. Yet voices have for years warned that urban ghettos are crucibles of discontent and alienation, and breeding grounds for violent outbreaks of frustration. These same voices say that employment is, among young men, the single most important factor in soothing the frustrations.

What do riots cost? We can, perhaps, measure the cost in dollars and cents of physical damage. But can we ever measure the cost in national prestige? In lives? In young men and women who will never feel the same about the American way of life? In the willingness of small businessmen to locate in ghettos?

What the Emergency Employment Act does is to authorize $2.8 billion spread over 2 fiscal years, 1968 and 1969, to create public service jobs. This is a small price to pay, I think, when stacked up against the true costs of past or possible future riots. It is, too, pale in comparison to the space budget, the Federal highway budget, or to many others.

We should ask ourselves, what will be the cost of delaying a year in sending a man to the moon? Or, what will be the cost of delaying for a year a few miles of urban freeway?

This is the frame of reference for debate on this bill. We are talking not about a capital investment in physical facilities—we are talking about a capital investment in human beings. These human beings are not passive, and it is they who will make or break the future of this country. If there is any clear message of the past two summers, I think it is that our investment, to date, in human beings, has been far too small. The gulf between the affluent American and the poor American is widening—and it is this gulf which has rubbed raw the sores of 300 years of deprivation.

CONCLUSION

There is one last area I would like to discuss—the issue of control of the program. "Increase local control; untie the Federal strings"—how often have we heard that cry? Yet, when charges were leveled this summer that local poverty workers were involved in the riots, these same critics cried: "Tighten up the controls." Now, let me ask: When will these critics make up their minds? For we cannot have it both ways. We cannot tighten Federal controls and loosen them at the same time.

I, for one, have made up mine: I think the local control in design and operation of poverty programs is unprecedented in extent and crucial to its success. Poverty is simply not subject to the contours of a grand design; the poverty program, in this regard, is totally different from the Federal highway program, which is susceptible to national standards and criteria. I think the extent of local control is important and meaningful, and I reject out of hand the assertion that the program is controlled in Washington, and that local programs cannot show initiative.

The poverty program is without parallel as an innovative Federal effort at unraveling a problem as complex as society itself. I am, as one who participated in the development of the initial program and the subsequent years' amendments, proud of what it has done. I know the road ahead is long and difficult, but I think the changes made in this year's bill are constructive and will help us down that road with firm conviction and deliberate speed.

Mr. President, I would like once again to express my admiration for the work of the distinguished floor manager of the bill [Mr. CLARK]. He is in no small measure personally responsible for the vast amount of thought which went into the development of this bill, and I commend him for his leadership.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the senior Senator from Massachusetts for his fine statement.

Senator KENNEDY's aid and support throughout the subcommittee's examination of the war on poverty were notable. Senator KENNEDY held extensive hearings in Massachusetts. He was particularly helpful in the subcommittee's hearings of administration witnesses and in drawing up the legislation which is now pending.

Senator KENNEDY's amendments in the areas of health, housing, neighborhood centers, and the elderly have greatly strengthened the bill and the poverty program.

I thank the Senator for his support and his kind comments.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS 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.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the Ribicoff-Percy amendment to the instructions of the motion of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the proponents of the amendment and the junior Senator from West Virginia, the sponsor of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 367.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment (No. 367) offered by Mr. RIBICOFF, for himself and Mr. PERCY.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment (No. 367) is as follows:

In lieu of the motion by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia to strike out title II, I move to strike

title II and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Emergency Employment Act of 1967'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 202. (a) The Congress finds that certain communities and areas in the Nation are presently burdened by severe unemployment and underemployment. Such areas contain large concentrations or proportions of persons who are unable to obtain jobs in regular competitive employment because of lack of education, occupational skill, or work experience and because of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement. This situation is aggravated by migration of unskilled rural residents to urban areas. Many of the affected areas are doubly handicapped by the lack of sufficient jobs for all the potential labor force. This condition is destructive of human dignity and results in a loss of national productivity. In many localities the problem has reached crisis proportion by contributing to social unrest and civil disorder.

"(b) At the same time there is a huge backlog of need for additional public services and public facilities in such fields as those which (1) contribute to the development of human potential, (2) better the conditions under which people live, learn, and work, and (3) aid in the development and conservation of natural resources.

"(c) Therefore, it is the purpose of this title to provide meaningful employment opportunities in public service and other activities which will relieve severe unemployment in urban and rural areas and contribute to the national interest by fulfilling unmet needs.

"ELIGIBLE AREAS

"SEC. 203. The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall designate urban and rural areas to be eligible for assistance under this title. Such areas shall contain a high concentration or proportion of low-income families and individuals and shall have severe problems of unemployment and underemployment. They may be defined without regard to political boundaries.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to public agencies and private organizations for part or all of the costs of programs which create meaningful public service and other employment opportunities. He shall adopt procedures to assure (1) that there is maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility with full participation of and maximum cooperation among local public officials, residents of eligible areas, and representatives of private organizations in the establishment of programs under this title, including, without limitation, the determination of areas and participants eligible for assistance and the selection of projects under subsection (b) of this section, and (2) that such assistance is fully coordinated with programs operated under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and other relevant Federal Acts.

"(b) Jobs created or made available under this title may include services and supporting facilities in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and public improvement. Such jobs shall include (1) those which can be made available immediately to persons who are otherwise unable to obtain employment, (2) those which provide placement resources for persons completing training under titles I and V of the Economic Opportunity Act and other relevant manpower training programs, and (3) those which use the skills of unemployed persons in areas with a chronic labor surplus. Priority shall be given to projects which are labor intensive in character.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to assure that (1) persons employed in jobs created by this title are provided opportunity for further education, training, and necessary supportive services, including those provided by other relevant Acts, so that they may be prepared to obtain regular competitive employment in the future; and (2) that maximum effort is made to encourage private employers to adopt innovative approaches which create additional jobs and new types of careers for low-income and disadvantaged persons.

"LOANS

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make loans to public and private agencies for the purchase of supplies and equipment which support and supplement projects carried out by participants under section 204.

"(b) Loans authorized under this section may be made without interest and under such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

"ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 206. Participants in programs under this title must be unemployed or low-income persons who reside in eligible areas and who meet other criteria prescribed by the Secretary. Low income shall be defined in terms of section 125 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this title unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) wages paid a participant shall not be lower than, whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum wage wihch would be applicable to the employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the participant and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment, or (C) the prevailing rate of wages in the area for similar work.

"(4) the program will, to the extent appropriate, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs related to physical improvements preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families in urban neighborhoods or rural areas having concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this title have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"(d) Programs approved under this title shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement, including civil service requirements which restrict employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 208. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the progress made in implementing this title and suggestions for improvements on or before May 15, 1968, November 15, 1968, and on or before May 15 and November 15 of each year thereafter.

"EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT FUND

"SEC. 209. There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States an Emergency Employment Fund. To provide capital for such fund, the President is authorized to allocate to such fund an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, which are determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be available to carry out Federal programs which are not directly and primarily related to the national defense. Sums so allocated to such fund shall be available to the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this title."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia renew his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, while the creation of an emergency employment program has my enthusiastic support, I believe we can accomplish this goal without spending any additional Federal money.

Amendment No. 367, which the junior Senator from Illinois has cosponsored with me, authorizes the President to transfer up to 2 percent of nondefense moneys from the current budget into an emergency employment fund.

The 1968 budget calls for $55 billion in nondefense spending. Two percent of this sum would yield $1.1 billion—the amount that title II of S. 2388 would authorize each year to create employment opportunities in public service areas.

Mr. President, the most obvious fact in America is that a good job at an adequate wage is the key to providing self-respect for an individual and progress for a nation.

Yet unemployment in our central cities is twice the national rate. A recent Labor Department survey of 10 big city slums showed that 1 of every 3 persons was unable to earn a living. The same study also found that unemployment among Negroes between the ages of 16 and 19 was as high as 40 percent.

If this severe employment problem existed at a time when there were no tasks waiting to be performed, no jobs that needed to be done, that would be one thing. But that is not the case.

There are today a total of 5.3 million potential jobs in the public service field alone, according to the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Under the provisions of title II, meaningful employment opportunities would be provided in such fields as health, recreation, public safety, education, beautification, municipal services, and neighborhood development and improvement.

Jobs are the number one priority in America today. Survey after survey proves that much of the violence that has struck our cities stems from unemployment, and that disorder often comes from persons who feel they have no stake in society.

However, this is also a time when our national financial commitments are strained to the utmost. It is obvious that Congress and the executive branch are in no mood to vote additional expenditures. But the need for jobs is our No. 1 priority. Other expenditures can be deferred. I am sure that 2 percent can be found in items of less priority in the domestic budget. Here is an opportunity to give priority where the need is greatest.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the issue before us is a very simple one. Hardly a day goes by that we do not hear either from an urban specialist or academician, a mayor, or a ghetto resident that an immediate priority in our urban areas is jobs. And who amongst us can deny this? Is not man's most valuable asset his ability to find and maintain meaningful employment? At the present time there are 3 million able-bodied men and women on the streets of America looking for jobs, but it is a hopeless search for the jobs which they seek and are prepared to fill do not exist. Ironically, at the same time, there are millions of positions going begging for lack of adequately trained persons to fill them. The frustrations to the community as a whole and the indignities to the person as an individual that this situation engenders are obvious. I need not repeat them here.

Even the most ardent supporter of title II of the bill under consideration will admit that it does not offer the final or long range solution to the unemployment problems of our nation. As a realistic advocate of the program I argue that we have an emergency situation to deal with as well as a long term one.

This program is, as its name implies, an emergency program. It should be judged on those terms. I do not advocate that it take the place of existing or future long range programs.

I am certain that everyone in this Chamber knows the value of manpower training and retraining and most of us realize what a tangled mess the Federal manpower programs are now in. There presently exist over 79 Federal training and education programs administered by 15 different agencies and bureaus. The real tragedy is that one finds example after example of completely uncoordinated training programs and of men and women training for jobs which do not exist. Welfare mothers tell me stories of leaving their children home alone at night in order to participate in a Federal training program and then, after graduation, not being able to find work in the field for which they have prepared themselves at government suggestion. Others tell of taking basic education courses which bring them up to a sixth-grade level in reading and writing, but then discovering that a ninth grade literacy level is needed to qualify for a job training program.

In not assuring that these programs are properly and efficiently administered this Congress and, to a greater degree, this administration is guilty of dashing untold numbers of personal dreams and ambitions on the part of low-income citizens. In a real sense the Great Society has failed its people. Now it must begin to make up for this failure by giving some of its citizens a little extra help.

The emergency job program will do just this. It will give an extra boost to those who need it the most. This program offers much more than a job and a steady income. The program, by providing employment, offers dignity to the individual, stability to the family and hope to the community.

All this being so, is it too much to ask that this administration accept the emergency job program as a priority and cut back on other less pressing, less immediate and less efficient programs? I think not.

The amendment which Senator RIBICOFF and I have offered today would give the President the authority to set the priorities in his administration by cutting back some less important programs. He would be authorized to use up to $1.1 billion of the resultant savings the first year to fund the Emergency Employment Act.

As strongly as I believe that such a job program is ncessary I just as strongly believe it would be wrong for us to authorize an additional $2.8 billion at this time even for so high a priority item as jobs. With a projected deficit of $25 to $30 billion and with full proposed 10 percent surcharge which would bring in less than $5 billion this fiscal year, we have no choice but to pull in our belts. An average American family of four with a $7,000 income could certainly cut back 2 percent of their budget, or $116, if necessary to meet a new urgent need rather than just spending its money adding to its debt. Why should we not do the same thing in government?

If we do not, the resultant inflation will impose a stiff penalty on millions of American families, acting most harshly, as inflation does, on the poor.

With a $135 billion budget, no one can argue that there is not plenty of room to tighten our fiscal belts. This Government is like so many Americans—it keeps talking about going on a diet, but it is all talk for the scales never show a loss of weight. Every year the President promises economies and every year we have a larger and larger budget. The more we talk about dieting, the fatter it gets.

The President often criticizes the Congress for not permitting him to economize. Let us say to the President—we now authorize you to cut back 2 percent on nondefense spending and to use these funds to meet an emergency situation in our Nation. Let us assure him that the American people are willing to economize on other important programs in order to help those in our midst who need emergency assistance.

Mr. President, not just as Senators, but as Americans, let us wake up to the need and set our priorities. What is more important than the dignity and fulfillment of meaningful employment?

I therefore, Mr. President, offer cosponsorship and support for the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut which is now before the Senate, as a possible means of meeting this emergency situation by providing legislation that will end on June 30, 1968, to deal with this immediate future period, which we do consider an emergency period insofar as it involves the necessity of providing jobs for Americans who urgently need useful and gainful employment, and the sense of dignity that can only come with a job and a chance to earn one's own living.

We offer this amendment as a means of shifting priorities from less essential items to an essential item of high priority and urgent need, in both our rural and urban communities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I do not question the purpose and intent of the pending amendment. The purposes are good. I have great respect for both of these dedicated Senators. However, speaking as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I think the Senate should have a word of caution.

I do not care who the President is or to what party he might belong, when we transfer to the President the power to determine priorities, after both our branches of the Congress and the Appropriations Committees and the committees of conference have thrashed out and determined the priorities on behalf of the Congress—in which body the Constitution vests this power and responsibility—we are liable to run into a good deal of trouble.

In principle I think it is a violation of constitutional intent, but I also would suggest to the Senate that it might find itself very much disappointed in the possible results.

We have just been going through a long committee of conference on the appropriation bill for Labor-HEW. The committee felt with respect to that appropriation bill that a certain amount of money should go to impacted school areas. The committee felt that a certain amount should go to a long-established and well-working program of national defense education funds in which I think almost every superintendent of schools and school principal in the country are interested.

The President, I am quite sure, is not in sympathy with those programs at this time.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation has seen fit to add funds for air safety, for the policing of the air, for observation, for personnel, and for devices to insure the safety of those flying. The President does not approve of the addition of those funds.

It would be all right if the 2-percent leeway were restricted to the poverty program, to shifting programs within the poverty program itself. However, when we transfer to the President the power to

establish priorities all along the line on nondefense spending, we will suddenly wake up and find that our studied, final decision on very delicate and sensitive matters will have been nullified by our own action.

We will begin to hear from our school officials and those who are vitally interested in the development of airports and air safety. We will hear from the people.

The committees in both bodies of Congress have acted upon the matter. I feel that in spite of the good objectives of the pending amendment, to take this unprecedented step of surrendering to the Executive the power to establish priorities after we have gone clear through the legislative process—from the House committee to the House, from the Senate committee to the Senate, and from there to the conference committee, and finally to a decision—would be a very dangerous precedent to set.

I must oppose the amendment.

I am not authorized to speak for the members of the Appropriations Committee. However, I believe it will be found that almost every member of that committee feels this would set an extremely dangerous precedent.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is true that the action we seek to achieve is unprecedented. However, we live in unprecedented times.

It becomes very obvious as we study the basic problems of the cities of America that the key problem today is jobs. That is the view of everyone, whether they be sociologists, mayors, or people living in the ghettos.

It is also apparent that the Congress is reluctant either to spend the money and appropriate the funds, or to raise taxes to supply the funds needed for programs such as this.

Under such circumstances, we must make a choice. If we are unwilling to raise taxes and are unwilling to appropriate the money, then I believe we have a duty to start setting priorities. And if we ourselves are unwilling to set certain priorities, I see nothing wrong with allowing these priorities to be set by the President of the United States.

We should keep in mind that, whether we will it or not, the President of the United States does have the authority to withhold spending if he is dissatisfied with—or finds that he does not have the funds with which to carry out—programs that Congress authorized.

I recall that in 1961, after Congress had adjourned, the late President Kennedy—I having been a member of his Cabinet—called the Cabinet together and asked us to hold back on the spending of various appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, as the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I did withhold the spending of a substantial sum of money. If my memory serves me right, it involved a sum of $100 million in funds that Congress had voted to appropriate. And no one raised the question of whether the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the President of the United States had the authority to withhold these funds.

We have a basic problem that we must decide. We should either vote the money and raise the taxes; or, if we are unwilling to take these steps, we should set priorities.

The needs are present and very great. This program is so important that we should at least give the President the authority to determine the priorities that are so vital to the future of our country.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said is perfectly true. We do have precedents, I think, for impounding and withholding funds.

I do not know that the courts have ever passed on that privilege. However, in a sense it is exercising an item veto.

Let us concede that it is true. No one has questioned it. However, it is one thing to withhold money and not spend it. It is quite another thing to have the ability and the power to decide that some particular program that Congress has decided is highly important is not important or not as important as others, and to take money from that program and expend it in a way that Congress did not see fit to authorize.

I agree with the Senator. I commend him for what he has to say. Congress has not met its responsibility either in holding down expenditures or in being careful about priorities.

I have much sympathy with the position of the Senator from Connecticut and the junior Senator from Illinois. However, merely because we do not face up to our responsibilities in one respect, we are not going to improve things by transferring to the President of the United States the right to exercise this power. Congress might as well go home, if that is going to be its future policy.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I point out that there are 250 programs in the Federal Government today that deal with the problems of the city. That is the informal count we have received from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Last year the mayor of Oakland appeared before our Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization and said that they had taken an inventory and found that there were some 140 Federal programs in which the city of Oakland alone was involved.

I have before me the catalog of the Federal assistance programs put out by the Office of Economic Opportunity. This newest catalog lists 459 channels through which Federal help and dollars can flow to cities, States, and individuals.

We are in a ridiculous situation. We pass program after program, and the executive branch of the Government and the Congress are equally at fault.

For we rarely stop to think about what America needs most. We keep voting piecemeal programs until they become astronomical in number and in amount. We think they will solve everything. Yet when we look at the problems, in depth, we finally realize that we can make our greatest impact on problems of poverty and disorder in our cities by providing job opportunities.

In 1966, the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress studied this problem. They pointed out that there were 5.3 million potential jobs in the public service field. In medical institutions and health services, there were 1.2 million; in educational institutions, 1.1 million; in national beautification, 1.3 million; in welfare and home care, 700,000; in public protection, 350,000; in urban renewal and sanitation, 650,000—some 5.3 million jobs, that were not leaf-raking and "make-work" tasks, but were both productive and in the public interest.

When you consider the rate of unemployment in our central cities, and when you study the riots across America, you see that teenaged youngsters, without jobs, often are in the forefront of the riots. We must realize that jobs are the important key to the self-respect that can help eliminate violence and help solve the crisis of the cities.

I believe that the program submitted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is a worthwhile program. But the weakness of that program is that at a time of national stress and national shortage of funds, they are voting $2.8 billion. We, as realistic men, know that Congress will not spend $2.8 billion. But if jobs are as important as the committee says—and I agree that they are—then we have a duty to determine how we will set and reach this priority.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I have great regard for the comments made by the Senator from New Hampshire. I certainly respect the judgments of members of the Committee on Appropriations. I have a reverence for the operation procedures that have been developed over a period of many years in this body.

But I believe that sometimes emergency conditions require carefully calculated and carefully controlled innovations. The control placed upon this innovation would be that it would be subject to the discretion of the President. It would not involve additional funds. It would involve a transfer of funds. It would be strictly limited to 1 year. The authority would end on June 30, 1968. We have an election coming up,

and I have great faith in the electoral process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PERCY. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PERCY. The able Senator from New Hampshire has rightfully indicated that if the President chose to cut back, say, the air safety program or the school milk program, you would have enraged citizens, and you would have school superintendents making complaints to Congress. But the man who would be responsible for making that decision would be the President. Presumably, he would be running for reelection, and he would be held accountable for having made that decision. I believe we can have sufficient confidence in the President of the United States—one of the only two officers elected by all the people of this country—to use discretion, to consider this an emergency, to apply these funds only as would be prescribed in the measure, and to put them to work where those conditions exist today that have created in our cities an emergency condition.

We have talked a great deal about the long, hot summers, but they come only once a year. When I met yesterday with the leaders of nine of the Youth Corps centers in New York, each of them in turn said, "Now, this authority for the summer jobs is over, but where are the boys? Back on the streets." Perhaps the weather is cooler, but the condition is just as bad as it was before, and we need something that is year-round; because the frustration, the bitterness, and the discontent exist year-round. The hot summers are just the top of the iceberg. The remainder, which is not showing, is the fact that society has somehow not met the need of these people, who do want work but do not have the skill and training for one reason or another—perhaps because of their fault, perhaps the fault of society, or perhaps a combined fault.

This emergency situation calls for some innovation. This is a carefully controlled situation. If it did not work, we could easily cancel the authority. The authority would not be extended beyond June 30, 1968. Certainly, we would hold the President accountable for every decision he made. His commission, which already has been appointed, has indicated informally and in conversations that housing and jobs are the two most urgent problems they face. We are simply trying to find a way to meet the problems without adding to the deficit, without adding to the fires of inflation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] be permitted to speak for not to exceed 3 minutes, to submit a conference report, and that the time not be charged to either side.

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

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS DEPOSITED TO THE CREDIT OF THE CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO TRIBES OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate a message from the House on S. 1933, a bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1933) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to distribute and expend the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma that were appropriated by the Act of October 31, 1965 (79 Stat. 1133), in satisfaction of the settlement and compromise of claims of said tribes against the United States in the Indian Claims Commission in dockets numbered 329A and 329B, together with the interest accrued thereon, as herein provided.

SEC. 2. Five hundred thousand dollars of said funds shall be held in trust for the purpose of providing education and scholarships for members of said tribes pursuant to a trust agreement to be made and entered into by and between said tribes, as grantor, and a national banking association located in the State of Oklahoma, as trustee, which trust agreement shall be authorized and approved by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall distribute remaining funds per capita to all persons alive on the date of this Act whose names appear on the membership roll of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma or who, on the date of this Act, were eligible for membership, hereinafter referred to as "enrollees", as follows:

(a) a share payable to an enrollee not less than twenty-one years of age shall be paid directly in one payment to such enrollee, except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section;

(b) a share payable to an enrollee dying after the date of this Act shall be distributed to his heirs or legatees upon the filing of proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, whose findings and determinations upon such proof shall be final and conclusive: *Provided*, That if a share of such deceased enrollee, or a portion thereof, is payable to an heir or legatee under twenty-one years of age or under legal disability, the same shall be paid and held in trust pursuant to subsection (c) of this section;

(c) a share or proportional share payable to an enrollee or person under twenty-one years of age or to an enrollee or person under legal disability shall be paid and held in trust for such enrollee or person pursuant to a trust agreement to be made and entered into by and between the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, as grantor, and a national banking association located in the State of Oklahoma, as trustee, which trust agreement shall be authorized and approved by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. (a) All claims for per capita shares, whether by a living enrollee or by the heirs or legatees of a deceased enrollee, shall be filed with the area director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Anadarko, Oklahoma, not later than three years from the date of approval of this Act. Thereafter, all claims and the right to file same shall be forever barred and the unclaimed shares shall revert to the tribes.

(b) Tribal funds that revert to the tribes pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, including interest and income therefrom, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body.

SEC. 5. No part of any funds distributed or held in trust under the provisions of this Act shall be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

SEC. 6. Funds distributed and payments made under this Act shall not be held to be "other income and resources" as that term is used in sections 2(a)(10)(A), 402(a)(7), 1002(a)(8), and 1402(a)(8) of the Social Security Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 302(a)(10)(A), 602(a)(7), 1202(a)(8), and 1352(a)(8)).

SEC. 7. (a) All costs incident to making the payments authorized by this Act, including the costs of payment roll preparation and such sums as may be required to distribute said funds, shall be paid by appropriate withdrawals from the judgment fund and interest on the judgment fund, using the interest fund first.

(b) In the event that the sum of money reserved by the Secretary of the Interior to pay the costs of distributing said funds exceeds the amount actually necessary to accomplish this purpose, the money remaining shall revert to the tribes and may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized and approved by the tribal governing body.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4 of the amendment adopted by the House, strike section 6 in its entirety.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate will recall that as introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] for himself and his colleague, Senator MONRONEY, S. 1933 had in it section 6, which provides that funds distributed under the act, amounting to some $15 million, should not be held to be "other income" under the Social Security Act and hence subject to contribution under that law. However, after hearings on S. 1933 conducted by the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Interior Committee on August 9, the committee concurred in the recommendation of the Department of the Interior that the section be deleted.

The Department pointed out that it had consistently maintained that Indians are entitled to receive assistance under the Social Security Act on the same basis as non-Indians. Acceptance of this position has been achieved.

But acceptance of benefits under the act carries with it assumption of responsibilities. Payments to the fund from

which benefits are received is such a responsibility.

Thus, the deletion of section 6 from the bill was still another step forward in making Indians full-fledged American citizens, ready, willing, and able to accept responsibilities as well as benefits.

The committee was assured by responsible spokesmen for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribe of Oklahoma that the tribe was willing to accept S. 1933 as we amended it.

However, the companion bill in the other body, H.R. 11847, was passed on September 18 with the provision exempting the per capita distribution funds from contribution under the social security law, and the text of the House-passed bill substituted for the text of S. 1933 as amended and approved by the Senate on August 21. The amendment I am proposing would, in effect, reinstate the Senate language.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on the basis of the position of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes in favor of the Senate position as the best way to secure the most rapid passage of this measure, I join in the motion just made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

I ask unanimous consent that certain correspondence and communications from those tribes be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CLINTON, OKLA.,
August 22, 1967.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: Thank you for your work on S. 1933. Business committee now favors the complete omission of section six in order to expedite passage. We will want House to pass the Senate version and will notify EDMONSON by letter. Will you secure the flag used yesterday over the Senate for the tribes? This may be a presumptuous request but I know you understand their patriotism to our Nation with all American Indians. The flag will have great meaning to the members of the tribes and I will appreciate it if you can fulfill this request.

Very sincerely,

LAWRENCE H. HART.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully request passage of S. 1933 as amended. Cheyenne-Arapaho Business Committee by formal action favors deletion of section six. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE HART,
Cheyenne-Arapaho Chairman.

CONCHO, OKLA.

CHEYENNE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES,
August 23, 1967.

Re: S. 1933

Senator FRED R. HARRIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: The Business Committee of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma met on August 21, 1967 to consider the Senate passage of S. 1933 as amended.

After a careful and thorough deliberation the Business Committee resolved to accept the Senate version. We feel that this will help to expedite passage by Congress. We also are impressed with the reasoning to the objection of Section Six. We concur with the objection and as an alternative we intend to cooperate fully with the Department of Public Welfare of the State of Oklahoma.

I want to thank you for your work on S. 1933. Your testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs for and in behalf of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma was most impressive.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE H. HART,
Chairman, Cheyenne-Arapaho Business Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 223) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1308. An act to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands;

H.R. 5943. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps;

H.R. 8632. An act to amend section 40c(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to reallocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund;

H.R. 9796. An act to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.; and

H.R. 12910. An act to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1308. An act to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands;

H.R. 5943. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps;

H.R. 9796. An act to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.; and

H.R. 12910. An act to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8632. An act to amend section 40c(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to reallocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] be recognized for not to exceed 3 minutes, for the submission of a conference report, and that the time not be charged to either side.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy.

ACQUISITION OF CAREER STATUS BY TEMPORARY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1320) to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. 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 assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Sept. 28, 1967, p. 27175, 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. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I believe we have worked out a good bill. Both the House and Senate versions of the bill were designed to provide for the conversion of certain long-term temporary employees in the classified and postal service to career status. Both committees held hearings on this legislation and heard testimony from the Civil Service Commission, the Post Office Department, and interested Federal employees and Federal employee organizations.

We have ironed out certain basic policy differences between the House and Senate versions. After a full and free conference, and after a cooperative session with our counterparts from the House of Representatives, we are able to recommend a final version which will eliminate a serious inequity in present law and generally improve the efficiency of the civil service.

The conference report provides for the conversion of temporary indefinite or TAPER employees to career status if they have 3 years' continuous service, pass a suitable noncompetitive civil service examination, are otherwise eligible and qualified for the position, and receive a recommendation from their agency for conversion to a career appointment. In the case of postal employees, the legal ratio of five regular employees for each one substitute will be maintained, and conversions will take place only when suitable vacancies occur.

The Whitten amendment, imposing a limitation on the total number of permanent employees in the Government, which was enacted in 1951 and which has been revised from time to time since then, is repealed.

At this point I would like to have inserted in the RECORD an analysis of the differences between the House and Senate bills and a statement of the agreement on each point reached by the conference.

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

S. 1320—TAPER APPOINTMENTS CONFERENCE

Senate version	*House version*	*Conference agreement*
TYPE OF APPOINTMENTS		
Senate excludes any term appointment, overseas limited appointments and supergrades	House excludes any term appointment and supergrades	Senate provision adopted
CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS		
1. Four years' service 2. Suitable non-competitive examinations 3. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is "equivalent" to employees appointed competitively. 4. General eligibility and qualification	1. Three years' service 2. Suitable noncompetitive, unassembled examination 3. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is "satisfactory." 4. General eligibility and current qualification.	Conferees have agreed to: (1) Three years' service; (2) Noncompetitive examination; (3) Recommendation by superior and certification of "satisfactory" service; (4) General eligibility and qualification.
POSTAL EMPLOYEES		
Has a different section of the bill unrelated to classified service, to amend postal statutes (title 39) rather than government employees statutes generally (title 5)	Postal employees are included in amendments to title 5.	Postal employees included in title 39; other employees included in title 5.
CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES		
1. Four years' service 2. 700 hours satisfactory work each year. 3. Suitable noncompetitive exam. 4. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is equivalent to employees appointed competitively.	1. Three years' service 2. 700 hours satisfactory work each year. 3. Suitable noncompetitive unassembled exam. 4. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is "satisfactory."	Conferees have agreed to: (1) Three years' service; (2) 700 hours' satisfactory work each year; (3) Noncompetitive examination; (4) Recommendation by superior and certification of "satisfactory" service.
RATIO OF REGULARS TO SUBSTITUTES		
Senate requires conversions be "stockpiled" awaiting vacancies. Regular 5 to 1 ratio will continue in full effect.	House waives ratio requirement but postmaster must certify that other substitutes having career appointments will not lose any regular work.	Senate provision adopted.
WHITTEN AMENDMENT		
Senate limits permanent appointments to number necessary "required for the efficiency of the Federal Civil Service."	House has no limiting language.	Senate provision adopted.
EFFECTIVE DATES		
Senate provides 120-day grace period for the first group of employees not recommended for conversion before they are automatically separated.	House has 90-day grace period.	House provision adopted.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

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. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, so frequently do I find myself in sympathy with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] that it is with great reluctance I find it necessary to oppose the amendment they have offered, although I am highly sympathetic to the principles which inspired it. As a matter of fact, I had offered the same amendment in committee and it was rejected.

Mr. President, since that time I have changed my mind on this matter because I think, as the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire has so eloquently expressed it, this amendment would abrogate the appropriation process which has been in the Congress for these many years.

If we leave this matter up to the administration to determine where funds are going to be removed from other programs and transfer them to the poverty program, I am sure we are going to find that many programs which we have all supported in our own districts and elsewhere will be nullified. I think it is the responsibility of Congress to determine where money is going to be appropriated, how, and for what programs. We would violate that concept under the proposed amendment.

In addition, I am opposed to the measure because, on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania, I shall offer an amendment later on which I hope a majority of the Senate will consider constructive, and a compromise which a majority on both sides can accept.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, there is nothing more I can add to what has been said except to say that at the Republican policy luncheon this noon, many members of the Committee on Appropriations expressed deep concern over the procedure suggested by my two distinguished colleagues. For that reason, and for other reasons, I hope very much that the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. 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, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with some regret, because the proposal is rather alluring, I am opposed to the Ribicoff-Percy amendment.

The key clause is section 209, which establishes in the Treasury an emergency employment fund. The section further provides:

> To provide capital for such fund, the President is authorized to allocate to such fund not to exceed 2 per centum of any unobligated funds, appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, which are determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be available to carry out Federal programs which are not directly and primarily related to the national defense.

This proposal, to me, is quite unrealistic. In the first place, it circumvents the already swollen defense appropriations. If any money is to be cut to provide funds for the Emergency Employment Act, that is where they should come from.

I think the debates on the military authorization bills and the Military Appropriation Act have shown quite conclusively, at least to my satisfaction, that the military-industrial-scientific complex, which has pretty nearly taken over this country, has gotten appropriations for the vast expansion of military activities which are definitely not in our national interest.

We have been having a debate in connection with Vietnam on the floor of the Senate for the last several days. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who probably has been as well informed as any other Senator in this body about the cost of the Vietnam war, responded to a question by me just a few weeks ago that the actual cost of the war in Vietnam is running about $30 billion a year.

Mr. President, that, in itself, is more than 10 times the amount which this Emergency Employment Act asks to be authorized. The remainder of the military budget—Vietnam is less than one-half of it—is still susceptible to being cut by 2 percent, and I think probably more. To my way of thinking, the exclusion of the national defense appropriation from the areas where cuts should be made under the Ribicoff-Percy amendment is unwise and really unfair. I reiterate that this swollen military budget is the one place where I think cuts could easily be made. For that reason alone, I would oppose this amendment.

However, a second reason for opposing the proposal is perhaps best expressed by asking a question: How is the President going to determine what appropriation he is going to cut by 2 percent? He cannot cut in on the national debt which is one of the largest of the items in our budget. Is he going to cut the expenditures for the space program; or will some say, and not without reason, that the space program is directly and primarily related to the national defense? I do not think it is, but imagine the storm which would arise on the floor of the Senate if we abandoned the effort to put a man on the moon in order to pay for the poverty program. Mr. President, I think we should, but to me this is not pragmatically or politically feasible.

Are we going to cut back on the Atomic Energy Commission and its efforts in support of the peaceful development of atomic energy? Imagine what that lobby would say if the President was going to cut 2 percent from that. Are we going to take from health programs and social security programs, or primary, secondary, and higher education programs?

Are we going to take it out of public works? Are we going to take it out of air pollution control? Are we going to take it out of water pollution control?

We would not dare take it out of the highway program, would we? That is a sacred cow. Think of the lobbyists for the highway program who would be storming the ramparts of the Senate if 2 percent were to be taken out of that.

I have great sympathy for the President of the United States in the difficult situation in which he finds himself, but I would not want to make those difficulties almost insuperable by throwing the Ribicoff amendment at him and saying, "Look, Congress passes the buck to you. You decide where these programs shall be cut. Do not ask us to do our congressional duty by telling you where we want the appropriations cut to pay for the poverty program."

Mr. President, I would hope very much that the OEO Act would survive the debate which has been instituted on the floor of the Senate, but I cannot conscientiously vote for the Ribicoff-Percy amendment. To my way of thinking, it is unfair to the President. It is unrealistic in terms of the way to legislate, to create appropriations for badly needed programs. It is quite wrong in excluding the military budget from the area in which the cut is to be made.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes remain to the Senator from Connecticut and 14 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the argument of my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, particularly to his dire predictions as to what would happen if we cut back on the multitude of programs which he reeled off.

I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for having the foresight to add title II to the poverty bill—a giant step forward in trying to solve the problems of the American cities.

The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania would not have taken this great step that will cost $2.8 billion if he did not think it was important.

But if we really believe that jobs are the No. 1 priority in America today in the ghettos and cities of America, then we should be willing to say that if we do not have sufficient funds, then we will spend our money on the matters and the programs that are most important.

The distinguished Senator was absent from the Chamber when I pointed out that the Department of Housing and Urban Renewal estimated there are some 250 urban programs. The latest OEO catalog indicates there are 459 programs through which Federal funds flow to various cities, organizations, and individuals.

Basically, if the various committees of Congress have not taken the time to list the priority items among 459 programs, then I believe that we have abdicated our responsibility

Mr. President, I should like to read for a few moments from an article in the publication "Urban America: Goals and Problems," of the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Urban Affairs. The article was written by Roger Starr, who is the executive director of the Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York. He writes:

> One cannot understand the riots without studying the psychological structure of the rioters and their sympathizers, or investigating their family constellations, education, and personal history. Such an investigation might reveal that the riots themselves are not so much a form of protest as a form of gratification; that they express the extent of the disorganization of some low-income Negro families as well as the economic and social deprivation of the Negro community as a whole. Such an investigation might reveal that this family disorganization is partly

the cause of the conditions complained of, and partly an effect of those conditions. From this point of view, the riots become, for those engaged in them, a substitute for the gratifications of work, and the socially acceptable masculine satisfactions of family leadership.

The article also points to the basic need for jobs in establishing the self-respect of the individuals who are rioting, the gratification of having a job, the need of the people for self-respect, so that they will feel they have some meaning in our society.

I, for one, cannot understand the leadership of this august committee, which was willing to face the problem and the need for jobs, and willing to say that they would authorize the expenditure of $2.8 billion because they thought it was so important, even though we are running a deficit of $29 billion at the present time; and their current position of being concerned that if an element of priority was introduced, some less important items might be deferred for a year. All these items are important. But the time has come for us not to put all our faith in a programmatic approach, which has failed, but in a systematic approach based on priorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. With all the programs we have voted on, we still have not achieved the objective we sought. The reason is that we have not gone to the root of the basic problem that plagues the ghettos and cities of America.

The No. 1 problem that cries out for priority action is for jobs. The No. 2 priority is housing.

I do not believe that we are studying the problem enough, that we are willing to come up with a solution, when we fear to ask the President to temporarily put aside a worthy project if it does not have the priority of jobs and housing—and in this case we are talking about jobs.

I would hope that since the Congress of the United States is unwilling to vote the funds or to vote the taxes for the No. 1 priority of the cities in America, that at least we would have the good judgment to authorize the President to defer the expenditure of programs that are of less importance in order to vote money for jobs, jobs which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and his committee thought were so important that they were willing to authorize $2.8 billion of new money.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield at that point for a question?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not read the entire amendment, but when we talk about setting aside 2 percent, is that the figure——

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is on the domestic budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Is that 2 percent in any given project, or is it 2 percent of the total?

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is 2 percent of the total. The President would be able to make the choice as to whether he would take the 2 percent. He could take more than 2 percent from one project, or nothing from another.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, there would be flexibility there.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would not be what is called 2 percent across the board?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No. It would not be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The total sum allocated would be 2 percent, or a total of $1.1 billion that would be taken from the overall domestic budget of approximately $55 billion; is that not correct?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will heed the cogent arguments presented by the Senators from Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and reject the motion, cosponsored by the Senators from Connecticut and Illinois, which would substitute instructions for the instructions in the motion which has been offered by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back their time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Illinois. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was resumed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 73, as follows:

[No. 273 Leg.]

YEAS—14

Brewster	Jackson	Proxmire
Case	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Dodd	Magnuson	Smathers
Harris	Morton	Tydings
Hartke	Percy	

NAYS—73

Aiken	Hansen	Mondale
Allott	Hart	Monroney
Anderson	Hatfield	Mundt
Bartlett	Hayden	Murphy
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Nelson
Boggs	Holland	Pearson
Brooke	Hollings	Pell
Burdick	Hruska	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Carlson	Kennedy, Mass.	Sparkman
Church	Kennedy, N.Y.	Spong
Clark	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Lausche	Symington
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Dirksen	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dominick	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Fannin	McGee	Yarborough
Fong	McGovern	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	McIntyre	Young, Ohio
Griffin	Metcalf	
Gruening	Miller	

NOT VOTING—13

Baker	Gore	Pastore
Bayh	Inouye	Russell
Cooper	Montoya	Tower
Ellender	Morse	
Ervin	Moss	

So the Ribicoff-Percy amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 371

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I call up amendment No. 371, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 waived.

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

The amendment (No. 371) of Mr. PROUTY is as follows:

In lieu of the instruction to strike out title II, I move to strike title II and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Emergency Employment Act of 1967'.

"PART A—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 202. (a) The Congress finds that certain communities and areas in the Nation

are presently burdened by severe unemployment and underemployment. Such areas contain large concentrations or proportions of persons who are unable to obtain jobs in regular competitive employment because of lack of education, occupational skill, or work experience and because of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement. This situation is aggravated by migration of unskilled rural residents to urban areas. Many of the affected areas are doubly handicapped by the lack of sufficient jobs for all the potential labor force. This condition is destructive of human dignity and results in a loss of national productivity. In many localities the problem has reached crisis proportion by contributing to social unrest and civil disorder.

"(b) At the same time there is a huge backlog of need for additional public services and public facilities in such fields as those which (1) contribute to the development of human potential, (2) better the conditions under which people live, learn, and work, and (3) aid in the development and conservation of natural resources.

"(c) Therefore, it is the purpose of this part to provide meaningful employment opportunities in public service and other activities which will relieve severe unemployment in urban and rural areas and contribute to the national interest by fulfilling unmet needs.

"ELIGIBLE AREAS

"SEC. 203. The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall designate urban and rural areas to be eligible for assistance under this part. Such areas shall contain a high concentration or proportion of low-income families and individuals and shall have severe problems of unemployment and underemployment or, with respect to rural areas, problems of outmigration. They may be defined without regard to political boundaries.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to public agencies and private organizations for part or all of the costs of programs which create meaningful public service and other employment opportunities. He shall adopt procedures to assure (1) that there is maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility with full participation of and maximum cooperation among local public officials, residents of eligible areas, and representatives of private organizations in the establishment of programs under this part, including, without limitation, the determination of areas and participants eligible for assistance and the selection of projects under subsection (b) of this section, and (2) that such assistance is fully coordinated with programs operated under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and other relevant Federal Acts.

"(b) Jobs created or made available under this part may include services and supporting facilities in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and public improvement. Such jobs shall include (1) those which can be made available immediately to persons who are otherwise unable to obtain employment, (2) those which provide placement resources for persons completing training under titles I and V of the Economic Opportunity Act and other relevant manpower training programs, and (3) those which use the skills of unemployed persons in areas with a chronic labor surplus. Priority shall be given to projects which are labor intensive in character.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to assure that (1) persons employed in jobs created by this part are provided opportunity for further education, training, and necessary supportive services, including those provided by other relevant Acts, so that they may be prepared to obtain regular competitive employment in the future; and (2) that maximum effort is made to encourage private employers to adopt innovative approaches which create additional jobs and new types of careers for low-income and disadvantaged persons.

"LOANS

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make loans to public and private agencies for the purchase of supplies and equipment which support and supplement projects carried out by participants under section 204.

"(b) Loans authorized under this section may be made without interest and under such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

"ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 206. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons who reside in eligible areas and who meet other criteria prescribed by the Secretary and priority shall be given to persons who are heads of families. Low income shall be defined in terms of section 125 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

"(b) For the purposes of this part, the term 'heads of families' includes any person who contributes more than one-half of the support of one or more other persons.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) wages paid a participant shall not be lower than, whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the participant and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment, or (C) the prevailing rate of wages in the area for similar work;

"(4) the program will, to the extent appropriate, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families in urban neighborhoods or rural areas having concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"(d) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement, including civil service requirements which restrict employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 208. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the progress made in implementing this part and suggestions for improvements on or before May 15, 1968, November 15, 1968, and on or before May 15 and November 15 of each year thereafter.

"PART B—HUMAN INVESTMENT JOB TRAINING

"SEC. 210. This part may be cited as the Human Investment Act of 1967.

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 211. The purpose of this part is to provide incentives to private employers other than nonprofit organizations to invest in the improvement of the Nation's human resources by hiring, training, and employing persons eligible to participate in programs as provided in section 206 of this title.

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 212. For purposes of this part, the term 'employer' means any private person, corporation, firm, or business concern which employs more than ten individuals in a trade or business.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 213. In order to carry out the provisions of this part, the Secretary of Labor is authorized:

"(a) To provide financial assistance to employers for training and employment costs incurred pursuant to a plan approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 214, including, but not limited to—

"(1) unusual training and other unusual services for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, including, on-the-job counseling, day care and other supportive services;

"(2) all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income persons;

"(3) payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation; and

"(4) unusual overhead costs incurred as a result of an employee's lack of education, training, or experience, such as costs of spoilage of work or of added managerial effort.

"(b) To prescribe regulations to—

"(1) establish criteria to achieve an equitable distribution among the States of payments made from funds reserved under this Act; but not more than 12.5 per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be used within any one State;

"(2) provide such application, reporting, and accounting procedures as he deems necessary;

"(3) provide for an evaluation of the program authorized by this subsection in achieving the objectives of this part;

"(4) safeguard against abuses of any incentives provided under this part, including, but not limited to, safeguards against the use of such incentives in order to transfer any enterprise from one area to another and safeguards designed to prevent such incentives from being used as a subsidy for normal operations; and

"(5) assure compliance with the requirements of section 207(a) of this title.

"TRAINING PLAN

"SEC. 214. No financial assistance shall be provided under this part except upon approval by the Secretary of a plan submitted by an employer which shall be revised from time to time as requested by the Secretary, the provisions of which shall include:

"(a) The title and description of the job objectives for which individuals are to be trained;

"(b) The length of the training period;

"(c) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing, for each, job opera-

tions or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"(d) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course or training, at each successive step in the course and at the completion of training;

"(e) The entrance wage or salary paid to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the individuals are to be trained;

"(f) The number of hours of supplemental related instruction required; and

"(g) Information respecting the cost of usual training and other usual services provided employees other than those described in section 206 of this title, in order to make them fully productive.

"SEC. 215. For purposes of applying chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, any grant received by an employer under this part—

"(a) shall not be included in the gross income of such employer, and

"(b) shall not be treated as reimbursement for expenses incurred by such employer in his trade or business.

"PART C—AUTHORIZATIONS, DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 221. The Secretary shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year.

"SEC. 222. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, except the provisions of section 205, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $875,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"(b) Of the funds authorized under subsection (a) of this section, not less than 10 per centum nor more than 20 per centum shall be used by the Secretary for the purpose of carrying out training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 for persons eligible under section 206 of this title.

"(c) Of the funds appropriated under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall reserve not less than 12.5 per centum nor more than 37.5 per centum for the purpose of carrying out part B of this title.

"(d) For the purpose of making loans under section 205, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"(e) Appropriations authorized by this section shall remain available until expended."

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as well as with the proponent of the pending amendment, the manager of the bill, and others, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, October 4, after the approval of the Journal there be a quorum call to ascertain the presence of a quorum, immediately after which further debate on the motion by the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prouty) (amendment No. 371) to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd) to recommit with instructions 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 20 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prouty) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, just to make it clear, Senators have unlimited time today and tonight, as long as they wish to remain in session, to debate this amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; the limitation does not begin until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader at what time he intends to have the Senate convene tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Ten o'clock. We already have an order.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether amendments to the Prouty amendment would be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

VIETNAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on yesterday we had very considerable discussion of the situation in Vietnam, and I think it ranged into the question of the conduct of that struggle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I suggest that the Chamber be cleared and that there be order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chamber will be cleared, and we will have order. All attachés whose presence is not needed in the Chamber will remove themselves from the Chamber.

The Sergeant at Arms is directed to see that these instructions to clear the Chamber are carried out.

The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from time to time inquiry has been made of me about what seems like dissident views that have been expressed on this question of Vietnam, and particularly as it relates to the minority side of the aisle.

I have stated over and over again that the Republican Party umbrella is ample for all purposes and for all shades of opinion. I have only two concerns. The first is, of course, that we do not try to invade the constitutional prerogative of the President of the United States.

The first article of the Constitution does give to the Congress the power of the purse. And, in exercise of that power, we can discipline virtually everything in Government.

The Congress also is the exclusive lawmaking body in our form of government, and we can abolish every bureau. We can abolish nearly every agency. We cannot abolish the Presidency or the Supreme Court because they are constitutional offices. However, with those exceptions, we can go pretty far in exercising our exclusive function as the one and only lawmaking body. The fact that a whole body of administrative law has developed in this country was only possible under a delegation of power by Congress.

So, we have the power of the purse, and when the Constitution made the President the Commander in Chief, it tendered to him the sword of the country. And that includes not only the conduct of our foreign relations, but also the conduct of any struggle or hostility in which we might be engaged.

The only other concern I have is about my own conduct in this matter. I want to be sure it is in conformity with my conscience and my conviction. Beyond that, it does not make any difference, because my responsibility is to explore for the facts, to ascertain as much as I can on a given subject, and then to exercise an independent judgment.

Mr. President, I hope I have not failed to do that, for Edmond Burke once remarked in Parliament that he felt he would betray his constituency if he did not do that. I grant the same privilege, the same prerogative, and the same latitude of every Member of the Senate.

What is more, I have no hostility toward criticism. I think it was in World War I that Woodrow Wilson said that in time of war we need more criticism, not less. But always it has to be within the framework of our constitutional power, and we must not arrogate to ourselves the conduct of an external struggle.

I think we have had some lessons in that field. Mr. President, the very Capitol, where we sit in the Senate wing, was destroyed in the War of 1812 because there was too much civil interference with the conduct of that war.

Lincoln did not brook any interference from a committee that was set up on the conduct of the war. I think it was General Grant who said that the greatest aid for him was from none other than Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy, because he was interfering with Robert E. Lee and his tactics and his strategy.

Who shall say what the outcome of that war would have been if that great general from the South had been left alone? Nobody knows, but that interference was helpful, and Grant recognized it and paid testimony to it.

So, I grant that right, but I hope always it will be within due bounds. However, criticism, I always recognize.

On Sunday I had an experience and at first, I did not know how it came about. The operator of a very splendid motel in Galesburg, Ill., called me on the telephone. I scarcely know him. He said that he and the city—having a population of about 40,000—were going to be hosts to about 130 or 140 Vietnam veterans, all wounded, who were in the hospital at Great Lakes, Ill.

The whole community was energized to turn out for these youngsters. They lodged them. They fed them. They entertained them. They brought them from Great Lakes to Galesburg, a distance of 150 miles, and they took them back.

I was asked to get on the telephone at 5 o'clock on Sunday and to make them a telephone speech, which I did.

When the speech was over, a sergeant by the name of Wright was designated to respond to the speech, and he did.

He said:

Senator, we want to thank you. You are in our corner, and you have stood up for us, and you stood up for the cause. And we, the wounded from Vietnam, want you to know it from us. And we say it as sincerely, as simply, as emphatically as we know how. We simply thank you.

What I did first on Sunday was to salute them as a measure of deference, because a salute is given to a superior, and I recognize the superiority of their sacrifice. They come back without legs and without arms. And if anybody wants to see what Vietnam has done, he needs only to go out to Walter Reed, which is an evacuation hospital, to see the results.

When flowers came into my room at the hospital from time to time, I got a cart and went down to the Vietnam wards with those bouquets. They were better for them than for me. However, I have seen what has happened, and I yield to nobody in my hope, in my desire, and in my prayers that somehow this insane and grim and grisly business can honorably come to an end.

I think you have to say that for the President of the United States. I cannot in my position, and I cannot under any circumstances, denigrate him or demean him in the eyes of the world in connection with this controversy by anything that I might say. And so, granting all this latitude to anybody in the legislative branch of the Government, I feel that the time has come to say a little more than I have said on the subject of Vietnam.

I recognize my kinship with those who were out in Galesburg, Ill., by virtue of a common uniform which I wore 50 years ago as a private first class, as a sergeant, and as a second lieutenant in France on the western front. That is a kinship that you cannot forget.

And I want to be sure that almost a half million American boys who are out there in the cause of our country will not be the forgotten men under any circumstances, because they are too precious as Americans who have responded and are willing to do their duty even if the last and supreme sacrifice is required for their services.

I will never forget as I think of the thousands who have now died, in addition to the thousands who have been wounded, the lines of Colonel McCrae, that Canadian doctor who had a field dressing station on the banks of the Ypres River in France, and saw the bodies roll down into the door of his dressing room tent out there on the front, and who finally committed his soul to paper and in that tender and gentle poem said:

We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

Well, some boys are lying out there. I do not know what I would say to the shades of those who made that sacrifice. I want to be sure, if I can, that it is not a vanity and that I fully recognize my responsibility in an anxious hour like this.

It was said the other day:

First. That our programs and our policies were suspect by friend and foe alike. Where, I would like to know? Who besides bonnie Charles de Gaulle has been so bold as to affront us in this field? Thirty countries are helping us now. Have you heard it from Australia? Have you heard it from New Zealand? Have you heard it from Korea? Indeed, not. The nations have been there in our corner. They did not always send troops, but there were other kinds of assistance that they sent.

So, is that a good sentiment to utter, that we are suspect by friend and foe alike? I do not know where it is, and I want to see the proof. And I do not like to see it go on the dispatch wires into every corner of the earth, to make a headline.

I remember once doing some work on immigration, trying to help India; and when I got to Bombay and Calcutta, the headlines were that high—"India's Friend Is Here."

Nothing is provincial here, or parochial; nothing is limited. What we say here goes on the wire. And if you want a lesson, send somewhere—I could tell you where—to get the international shortwave monitor, and see what is said on the Senate floor, which goes out of the shortwave stations from Peking and from Hanoi and elsewhere.

How good is it for the morale of the troops? You ought to be out there on the front on a lonely night, when the bombs are dropping or the mortar shells are coming over, and see whether it makes a difference. Oh, yes, they begin to wonder whether they are the forgotten men, and are forgotten back home. It is a ghastly feeling, I can tell you; and sometimes I had it on the western front a long, long time ago. That is one thing about which I want to be extremely careful.

It has been said that the President was brainwashed by a military-industrial complex. I would hate to have heard that said about General Eisenhower, the grand captain of the second great crusade mission in world affairs. I do not believe anybody ever said it about him, great tactician that he was, great strategist that he was. They combed the Army to find him. And General Marshall was deeply attached to him. And so he became the grand captain.

Well, I can imagine how he feels about a statement like that. It does not sound good and it does not look good, because he was a Republican President who served us with honor and distinction. And it would not sound good about any President.

Have you heard the British demean their King and Queen? If you have, show me the day and the time. Why, we were so circumspect about it that when the King and Queen were our guests, we set up a scaffolding in that rotunda so that the cameras would not catch the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga and the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. That is how circumspect we were. And I was there, roving around in the place, to find out what it was all about.

No, you do not demean the ruler. The President is not our ruler, but you do not demean him in the eyes of people abroad; for when you do, you demean the prestige of this Republic. And I do not mean to do it, as the one remaining great, free republic on the face of the earth.

Yesterday, this whole question about security came up. Where was our security? I heard the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee ask these questions. I am no tactician, goodness knows. I have been to the command staff school as a lieutenant, but I am no tactician, I am no strategist. But I do know this, Mr. President, from those with whom I have associated in government: that our outer defense perimeter started in Korea and went to South Vietnam. Now, you see, Saigon, in South Vietnam, is at the lower end. That is our left flank. Suppose the left flank of your line is turned and you lose Vietnam? Then what?

The distinguished Senator from Hawaii can certainly tell us about how close it is from the Philippines to Malaysia and to Indonesia. And you cite to me a holding station where you can hold if we lose Vietnam. There is no place short of Singapore. Anybody who has some perspective knowledge of tactics can tell you that. And when you are in Singapore, you are at one of the clogged water courses that I am confident, as surely as I am standing here, the Soviets are going to try to control. Control Panama, control Singapore, the two ends of the Gulf of Aden and Suez, and you have just about command of the world. That is all you need.

So you have to see this in perspective. There is no holding line between Saigon and Singapore. So when they speak about the fall of Southeast Asia, they are not kidding. And I am not disposed to quarrel with men who have gone through our military schools, who have worked with worldwide maps, and who are expected to plot this thing in the large. That is what you need for the security of the country.

There may be Members in this body this afternoon who may remember, as I remember, when during the war we went down to the Munitions Building for briefings by George Marshall, the Chief of Staff.

I almost fell out of my seat one morning. These were members of the Appropriations Committee. I almost fell out of my seat when suddenly, out of a clear sky, he said:

Gentlemen, I may have bad news for you.

We waited with bated breath. He said:

Our best intelligence tells us that the Japanese are going to invade Alaska, and for the moment we can't stop them. We can't redeploy our troops from the Pacific. We think the strategy we follow is correct; and if they invade Alaska, we'll have to let them do it.

What do you think the wave would have been in this country if the Japanese Army had suddenly invaded Alaska? I ask you.

Why, it would have been a wave of such intensity that I expect people would want to come and cut the throats of

leaders down here for letting our domain be invaded. But General Marshall was a soldier and a great one. He knew what he had to do, no matter how much he might be scolded, and he kept the ship's nose in the wind. Everybody knows how we came out. He was right and I do not try to argue with them about it.

That is our outside security line. Suppose it fails. I think the Senator from Missouri could tell us the answer. It will run from Alaska to Hawaii, and you tell me how far you are from San Francisco and Los Angeles, as to whether or not our security is involved out there in Asia. If I did not think it was, I guess I would take another good long look at this whole business before we get through.

It has been said we have not emphasized the political needs and aspects of this controversy in the face of the fact that maybe we cannot get a military solution. Have we defaulted in that field? I thought they had an election out there to pick a constituent assembly. I thought they had an election out there. Senator MURPHY and Senator HICKENLOOPER went there as observers from this side. They came back and said that in their judgment it was a fair and honest election. They brought back ballots with them and indicated exactly how the people went to the polls. Is it not strange that in this second election in September a half million more people voted than had voted in the earlier election? Does that mean anything? It means we have done something to dispel fears in Vietnam and in shoving back the Vietcong so that life can pursue its normal course. Has that been neglecting the political fabric? Those figures simply do not prove it.

I reemphasize these two facts largely because the point is made that our security is not involved. This is a pretty small consideration when one thinks of these high-speed bombers. The designers are not at all satisfied with the speeds we get today, and I presume that would be particularly true with respect to military aircraft. They have just tied this great ball into short reaches, and you can go from here to there in very short order. When you do so on a pair of wings, you can have in the fuselage the lethal and deadly weapons that will impair our security. Let no one say our security is not involved, and with it, of course, the peace of the world is involved.

Who can forget how fast these things move. Here was a student. I suppose almost everybody has forgotten his name. His name was Princip and he was standing in a doorway in the little town of Sarajevo. When the Austrian Archduke and his Duchess, who were the heirs to the throne, came by, out comes the pistol and he shoots and both die before they get to the hospital. The legends are set in motion. The boots on the cobblestones begin to sound all over Europe, and before we knew it we were caught up in a frightful conflagration.

What about this area in Southeast Asia? Are we there to stop aggression? I think we are. Are we there in the interest of peace so that the thing will not spread? I think we are. Are we there in the interest of self-determination, a phrase Woodrow Wilson used so often? I think we are. Can we not do that without undertaking to police the entire world? I think we can. I am not insensible to the fact that there is a limitation to our capacity in manpower, in finances, and in any other field you want to mention. No one can be insensible to it today when you stop to figure the fever, turbulence, and problems you have everywhere in the world. But these are ideals and these are objectives that I think we can probably serve and I think we are serving them now. I think it is an undertaking to which we were committed.

I hear it said that we ought to stop bombing immediately, project a day, sharpen up your forces, then say to all the world, "On this day we stop; on this day a ceasefire will stop everything. Now, if you, the enemy fail to desist in your hostility, then we shall feel free to use everything at our command in order to bring you to heel."

Well, have we not said some of that already? Oh, I rather think so. We have used a good many countries, like Britain, we used the Hanoi embassy in Moscow, people in Warsaw, and elsewhere, but strangely enough these things have not produced anything yet. The tragedy of it is that I think we have gone pretty far but, Mr. President, we could get no reciprocal assurances, and that is the stinger.

I am sure we were willing and I am sure that sentiment was conveyed. If only those three crack divisions they had at the demilitarized zone would stay in their place, but Ho Chi Minh and his associates would give no such assurance. What would you deduce from it? If you would stop the only leverage we have now, those troops would have moved. And what about the Marines on the outside and north of the demilitarized zone? What about those who could become the forgotten men? I am not going to forget them. I am not going to see that kind of punishment visited upon them because suddenly we felt we had to stop this bombing business as a kind of last, desperate resort. It may be the war is a one-way street. Everybody discovered that from the day they invented warfare. There is a great troop risk involved when they counsel that kind of action.

But there is something else that ought to engage our recollection and that is what happened in Korea in 1951. We had a brilliant offensive mounted there and we were doing exceedingly well. Then, suddenly, a kind of inertia came into it. In some areas they reported that President Truman had issued a standstill order. He had not. You will not find it in history books or papers. That is not what happened. But the word went out that we were going to settle for the 38th parallel and that deenergized the drive, and as a result it cost us 90,000 casualties.

Do you want to go down that anxious road again? Not me, not me. One lesson in history is enough and with 450,000 men, and perhaps more over there now, no sir, I am not going to expose them to that sort of thing and rue the day that I do it. That will be a hardened memory with which to keep a rendezvous from that day on.

I, for one, do not propose to do it.

In a recent speech, it was stated that we should end our search-and-destroy operations. The Senator has seen the Montagnards when he was in Vietnam last week. We could not bring them in before. Finally we had to go out and find them by searching the hills and the valleys. That was the only real technique we had which was effective for a time. But, it is said, we should stop it. We should end this business of search and destroy.

What kind of posture does it put us in? A defensive posture.

The moment we are on the defensive, we can no longer employ a technique of this kind. Is that what we want to do? Is that what we want to say to General Westmoreland and our troops out there? I do not.

Sooner or later the truth has got to come to the American people.

A great point was made about taking all this to the Security Council. That matter was argued in this Chamber for hours on yesterday, as if it had not been up there. They made a real endeavor. We have to get nine votes. Yes, there is no veto power where a procedural matter is involved, and this would be procedural. But, we could not get them. We could not energize the members of the Council to take a real interest in it.

Suppose, however, we did get nine votes. What would be the next step? Not procedural. It would have to be substantive.

How do we get a substantive matter out of the Council, with the Soviet Union sitting there with a veto?

I do not think we have looked all the way down that road. Inquiry leads me to believe that our Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg, has not been wanting in trying to get some kind of action in the Security Council. He has not been successful.

Thus, Mr. President, in all the discussion had on yesterday, I do not think it came to anything because I doubt very much whether it was pursued to a real conclusion.

I fairly shuddered when the two newspaper editors, Ashmore and Baggs, finally got visas from the State Department and went out to Hanoi.

If I had been the State Department, they would not have gotten any visas, because they are both associated, as I understand it, with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, in Santa Barbara. That is where Robert Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago, is. Senators should read some of the stuff that comes out of that center. I sent for and got lots of it. I delivered quite a lecture on one. The subject was "Justice for All, Freedom for None."

I wish I had my notebook with me so that I could read a few of the notes—they would knock your hats off as to what they had in mind as to the ultimate in a free society. Their idea was that our free society would have to be restructured, that there could be no freedom any more. Justice, yes.

But, I say, what will happen when freedom goes?

What is that old ditty——

No man escapes when freedom fails.
The best men rot in filthy jails.
And those who cry "appease, appease."
Are hanged by those they sought to please.

Mr. President, that is one reason why our boys are in Vietnam. Let freedom slip, and it begins to slip everywhere.

We remember that Churchill said he was not made the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

Let me say that I was not made a Senator to preside over the liquidation of the holy fabric of freedom. May I be the last ever to approach that kind of task.

Well, Mr. President, Ashmore and Baggs go out there. I followed that pretty closely. I thought perhaps they were really going to "pin one on." But read between the lines. What and how much did they get out of Hanoi, if we stopped bombing? It could have eventuated into something. Not that it would. It just could. They came back emptyhanded. But they had enough for a few headlines.

I consigned Ashmore and Baggs to the wastebasket. I received a letter from them excoriating me for identifying them with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Well, Mr. President, they have not heard the last of it, I say to my friends of California. They will hear a lot more on that subject before I get through, because if this is going to be the new politics in our country, predicated on the theory that freedom must be liquidated, then the time to start fighting is now.

Thus, I just "kiss off" Ashmore and Baggs after their escapades on the front pages. I doubt very much whether they will make any significant history from now on.

Now I get back to one more point, and then I think I have said enough.

In 1952 we actually went abroad to bring the grand captain back, made him the head of our party and elected him to the Presidency of the United States. We reelected him in 1956. If there had been no constitutional prohibition on a third term, I make so bold as to say that Dwight D. Eisenhower had sufficient of the trust, esteem, and confidence of the American people to be elected for a third time.

Thus, it would occur to me that we who have been associated with him in a common party, we who have gone to see him so often at the Tuesday morning sessions at the White House, could very well, when we are baffled and troubled by problems of this kind, when we are disconcerted of spirit in what appears on the outside to be a kind of party dissidence, we could take a little more counsel from him because he is a great tactician and a great strategist. He is now at that age where he can speak with a wealth of wisdom and experience.

I can only hope that we do not wander too far afield so that, somehow, we go across that yet undefined line under which we might arrogate to ourselves the conduct of the war.

It is a rather interesting thing—I have run down many legal cases before the Supreme Court—that I have found as yet no delimitation on the powers of the Commander in Chief under the Constitution. Thus, I want to abide by that Constitution. I do not want him to invade our responsibility and I do not want to invade his. When he wants counsel, he can call—and he does; how many times we have been to the White House with the maps and the charts looking over them to see where we are and getting some better ideas about direction. Then we knew, I think, a little better, for our own comfort and the stability of our soul, what we should do.

So, Mr. President, that is the whole story. I am not disposed to argue it, as I said at the outset. I want to be sure only that I comport myself according to my own convictions and my own conscience, because I have a responsibility to myself, to my country, and to those boys who are out there in Vietnam now.

May we pray for them always. May we make no mistakes that will add an undue burden on, and an undue jeopardy to, a task which in itself is amply hazardous without our adding to it.

I do not want our boys in Vietnam to become the forgotten men.

Thus, in every step we take, in every word we utter, let us be sure that we have in mind those men who, at this very moment, are 12,000 miles from this gracious country, who are ready for any sacrifice, who are ready for any vigil, who are ready for any task in order to requite their obligations and responsibilities as soldiers of the United States of America.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, what the distinguished minority leader said needed saying. It was said eloquently. He spoke as an American. I think the American people approve of what he had to say.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it was indeed said eloquently, and, of course, as an American, and I suggest there has not been a word uttered in this Chamber over the last many months that has been uttered by other than an American. I think this is very clear. I do not think any of us who have spoken has had any lack of responsibility or any reason to feel that he was not discharging his obligation to his country or to this body, or to those who are serving on active duty anywhere in the world.

Just as it was proper for the Senator from Illinois to call to the attention of all of us our responsibility not to weaken the cause of our Nation, the cause of freedom in the world, so I think it is equally important for all of us to meet our responsibility, when we disagree with the conduct of affairs by our Government, to state that disagreement as clearly and distinctly as possible, whether in time of peace or in time of war.

The strength of our democracy depends upon this being done, because people in high office can make errors as can people of humble station.

The only way to guard against error in what is at best an imperfect world, in the conduct of affairs by men who are at best less than omniscient, as they should be less than omnipotent, is to encourage, certainly not to condemn or seek to stifle, criticism of a responsible nature by all citizens, including Members of the Senate of the United States.

(At this point Mr. SPONG assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have listened to the distinguished minority leader with a great deal of interest. All of us have very deep respect and affection for the Senator from Illinois, and certainly I have always counted myself as one of those who admire him very much. He has great talents and I particularly enjoy his company. It pains me very much to have a different view on such an important matter of policy.

I have not the slightest doubt that he has the deepest conviction when he says he is not a Senator to liquidate the holy fabric of freedom. I am sure he feels that way. I feel just as strongly that the pursuit of this war under the conditions that exist is more likely designed to liquidate the holy fabric of freedom because of what could well be a war of indefinite tenure, indefinite existence, and possibly involve China.

So what we are arguing about is not the objective. I think the objective of the Senator from Illinois and that of myself and those of us who disagree with the current policy in Vietnam are identical. We do have this difference of judgment, and it is a judgment based upon similar facts, as to the best way to go about preserving our freedom.

The Senator expressed his very deep feeling for the men in Vietnam. All of us share that. There are men from every State represented by everyone in this body, and we are all getting, almost daily, notices of their death or injury. The difference is, I think, that those of us who would like to liquidate this war believe that we are acting in the interest of those men in Vietnam. We do not wish them to stay there. Also, we believe it is not in the national interest to do so.

So it seems to me the question is narrowed a bit if we get down to some of the issues that are related to this question. What is the objective of this Vietnam policy? Is it in the interest of this country and the preservation of our strength?

The Senator intimates, in one section of his speech, that our security is involved. Yesterday I said I thought our security was best protected by maintaining a strong country, and not wasting or spending our resources, manpower, and money, in South Vietnam. This is not a part of the world which it seems to me has ever been regarded heretofore as strategic and as of vital importance to the United States.

The Senator from Illinois mentioned President Eisenhower, a great general. When President Eisenhower was in office, this matter was presented to him in 1954. He very carefully selected his Chiefs of Staff, General Ridgway and General Gavin. They undertook a study of the landing problems in support of the French in Vietnam. Very wisely, after a thorough examination, General Ridgway recommended against it, although there were powerful people in that administration, including the Secretary of State, and Admiral Radford, who were for it. But President Eisenhower, exercising his responsibility as President, decided against it. I think history will prove him right.

General MacArthur had made a statement, not under these same circumstances, but after what had been his experience in the same area to the effect that it would be very foolish to engage in a land war on the continent of Asia.

I believe there are other leading military men who have taken that view. There has been a difference of opinion among the highest branches of the military establishment on this particular problem. But General Eisenhower at least made a decision not to go into that precise area, Vietnam. I believe at that time there was the question of landing in North Vietnam, but, anyway, it was in the general area of Vietnam, and he decided not to go to the aid of the French.

We were at that time in a false position in supporting a colonial power, which is contrary to the tradition of this country. I think this whole operation from the beginning has been afflicted with this weakness. The idea that Vietnam would threaten the security of this country by bombs or other means is not realistic.

I assume that what the Senator is saying is that Russia and/or China will use it as a base to attack us. I do not know what other reason would lead us to say that what happens in South Vietnam is a real and direct threat to the security of the United States.

If it is Russia that is the threat, I do not see how Russia needs Vietnam to be a threat to the United States. At any rate, Russia, not so long ago, had missiles in Cuba and withdrew them. If she is determined on such an attack, I do not know why she withdrew those missiles in Cuba.

This gets us into a very involved matter as to motives. With due respect, I do not see how what the Senator thinks will happen in South Vietnam is a threat to us. I agree with what the Senator said about the recent election and that the votes were cast, but most people agree that the conditions for the voting were determined by us and our proteges. It seems to me this would be quite similar to having a rule in Arkansas that only Democrats could be elected. I would feel that I would come out pretty well under those conditions and we could count the votes as they were cast.

But coming back to the matter of security, which I commented on yesterday—and I assume perhaps the Senator from Illinois had that in mind, because I said I thought that we are playing the Communist game—if that is what is involved, and I think it certainly is involved in the long term, I think that we are weakening this country. I think there is evidence that this country, not just in the Senate, but in the polls, and the speeches, the statements of recognized and respectable people—they are not all peculiar people who are evidencing dissent in this matter—there is great confusion and much difference of opinion. But judging from recent speeches by responsible Members of this body, I particularly think it significant that some of the Republican Members are reflecting their own maturity of judgment, and also, presumably, that of their constituents. I think that is a very healthy thing. I think this is the proper role of the minority party in any government, to take that position, to refine the issues, and to contribute to a refinement of policy which I hope will be wiser than the one we are following.

I do not think even the Senator from Illinois is pleased with our present situation. It is a very disagreeable thing, even though he supports the present policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before the Senator gets too far away from Ridgway and Gavin——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield for a question, but I do not wish to lose the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think we have got to keep our history straight here. The Senator drew upon history. Let me state my version.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is based upon having been in North Vietnam in 1953. I was at Hanoi. I saw our Navy planes, that we had given to the French, take off in the hope that they could save Dienbienphu, the last French stronghold, as the Senator knows.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They did not save it. The French got licked.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Notwithstanding the fact that we poured 700 million American dollars into their effort.

Now, why were they there? They had been there; Indochina, as it was then known, was under French tutelage for more than 90 years.

They did not even train people to run the government. They were willing to train doctors only because of tropical diseases. They were there to conquer, not to preserve the freedom of a humble people. They were really there to subdue them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That may have been their motive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, it was the case.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But I daresay they did not cause nearly the destruction, in the 90 years they were there, that we have caused in 2 years. I am sure they did not kill anything like as many people, nor disrupt the economy and the life of the people in Vietnam as much.

I do not mean that we have done this because of bad motives; we have done it through lack of wisdom, I will say.

But if I may come back to it, the question which I think is central, and which we are really interested in, is what policy really serves the interests of this country. Surely just what kind of government they may have in South Vietnam is not of such importance to us as to justify our risking 500,000 men. We have already suffered 15,000 deaths, and nearly 85,000 casualties. To compare that loss to our interest in the kind of government in a little country that has never before had a representative government, and say that we must give them precisely what we think they ought to have, does not make any sense to me.

It is the question of our security, I think, that is of central importance. Surely we could agree that all that we are doing is not worthwhile, simply to give this little country representative government, or a democratic government, if you like, in which they elect people in the same fashion we do in Chicago, or in Harlem, or in Arkansas. Whether it is necessary to the security of this country, seems to me to be the crucial point.

I cannot see that it is crucial to our security. On the contrary, when you consider the cost that we are now undergoing, and what we have already suffered—the Senator knows how much we are spending; it is now estimated at the rate of $30 billion a year. The casualty rate is twice as high this year as it was last year. We have already suffered, this year, more casualties than in all of last year. The rate is going up, and will continue to go up if the war is intensified, one would suppose.

Is it worth the cost? It seems to me that it could be only if this is a very strategic area, from the point of the security of this country. I cannot see that the proponents of the war have made a case, their argument does not appeal to me. I would be most interested, if anyone can make that point.

On the contrary, as I said yesterday, the Chinese first stated this thought, and I think it has some validity: If we were not there, they could not challenge the United States; they have no air force worthy of the name—the Chinese, I am speaking of now, not South Vietnam—that neither South Vietnam nor North Vietnam have anything that they could attack us with is self-evident. The Chinese have no air force, they have no navy worthy of the name; they have, we presume, a very primitive nuclear weapon, but no delivery system, as of now.

In addition to that, while we have apparently built up great fear and apprehension about it, there is nothing, really, in the record, in our hearings, or anywhere else that I have heard of, indicating any fervent desire on the part of the Chinese to attack us in the foreseeable future. That will depend, of course, a great deal upon the way we conduct ourselves, in regard to China.

But what we are doing is sending our men over there and having them slaughtered. We are spending our money, we are disrupting our economy, we are threatened with inflation, we are confronted with an enormous deficit; I do not know what is going to be done about the tax bill, but the news in the papers every day says it will have very hard sledding. If that does not come through, there will be a deficit of some $28 or $30 billion. That will cause further disruption here.

Then there is the division within our country, the lack of unity and cooperation among our citizens, in carrying out our policies domestic as well as foreign, which is a very serious thing for a great and powerful country of this kind. The alienation of the young people—you can laugh all you like at hippies, but it is not just hippies. I have been to a number of universities where there are no hippies, or at least there are very few. The most responsible and intelligent young people of this country do not support this war,

by and large. They have given every evidence of it in practically every university in the country.

Not that that in itself is decisive, but it is indicative of a lack of justification for this war. It has not been made a self-evident fact of life that it is in our interest to pursue this war.

There was no question of this sort in the Second World War. There was very little question in Korea. There was certainly none in the First World War. Why is it that there is such a great question now? Could it not be possible that the feeling of those who oppose this war could have some validity? Might that not be indicated by the fact that it is shared by so many people in this country?

All of us are elected here. I do not think that my fellow Senators who have expressed their opposition to the continuation of this particular war—and I say "this particular war" because it is not like any of the other wars which have been mentioned—completely ignore the views of their constituents.

To make it out that Ho Chi Minh is like Hitler is nonsense. He has none of of the characteristics. His country has none of the power, or characteristics of power, that Germany had, and so on. That kind of an analogy makes no sense whatever to me. We have to judge it on the facts of this case; and it seems very strange to me that so many people in this country, of all types and characters, dissent from the pursuit of this particular war and the fashion in which we are pursuing it. I think it is something to give the Senate pause, and I believe that we should all participate, as are the Senator from Illinois, and his colleagues on his side of the aisle, and those of us on this side of the aisle, in discussing this problem.

I think the Senator has rendered a great service in opening up the subject. he always attracts attention to these problems, much more than any other Senator can, because of his own very special talents, which we all appreciate. But I think it is a very fine thing to discuss it, if we can arrive—and I hope we can—at an agreement about where the real interests, the vital security interests of this country lie, and what pursuits, what policies, would best promote them. If we could arrive at such an agreement, it would be the greatest favor we could render, not only to the President, but to this country.

The suggestions about using the United Nations, it seems to me, are entirely appropriate. We helped to create that body. We have been its principal sponsor. I do not think the suggestions that have been made should be dismissed because, in the past, the United Nations has not been able to solve all these problems. I think it should be given a real try. And I do not think we have yet given it a real try, partly because of the feeling that it is futile. Under the serious conditions that now exist, I do not believe that we should refrain from doing anything possible, and I do not think we have, to obtain the agreement of the Security Council to put this matter on the agenda and have it discussed, and hopefully to have some resolution of it, with the assistance of the members of the Security Council.

I can only say that I hope all Senators will do as have the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from California, and others, in talking about this matter and seeking to resolve it.

All the other matters that we have before us seem to be connected with Vietnam—the foreign aid program has been affected by it, and almost all the other matters that have come before my committee. This morning we had a meeting on the Asian Development Bank. All of the consideration comes around to the question of what is going to happen to Vietnam. Unless we can resolve this, it is like a cancer eating into all our other policies. I think everybody knows that it is affecting our budget. It affects the tax bill. All of these matters relate to Vietnam.

If the Members of the Senate cannot discuss it and hopefully come to some agreement upon it by a clear majority, the country is going to be more and more divided. We are going to get in deeper and deeper trouble.

I do not know what the answer is. We have to make some agreement on it, it seems to me. It is an intolerable situation for the most powerful country in the world with all its vast resources at its disposal to be in this position, apparently not able to make up its mind. Its mind is not made up. Even though the President has control, he cannot carry on indefinitely without the real support of the country. I think we can agree to that.

Difficulties will arise in other fields. Difficulties have already arisen in other fields. They are not directly affected, but are indirectly affected by Vietnam.

So, I could not overexaggerate the importance of the Senate continuing the discussion and coming to some resolution. I do not quite see how we can come to a resolution, but we ought to be able to come to a resolution and a high degree of agreement as to where our interests are.

Is it in the interest of this country to pursue the war indefinitely with the escalating cost of money and lives? Is it in the interest of this country to bring the war to a close by some kind of compromise?

I do not think that approach has been explored as it should be, certainly through the U.N.

I commend the Senator for at least bringing up the question for proper discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, certain it is that any war develops stresses, spiritual, moral, and emotional, that very often impel many people to take a given course of action. Even in the War Between the States it was so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was the trouble.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The party of Lincoln, decided that there would be a rump convention and that they would not nomi- when it came time to hold a convention, nate the Commander in Chief.

The person who then corresponded to the Republican national chairman today besought Lincoln with every talent he had to try to do something to get the soldiers back before the November election and to get this thing over and to receive some negotiators from the South.

I think history will bear this out, that Lincoln met aboard ship two of them that had been brought through the lines.

Lincoln listened very carefully and then he took a piece of paper. At the top he wrote:

> No. 1. The Union must be preserved.
> No. 2. Slavery must be abolished.

He then said:

> Gentlemen, you fill in the rest of it, the disposition of the horses, the military material, the feed stocks, all of that. You write that in there, but just leave No. 1 and No. 2 at the top, and I will sign it.

You see, we are up against a decision of some kind. No. 1. Do we quit? Do we retreat? Do we go ahead to a victory? Do we deescalate? And if we do, I think that we throw away whatever leverage we have?

What is the answer? I am content to go along in the interest of our troops with that position that does not forfeit our leverage in the hope that there can be negotiation and put it on thicker and thicker if necessary.

I learned long ago that it is the hit dog that yelps. They are being hit. They are being hurt, and they are beginning to yelp.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does the Senator have in mind as the final outcome in this area? What does he want to achieve in Vietnam? Does he want a colony?

I wonder what the Senator has in mind that we wish to have there in the foreseeable future.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do we have any commitment under the Southeast Asian Treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not to do what we are doing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What are the commitments? It is a protocol state.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are to cooperate with the other members of the Southeast Asian Treaty as to what course we should take. There was no guarantee that we were to come to their aid in South Vietnam.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No commitment as to self-determination?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think you had better reexamine that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have reexamined it. That is the opinion of a number of experts who appeared before our committee. I may say that the Secretary of State never used that as an excuse until about a year and a half ago. They gave other reasons.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Maybe there was not an occasion for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was only involved in a minor way until we began to escalate the number of troops.

I wonder what the Senator has in mind. Does he think the United States security requires us to have a permanent presence in Southeast Asia or South Vietnam?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said nothing about a permanent presence. I mentioned, and I presume the Senator was present, that

I probably have a different military concept in that we have an outside perimeter than runs from Korea to Vietnam. If that is there, what about the rest of Southeast Asia? And we will have to include Australia, New Zealand, Burma, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Laos, and Cambodia. They are all part of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Do I then understand that the Senator believes a permanent base there is necessary for our security?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I think that after stability is restored at long last, they can set up their own military requirements in order to meet this threat.

Perhaps the Senator does not share my conviction that this is a Red threat. This is a Communist threat that proposes to liquidate freedom in South Vietnam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish the Senator would explore that a little further.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does it need any explanation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it does. By way of background, a moment ago it was stated that this area of Indochina was a colony of France. France took it about 1870 or thereabouts, and they held it until they were forced out in 1954. And the leader then was Ho Chi Minh, the leader of the nationalist forces which really defeated the French.

Mr. DIRKSEN. You stated why the French troops were there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was a colony of France. That is why they were there. It was a colony, and they were trying to maintain it as a possession which they exploited for its national wealth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was colonialism at its very worst.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that it was different from all the other French possessions. They exploited it as they always have and as most colonial powers do.

What I am coming to is what do we have in mind? The Senator says that we do not have in mind maintaining a permanent presence there, and that it will not be a colony.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not think there is any doubt. This is a Communist threat. I do not want to see that line broken so that all of the rest of Southeast Asia is exposed, because if it is, then the whole Pacific coastline of this country will be exposed.

If that does not involve security, then I have no understanding of the word.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is making a real contribution. At least, we understand each other. If I understand the Senator, he thinks we should have a permanent presence there.

This, of course, leads to different conclusions. I do not wish to misspeak myself or misinterpret the Senator's words. If that is true—and I gather from what the Senator said that it is—then certainly my theory is quite wrong. I mean, I do not agree with that view at all. I do not believe that would promote the security of this country. I believe that the security of this country would be better promoted, rather than establishing a colony there in place of the French, to have Vietnam a strong, independent country. I think we made a great mistake in intervening there.

I believe the analogy of Yugoslavia is a very sound one. Vietnam would have been a Communist country, but an independent country; because they have had a thousand years of history, fighting the Chinese, to avoid becoming a satellite; and they succeeded in that up until the French took them.

This is an important difference. The President has never said that. I do not know whether the Senator means to say that or not, but I gather that he did say that. Am I correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said it; yes, I did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. You did?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. And yesterday you said our security is not involved at all. It depends on whether or not you take a global view of security. If you do not, the chances are that you are right. I take a different view, because we have conquered time, space, and distance to the point where this is a pretty small world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with that, and that is the reason why I think what I consider an obsolete concept of colonial bases is no longer adequate for security in this kind of world. I think we have to find new ways, particularly ways of working with countries such as Russia, rather than competing with them for bases in outposts such as South Vietnam. I think this is bound to bring a clash, bound to bring a nuclear exchange, which will not be in the interest of this country or any other country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, that is a speculation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is a speculation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What you just said. It is a speculation into the future, as to whether there will be a nuclear clash.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. You mean if we do not find a way to get along with Russia, it is speculation that there will be a clash?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is still a speculation in proportion, as I have seen these figures put on a blackboard in a good many places, as to how many people will be killed if they unleash nuclear exchanges, and whose people will be killed in greater numbers, and they run up into the millions. I cannot believe that mankind has so sloughed off its compassion and its commonsense as to get into that kind of a hole—yet.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think they do it deliberately.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have rarely got into wars deliberately. You blunder into these wars. And what we are doing in assuming the mantle of the British Empire, and in beginning to accumulate bases such as Vietnam, is to expose us to the same kind of troubles the British had, to a gradual erosion of our power and of our influence. We have already, I think, lost the sympathy of Western Europe in this policy—not because they do not have great respect for this country as such, as a great country, but they question our judgment in pursuing this war, which they believe is undermining the strength of this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot believe that mankind will blunder into this sort of thing. We did not blunder into it in Hiroshima or Nagasaki. That was done after the most prayerful deliberation. And when it was done, they picked up the pieces, assessed the damage, saw how many people were killed, and how by nuclear weapons you can convert a cool, placid river into a boiling stream. That is not lost on the leaders anywhere in the world, and I cannot imagine that they are going to blunder into that sort of thing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, of course, I wish I had the same faith the Senator has, even though we continue the policies we have now that apparently inspire his allegiance to this policy in Southeast Asia, which is to fight off this Red menace, that he at the same time thinks they are going to be so reasonable that they will never engage in a nuclear war. I think you are trying to have it both ways. If they are as dangerous a menace as you would lead us to believe because of Vietnam, then, surely, we could have no assurance that they would not use nuclear weapons.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They know that nobody ever won an earthquake, and they are not going to blunder into this.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see why the Senator thinks that they are behind Vietnam and that this is a step intended to attack us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are certainly behind North Vietnam. Have you any doubt about Soviet weapons over there?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no. But they are helping an ally, in the same way we have helped allies. That does not mean the Soviets are intending to use South Vietnam or North Vietnam as a steppingstone to attack us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are not over there to conquer anybody.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not? You just said we are going to have a base there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say we are going to have a base there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was trying to develop what the Senator did say.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I certainly did not. We are over there to help South Vietnam preserve their Republic, their freedom, their self-determination, and, over and above everything else, freedom from aggression.

Now, why is the Soviet Union helping North Vietnam? For freedom's reasons? No. To conquer South Vietnam. That is the difference. It is certainly a sharp difference in principle.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, of course, I need not tell you about this idea of aggression—the other side believes we are the aggressor. We have intervened in a civil war, a war between Vietnamese. The Senator does not deny that. These are all basically Vietnamese.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Basically, yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And we do not live there, and it is a foreign country, and we intervened.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What would have been the situation if the Chinese had sent a hundred thousand men over here during our Civil War?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad I do not have to speculate on that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a civil war; and the assumption that everybody believes that this is an outright aggression by one national state or another is open to question; is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It seems to me that from the very days of Ngo Dinh Diem—and I had many meetings with him when I was there—they were just trying to set up a republic to suit themselves. They were content to leave their neighbors to the north alone. That did not satisfy Ho Chi Minh—not on your life. He was going to bring all of what was ancient Indochina into the fold, no matter what it cost. That was the conflict.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All we tried to do in the South, since the Senator referred to the Lincoln principle, was to set up our own government, if the North would leave us alone, but the North would not do that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The North did not try to conquer the South. We had a Constitution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But we did set up a Confederacy, yet the North insisted on conquering us anyhow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, we did not; we took exception to Calhoun's Doctrine of Nullification and said that the South just could not walk out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what Ho Chi Minh said to Diem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Ho Chi Minh had nothing to say.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He thought he should have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a different thing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Just as Lincoln thought he should have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, Lincoln did not. Lincoln was guided by the Constitution that applied to the Senator's State as well as it applied to his own State. The South walked out on it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before I sit down, I should like to have a clarification. I understood the Senator to say that we needed a base; that we intended South Vietnam to be a permanent base for the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I said that, I would have opened up the whole subject of colonialism, which is as alien as anything I know of to our concept of government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to prolong the discussion, but I should like to clarify the question. What does the Senator say is the objective of our war in Vietnam? What is it that we wish to achieve that is worthy of what we are doing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mentioned security. Obviously, it would take a long military lecture of global dimensions to persuade my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I mean what concrete effect would result in Vietnam?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did I not recite the right of those people to decide their destiny for themselves, particularly their political destiny?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Are we going to leave Vietnam?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We undertook to fulfill a commitment under the SEATO Treaty, while we did not ask for much in Geneva in 1954, I think we came away from there somewhat with the idea that if they had to have help and asked us for it, we would help. What happened?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did not Diem ask us for help? We put him in office; he was "our boy."

Mr. DIRKSEN. We did not put him in; the people of South Vietnam put him there. Diem went around the countryside, talking to South Vietnamese farmers, rice farmers, and everyone else. He was a very popular person. I listened to him when he was on the platform at the time. We did not put him in; he put himself in.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean to say that Diem was elected in a free election?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I mean that he undertook, by going around the country, to get the trust and confidence of the people there. Then, too, of course, there had to be a leader to take over somewhere along the line. Who was a more natural leader than Ngo Dinh Diem? But we did not put him in.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The fact is that he created such a dictatorship that we had to come to his aid and support him all the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry to say that that case has been badly exaggerated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is a very grave difference of opinion as to the historical fact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But it is clear that the Senator does not wish us to incorporate this as a colony or a military base. He said that. And he does not wish us to be there permanently.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How often must I say that we do not go in for colonialization at all? As for setting up a base there, if I know the meaning of the word——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are people who say we have set up bases there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator says there are people. I have not heard them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has not heard them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, sir.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is very important to clarify what our purposes are in Vietnam. I would put it this way to see if it comes closer to the Senator's thought. The Senator says that we guarantee the right of self-determination, that they had an election, and that it was a good election. Why if that is so do we not leave or turn it over to them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have an enemy up there and we have to make sure——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That means we stay.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What does the Senator want to do? He has not heard me quarreling with what we have done. He has been quarreling for the last year about the conduct of the war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What does the Senator want to do?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have said it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Tell the Senate. Does the Senator want to quit now and pull out?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I would like to see happen—whether it will happen this way I do not know—is a reconvening of the Geneva conference, and our agreeing to abide by the result. We did not agree the last time at the last minute. We refused to agree.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We were not even a signatory.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Nobody was. There was agreement to it, and we refused to agree. We can neither claim rights under it nor claim other people's rights under it. The Senator is correct. We were not a signatory.

I would like to see a return to the principles of the Geneva conference. The President himself, at about the time of his speech at Johns Hopkins, said that was a proper basis. The North Vietnamese, have said that was a proper basis. I would like to see that, and a negotiation under the cochairmanship of Great Britain and Russia; and that they come to an agreement as to a way to have elections, full and free elections, throughout South Vietnam to create their government; and we would come home.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the Senator heard Ho Chi Minh ask for a reconvening of the Geneva Conference?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; but I have not heard us either. This is what I would like to see happen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He is the guy taking the pasting. He is the guy being pushed around.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; and so are we.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not ask, and see what the reaction is?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The reason is that he feels he has been unjustly attacked. I regret very much that he has not responded to these offers we have made. I think he is wrong for his benefit and for our benefit. Do not misunderstand me. What does Ho Chi Minh have at stake? A little God-forsaken country of 15 million or 16 million people.

We are threatening the security of the strongest country in the world, on which other countries depend economically, politically, and morally. This is a great undertaking and a great risk.

The Senator's expression of a moment ago reassured me when he said he was not a Senator to liquidate the holy fabric of freedom. Neither am I, but I think the course we are following will do it in the bitter end. We are expending this for what? Suppose we take all of Vietnam. Is it worth it? The price we are paying for this is all out of proportion to anything we can gain. We cannot do all of this. At least 15 or 30 million people have an election. That is not the kind of objective to justify this.

There is surely something more that the Senator has in mind. I was trying to develop it. Is it to have a permanent base? The Senator said "No."

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has not mentioned anything yet to make me believe that this is worth what we are doing. That is about the sum and substance of it.

Therefore, I think we should return to the Geneva Conference and liquidate this war on the same basis the parties

really involved, which were the French and the Vietnamese, agreed to in 1954, which we had a major part in disrupting and preventing from being carried out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I see no reason for continuing this. I tried to emphasize my concept of our security line from Saigon and Vietnam to Korea. I still believe in the general field of global strategy that is our defense line, and if we lose it by having the flank turned, that means the line is shortened and the Pacific will no longer be a real defense to our country. As for freedom, it is an indivisible as well as a holy fabric. When it is impaired in one place, that impairment continues.

What about the people in our country like those associated with the Center for Democratic Institutions, who, for instance, belabor the line "Justice for all, freedom for none." They would liquidate freedom.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator mentions freedom. What does the Senator say about Greece? Here is one of our old allies, and suddenly freedom is snuffed out, like that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it is not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course it is. I read just recently in the newspaper that a former minister there made a statement critical of the government and the next day they arrested him. One woman refused to print a newspaper under censorship and they threatened her with arrest. There are 50 members of the Parliament who are still in jail.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is only within the last 2 weeks that the newly elected Supreme, they call him, of the American Hellenic Organization, which is referred to as AHEPA, Mr. Andrew Fasseas of Chicago, who is president of the national association, has returned from Greece. He has been in my office. If ever there was a devotee of freedom he is. I have not heard him say yet they have been deluded of their freedom.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator think there is a free government in Greece?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, I do. Just because they have a military junta for a specific purpose for a little while to shove back the Communist influence——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Communist influence?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Surely, and it has been trying to move into Greece.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator saying that the previous government was a Communist government?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say anything about the previous government. You can have a new government move in without there being a Communist government. We have Communists in this country, do we not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a minor affair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It may not be as minor as the Senator thinks. I am having trouble trying to take the bill off the Calendar to reenergize the Subversive Activities Control Board, only to be met with resistance in this Chamber, and probably more when the authorization for State, Justice, and Commerce comes here, when every veterans organization in the country is for it, so that the Board can go through. Yet, the Assistant Attorney General went before the committee and said there are 100 cases over at the Department of Justice that should be submitted to the Control Board. It is not a government. The influence, however, is here. Perhaps the Senator does not——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a minor one, I think. It is here. If we continue to follow policies as misguided as the present one, it will grow. I have not heard J. Edgar Hoover say recently that he was as much disturbed about it as he was 20 years ago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Once upon a time it was minor. It was minor in Albania, Rumania, and Poland. But it is not minor any more. It has swallowed up all those countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator think the Communists are threatening this country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say that communism is threatening the world. If it is not, then why this imbroglio in Vietnam?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a pertinent question. I was under the impression that since the death of Stalin, the drive of that branch—not the Chinese—was receding. It certainly has become less aggressive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did the Senator get that idea from Kosygin's visit?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The strength of these parties, for example, in Western Europe, is not so powerful now as it used to be. In France and Italy it is still a major party. In France and Italy, about 25 percent of the electorate is Communist, although both countries have been making substantial economic and political progress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What were the gains reported in the press made by the Communists in France?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Where?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I saw a little subhead on it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In what country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought it was in France. I will look it up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not even know they had an election in France.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was a local election.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I saw a report on the elections in Bremen, Germany, where the right wing gained a little there. I saw that in this morning's paper. But I did not realize that communism is on the march, so to speak, nearly so much now as it was under Stalin.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has never been off the march.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As a relative matter, it is not so aggressive as it used to be. We have made considerable progress in various ways in adjusting to the Russians. The Senator himself, I believe, finally relented and supported the Consular Treaty this year. To me, that is just an indication. Not that the treaty is significant in itself, but it is an indication.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator like to tell the rest of the story about the Consular Treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was mentioning only that it was approved by the Senate. The press said—and I do not want to misquote without checking—that the Senator from Illinois did not positively oppose it. I think the Senator was right. Do not misunderstand me, I thought this was a sign of a degree of relaxation of the kind of fear and apprehension that afflicted us at the height of the Stalin era. I think we were quite justified in being apprehensive because Stalin was a very determined and resourceful man. But I think, since then, there has been a lessening of pressure, a relaxation of that conflict, that they are moving themselves internally more toward a different and more relaxed system.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All that has exactly nothing to do with it. I am sure that we can imagine the man who sat in my office——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And brought us all that information which I could not even discuss.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is quite correct. I did not mean to criticize him. I merely meant to say I thought this was a sign that he accepted a change or an evolution taking place in the Communist world. I think in the Kremlin and in Eastern Europe there are signs of it. China is in a class by itself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was not a sign at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just coming to grips with naked reality.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blakenship; and

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka).

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. KORNEGAY, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted on its amendment to the bill (S. 454) for the relief of Richard K. Jones, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASHMORE, Mr. HUNGATE, and Mr. SMITH

of New York were appointed as managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the Act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMERICAN LEGION RESOLUTION ON THE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the American Legion has long had a history of careful and knowledgeable interest in the foreign relations of the United States. The Legion has never hesitated to come out foursquare on issues in which they believe. But at the same time, they have not done so without the most careful study and analysis of the situation.

The 49th annual convention of the American Legion has passed a series of important resolutions on foreign policy. I have the honor of being foreign relations chairman of the American Legion of South Carolina. It will be my pleasure, therefore, from time to time, to call attention of the Senate to some of these carefully prepared resolutions.

For example, Resolution No. 356 concerns the Panama Canal, a subject which is under active discussion in this Congress. I would like to point out that the Legion once more reiterates its previous positions. It reaffirms support of the existing treaties and opposes any dilution of U.S. rights in the Canal Zone.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the 49th national convention of the American Legion on the Panama Canal be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION No. 356

Whereas, The American Legion has repeatedly insisted that the Government of the United States must retain sole and complete authority over the administration, operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal as provided for in the 1903 Treaty; and

Whereas, the course of U.S.-Panamanian relations has demonstrated that any concessions made on our part in regard to our rights in the Canal Zone have only led to increased demands by the Panamanians; and

Whereas, the most recent series of negotiations concerning the existing canal and a possible new canal has resulted in three proposed treaties which reportedly, if ratified, would—

(a) abrogate the 1903 Treaty,

(b) substitute a weak and perhaps inefficient form of administration over the present canal,

(c) compromise and probably render impossible our ability to defend the canal in times of crisis (or even to guarantee its security in normal periods),

(d) abandon both our capital investment and its earnings,

(e) give the canal to the Republic of Panama, completely, and unequivocally, on or before the last day of 1999 (just 32 years from now),

(f) provide that the United States—under very limited circumstances but at great cost to this country—might construct a second canal across the Isthmus of Panama, the ownership of which would revert to Panama—at no cost to that country—60 years after its opening, or the year 2067, whichever is earlier; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion in National Convention assembled in Boston, Massachusetts, August 29, 30, 31, 1967, That The American Legion:

(1) reaffirms its support of the basic and still existing provisions of the 1903 Canal Treaty, and of the continued indispensable sovereign control by the United States over the Canal Zone;

(2) opposes ratification of the proposed treaties in their present form;

(3) opposes any change in U.S. rights in the Canal Zone; and

(4) reiterates its stand taken at previous National Conventions concerning these matters.

(By unanimous consent the following routine business was transacted:)

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER 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.)

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The PRESIDING OFFICER announced that on today, October 3, 1967, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 602. An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; and

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of congressional alternates authorized to be nominated for each vacancy at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, to extend the period of time within which the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources is to submit its final report and to provide for a fixed expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

ROZA DIVISION, YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to law, a draft of contract relating to proposed drainage and minor construction work which, together with previously executed contracts, will exceed a total cost of $200,000 on the Roza Division of the Yakima project, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THIRD-PREFERENCE AND SIXTH-PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on third-preference and sixth-preference classification for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego, California, favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Westminster, California, favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition signed by members of the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, of the State of Kansas, relating to the provision of jobs, housing, and education to solve the problems of American cities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 12474. An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 579).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

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

S. 2498. A bill to amend section 2 of the National Housing Act to facilitate the financing of alterations, repairs, or improvements needed to provide sanitary waste disposal facilities upon, or in connection with the mooring of, houseboats; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

S. 2499. A bill to extend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S. 2500. A bill to require a health warning on the labels of bottles containing certain alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 373

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

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 374

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 375 AND 376

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

EXTENSION OF AIRCRAFT LOAN GUARANTEES LEGISLATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce by request of the Department of Transportation, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated September 15, 1967, from the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Secretary, Department of Transportation, explaining the history of this legislation, together with the need for its extension be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2499) to extend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MONRONEY is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., September 15, 1967.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I submit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, a bill "To extend the Act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees."

The Aircraft Loan Guarantee Program was established by the enactment of Public Law 85-307, September 7, 1957. It provided for guarantee by the Federal Government of up to 90 percent of private loans to local service, helicopter, Alaskan, Hawaiian and certain Caribbean carriers for the purchase of aircraft. The program was inaugurated because of a desire to assist these carriers in securing financing for replacement of obsolete piston aircraft with new modern equipment. It made it possible for these carriers to finance the acquisition of the new aircraft at the lowest possible cost. The object of the program, from the Federal government's view, was to assist these carriers in providing improved service at lower costs and thus reducing subsidy paid by the government.

The program was first authorized for a 5-year period. During that period, through September 7, 1962, twelve carriers received guarantees under the program for loans totalling $42 million. These loans covered the purchase of 33 F-27's, 2 DC-6's, 14 Convair 240's and 340's, a Boeing 720, 3 Martin 404's and 13 helicopters.

In 1962, the program was extended for an additional 5 years, to September 7, 1967. During that period new loans totalling $13.3 million were guaranteed for 4 carriers covering the purchase of 3 DC-9's, 4 DC-6's, 2 Hercules 382B's and 4 PC-6A's.

The need for the extension of the program at this time is not as great as the need was for the program initially, or in 1962 when it was last extended, in terms of the number of carriers that will require the assistance of the program or in the number of aircraft loans that are expected to be made in the next 5 years. However, some carriers continue to need the assistance of the program and it is still in the interest of the government to provide the guarantee to those carriers. The fact that the loan guarantee is no longer needed in the degree of 10 years ago attests to the success of the program in aiding the classes of carriers involved toward a sounded financial position and demonstrates the wisdom of keeping the program in force until it has served its purpose completely by providing assistance to those carriers still in need of it.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the enactment of this legislation from the standpoint of the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN S. BOYD.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE HEALTH HAZARD LABELING ON CERTAIN ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill on behalf of myself and Senators SMITH, MILLER, MORSE, BENNETT, RANDOLPH, and HOLLINGS. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred and printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most serious health problems in the United States today has received far too little attention. The one to which I refer is the health hazard posed by the consumption of alcoholic beverages.

Alcoholism, long viewed by many as solely a moral issue calling for social censure and punishment, is increasingly being viewed as the serious health problem that it is, requiring the application of the combined skills of medicine, psychiatry, and sociology. Because alcoholism has for so long been considered a moral rather than medical problem, medical science is just now showing an awareness of the severe problems to the physical welfare of the individual which can result from the consumption of alcoholic beverages.

In March of 1966, in his health message to the Congress, President Johnson called for the start of a new program

to counter the health problems created by alcoholism. The President said:

> I have instructed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint an Advisory Committee on Alcoholism; establish in the Public Health Service a center for research on the cause, prevention, control and treatment of alcoholism; develop an education program in order to foster public understanding based on scientific fact; and work with public and private agencies on the state and local level to include this disease in comprehensive health programs.

In accordance with the President's directive a National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism was appointed and a new National Center for the Prevention and Control of Alcoholism has been established as a major bureau of the Public Health Service. This recognition of the dimensions of the multitude of health problems involved in alcoholism signals a new approach to a decidedly old, but heretofore neglected, problem.

In April of 1967 the statistical bulletin of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. reported that deaths attributed to alcoholic disorders in the United States were nearly 11,000 annually. Additionally, their research revealed that the reported death rate from alcoholic disorders had risen steadily from 5.5 per 100,000 population in 1950 to 8.7 per 100,000 population in 1964. This amounted to an increase of nearly 60 percent over this short span of time.

It must be remembered that statistics of this nature necessarily refer only to deaths actually reported for the causes listed. It is highly probable, according to the most reliable and informed sources, that the reported mortality from alcoholic disorders do not disclose an altogether accurate reflection of the extent of the problem. Several studies reveal that serious understatement exists in the reporting of deaths associated with alcoholic disorders for several understandable reasons. Because of the social stigmatism involved, friendly family doctors are frequently reluctant to list the specific cause of death in order to spare the family the unnecessary embarrassment. In many cases, they prefer to list some general cause which gives no clue as to the actual cause of death. In other cases, individuals fall victim to one of the many accidents that drinkers are prone to, such as automobile or household accidents. For these reasons the exact dimensions of the health problem posed by alcoholism, which everyone admits exists, is impossible to state with statistical precision.

While the statisticians may have difficulty in measuring the dimensions of the problem, the medical scientists know that it is one of major proportions. The evidence indicates that alcohol acts as a systemic poison for many individuals which, over the years, results in identifiable physical damage. For a long time, it has been the fashion to accept uncritically the theory that alcoholism was basically a mental disorder. Opinions are now coming around to the belief that alcoholism is the result, as well as the cause, of physical dysfunction in a cycle that seems to begin with the inability of some individuals to metabolize alcohol properly.

It has been estimated that approximately 20 percent of the adult population in the United States is physically susceptible to alcoholism. But, of course, not all of these drink. Of those who do drink statistics indicate that one out of 15 either are now or will become alcoholics regardless of their intelligence, education, or many other factors.

Whatever the cause, the health effects of alcoholism are predictable. Alcoholism stands almost alone in that every system of the body is measurably damaged; other diseases may damage specific systems, but alcoholism damages them all. Most of the damage is non-fatal, but generally three of the body systems may find fatal or permanently crippling damage:

First, the cardiovascular system, comprising the heart and blood vessels; second, the nervous system, comprising the brain, spinal cord and the various nerves running to all parts of the body; and, third, the liver itself.

The frequent drinking of large quantities of alcohol tends to raise the blood level of fats; it may also result in damage to the heart muscle. At any rate, a disproportionate number of alcoholics suffer crippling or fatal heart attacks.

Damage to the nervous system of alcoholics has been observed for centuries. Numbness in hands and feet, frequent tremors, discernible differences in brain wave patterns, and rapid brain cell damage are phenomena associated with advanced stages of the disease. As a person grows older, his brain cells die and are absorbed. Fortunately, the normal person has a reserve supply of thousands of more cells than he needs. The alcoholic literally destroys his brain, resulting in the well-known effects of delirium tremens, complete loss of memory, and mental incapacity.

Not all alcoholics progress to this state, however. Most of them die from other causes, principally cirrhosis of the liver. Cirrhosis appears eight times more frequently among alcoholics than among nonalcoholics. Although malnutrition in the alcoholic is frequently the cause of this damage, in more recent years it has been found that alcohol itself has the capacity to cause liver cell damage even if the diet is adequate.

Despite these physically identifiable health hazards, it has long been the practice to label the alcoholic instead of alcohol. Alcoholism has been equated with mental illness with the assumption that once a patient's neurosis was cured, his alcoholism would go away. The fact seems to be that for a predictable segment of our population alcohol is a systemic poison whose progressively devastating effects can be halted only by a complete cessation of drinking alcoholic beverages. For the majority of drinkers alcohol has a mild, anesthetic effect which has been judged acceptable by the majority of our citizens. However, the unwitting minority is faced with a serious health hazard.

The chief problem is the problem of education. Few people today are aware that different individuals may face different hazards in drinking. The general public, both those who drink and those who do not, assume that holding to the norm of infrequent social drinking is simply a matter of willpower and choice. The man with a physical susceptibility for alcoholism is unaware that he is exposing himself to dangers that his social drinking companions do not face.

Unfortunately, the impression of socially acceptable drinking is fostered by the $15 billion-a-year alcoholic beverage industry. Studies by the Brand Rating Index, an independent survey organization, show that nearly 50 percent of the sales of alcoholic beverages is consumed by approximately 6 percent of the population that are heavy drinkers. The vast majority of these heavy drinkers are alcoholics. This means that the alcoholic beverage industry profits from exploiting the misfortune of sick people.

Not surprisingly, the industry depends upon heavy advertising schedules and massive public relations. The five top distillers in 1966 spent $154 million on advertising. In addition, the Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., a trade organization, maintains an extensive program to secure favorable news coverage, speakers, and a respectable public image. It even has a special women's division to promote the use of alcohol among women.

Faced with this barrage of propaganda for social acceptability of alcohol, the addict, or potential addict, hears no voice warning him that alcohol can affect different people in different ways. A health warning ordered printed on each label will serve as an objective guideline upon which he can base his own judgment or spur him on to further inquiries.

On September 17 of this year the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare released a monograph entitled "Alcohol and Alcoholism." This document, along with the others which will surely follow, will add immeasurably to the existing efforts to combat the ravages of alcoholism. The closing paragraph of the preface to the monograph reads as follows:

> Successful programs for the treatment, control and prevention of alcoholism will require unprecedented public understanding, public support and public participation.

As President Johnson indicated in his health message to Congress in 1966, there is a crying need to "develop an education program to foster public understanding based on scientific fact."

The bill I am introducing today is designed to contribute to a better public awareness of the health problems involved and to enlist public support for programs of this nature. This bill is not a prohibition measure. All it does is require a health warning label, similar to that now required on cigarette packages, on alcoholic beverages containing more than 24 percent alcohol by volume.

This is a reasonable and necessary approach to the problem. Congress should face up to the acknowledged health hazards caused by alcoholism and promptly take action on this bill.

The bill (S. 2500) to require a health warning on the labels of bottles containing certain alcoholic beverages, introduced by Mr. THURMOND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice

by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2500

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(e) of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (49 Stat. 982, as amended; 27 U.S.C. 205(e)), is amended by inserting the following new paragraph immediately before the last full paragraph of such section:

"It shall be unlawful to sell or ship or deliver for sale or shipment, or otherwise introduce in interstate commerce or foreign commerce, or receive therein, or to remove from customs custody for consumption, any bottle containing a beverage having more than 24 percent of alcohol by volume, unless the label of such bottle contains the following statement: 'Caution: Consumption of alcoholic beverages may be hazardous to your health and may be habit forming.' Such statement shall be located in a conspicuous place on each label, and shall appear in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with other printed matter on the label."

EXTENSION OF DURATION OF COPYRIGHT PROTECTION IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

The subcommittee has conducted 17 days of hearings on legislation to provide for the first general revision of the copyright law since 1909. Because of serious difficulties with certain provisions of this legislation, it became apparent during the summer that the Congress could not complete action on this subject during the current session. It, therefore, became necessary to consider what interim copyright legislation would be required pending the enactment of the general revision bill.

During the earlier stages of the revision program, the 87th and 89th Congresses passed legislation extending the term of expiring copyrights. The pending revision bill, S. 597, would increase the term of new works to a term for the life of the author and for 50 years thereafter. It also provides for a substantial extension of the term of subsisting copyrights. Under these circumstances, it has seemed desirable that the terms of expiring copyrights should be temporarily extended so that these copyright owners may enjoy the benefit of any increase in term that may be enacted by the Congress.

The joint resolution which I am introducing today would continue the term of expiring copyrights until December 31, 1968. I have been informed by the Copyright Office that this resolution will affect 57,811 renewal registrations. Included among these copyrights are a number of outstanding musical compositions, such as "Alexander's Ragtime Band", "I Wonder Who's Kissing Her Now", "Down by the Old Mill Stream", "Shine on Harvest Moon", and "By the Light of the Silvery Moon". It is appropriate that this joint resolution should be introduced this week since "Take Me Out to the Ball Game" is also among the compositions that will enjoy a longer term.

One of the major issues involved in the revision bill is the copyright liability of community antenna television systems. The liability of CATV systems for copyright infringement under the Copyright Act of 1909 is the subject of current litigation. In a case now pending before the Supreme Court, lower courts have held that CATV systems are fully liable for retransmitting copyrighted programs without permission. The pending revision bill, S. 597, would modify this liability to some extent. The Federal Communications Commission, the Department of Justice, and the Copyright Office in their testimony before the subcommittee urged certain limitations on the copyright liability of CATV systems.

The subcommittee has been confronted with a situation in which, before the Congress had an opportunity to complete action on the revision bill, a number of lawsuits for copyright infringement might be filed against CATV systems. This could disrupt the television viewing of millions of our citizens. Therefore, consideration has been given to the necessity of legislation providing for a temporary suspension of judicial remedies for copyright infringement by CATV systems. This legislation would have provided for a moratorium on such lawsuits during the period of this interim copyright legislation, but would have protected the substantive rights of the copyright owners by tolling the statute of limitations, and preserving all causes of action.

Before any such legislation was introduced, all interested parties participated in a series of meetings. As a result of these discussions there has been submitted to the subcommittee certain representations on behalf of the major owners and distributors of television film programs. The representations already received, plus others which are anticipated shortly, cover about 95 percent of the copyrighted programs carried by CATV. These representations provide that, while the parties are negotiating contractual arrangements and discussing appropriate legislative formulas, the copyright owners will refrain from instituting legal action against CATV systems. It is further provided that in the event such negotiations are terminated no infringement suits will be filed for a period of 90 days.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have been assured that these representations are made in good faith. The subcommittee expects both the copyright owners and the National Community Television Association to observe the commitments which they have voluntarily made. Consequently, under the existing circumstances there does not appear to be a substantial risk of lawsuits, and it would appear that no legislative action on this issue is required at the present time. The subcommittee will continue to observe developments, so that it may be prepared to take appropriate action in the future if this should prove necessary. But, as of now, it would seem that the only interim copyright legislation which must be considered at this session is the extension of expiring copyrights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 114) extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS TO S. 2226, THE CATTLE INDUSTRY TRADE CONFERENCE ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 2226, to provide for an annual conference between representatives of the beef industry, the Secretary of Agriculture, and representatives of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to consider problems relating to the export of beef and beef products from the United States and related international trade problems, and for other purposes, the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HILL, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McGEE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

I also ask that the statements of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] relating to the bill be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

The statements are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HATFIELD

Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to join as a co-sponsor of S. 2226, the cattle industry trade conference bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman).

Although I was not a member of the Small Business Committee at the time of the hearings in 1965 and 1966, I became a member in time to consider and participate in the report on livestock exports expansion which the Committee filed on June 12—Senate Report 343, 90th Congress Session.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I am aware of the fact that sales of beef animals account for fully one-quarter of all farm income. Therefore, any steps that can be taken to assist in the strengthening of domestic and foreign markets for this commodity will have wide benefits to livestock producers and processors across the country.

It is a pleasure for me to associate myself with the other Senators who have offered their support to this measure with these goals in mind.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

Mr. President, on August 3, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman) introduced S. 2226, the proposed Cattle Industry Trade Conference Act. On that day I was unavoidably absent. It is my understanding that 25 Senators have since asked to co-sponsor this measure.

As Chairman of the Small Business Committee, I would like to take this opportunity to join as the 26th co-sponsor, and to commend the Senator from Alabama for the leadership which he has provided in this area.

Senator Sparkman was among the first to bring to the attention of the Senate and the

American public, the potential abroad for the sale of U.S. quality meat products and the significance to small and independent livestock producers, finishers and processors, as well as the nation's balance of payments. The investigation of these possibilities spanned nearly three years and three sets of hearings before our Small Business Committee.

As a result, we have learned from the officials of the European Economic Community of a potential market which will have to be serviced by imports and which may reach a billion dollars a year by 1970. Moreover, the EEC constitutes less than half of the 380 million consumers in Western Europe.

It would seem eminently sensible for our meat industries in this country to examine these trade prospects on a regular and continuing basis, and this is what S. 2226 seeks to bring about.

For these reasons I am glad to support this legislation and to recognize the initiative and the accomplishments of the Senator from Alabama in this matter.

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE FRENCH REPUBLIC, RELATING TO TAXES ON INCOME—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive N, 90th Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and the French Republic with respect to taxes on income, signed at Paris on July 28, 1967, transmitted today by the President of the United States and that the convention, together with the message from the President, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and the French Republic with respect to taxes on income, signed at Paris on July 28, 1967.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the convention and the copy, enclosed therewith, of a note addressed on July 28, 1967, by the American Ambassador in Paris to the Secretary General of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Upon entry into force, the existing income tax convention of July 25, 1939, between the United States and France would be abrogated in its entirety and the double taxation convention of October 18, 1946, the supplementary protocol of May 17, 1948, and the supplementary convention of June 22, 1956, would be superseded insofar as they concern taxes on income, capital, and stock exchange transactions.

Fundamental changes in the French income tax structure were made in 1965. The new convention reflects those changes and also changes made in U.S. law by the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966. Certain aspects of the model convention on taxation of income and capital published in 1963 by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—resulting from the trend toward standardizing international tax relationships, are also reflected in the new convention with France.

The new convention follows the patterns set by the income tax conventions with Germany, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands as recently amended.

Among the articles of special interest are those which provide: (a) that dividends received by a U.S. corporation from a French affiliate will be subject to tax at a 5-percent rate instead of the 15-percent rate applicable under the existing convention; (b) that interest income will be subject to tax at a 10-percent tax rate in most cases instead of the 15-percent rate applicable under the existing convention; (c) that royalties, instead of being exempt from tax in the source country, will be subject to a 5-percent tax; (d) for changes in the definition of industrial and commercial profits to include motion picture film rentals; and (e) that France waives its tax on imputed income based on the rental value of property in certain cases where a U.S. resident owns property in France.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to this convention with France.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 3, 1967.*

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 3, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 602. An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

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.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HAYDEN ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I regret very much that I could not be on the floor of the Senate yesterday to pay tribute and to offer congratulations to our distinguished and beloved President pro tempore on the occasion of his 90th birthday anniversary. I was in Alabama attending a seminar sponsored by the Small Business Administration. I trust that the senior Senator from Arizona will know that my remarks today are no less sincere by reason of their being offered a day late.

I have known CARL HAYDEN since I first came to Congress as a Member of the House in 1936. At that time, Senator HAYDEN had been a Member of the Senate for 10 years, having been elected in 1926, after serving 15 years in the House of Representatives.

CARL HAYDEN is one of the most colorful Members of Congress. He was twice elected sheriff of Maricopa County—in 1906 and 1908. At that time, Arizona was a Territory, and the West was pretty wild. The sheriff was the law in those days, and it took a man of great courage and ability to fill the job. CARL HAYDEN was such a man. Following his service as sheriff, and upon the admission of Arizona as a State, he was elected as his State's first Representative in Congress.

As his years of service to Arizona and to America rolled by CARL HAYDEN built a remarkable reputation for ability and integrity. These two qualities, in combination with his seniority, have brought many honors to Senator HAYDEN. He serves as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and is a member of both the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He also serves as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The remarkable thing about CARL HAYDEN is that with all of the power and influence which is his to command, and with all the honors which have come his way, he remains a kind and considerate friend, always sensitive to the needs and feelings of others.

It is a great privilege for me to pay tribute to this great Senator and great American, and to wish him a happy birthday.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am delighted to learn that yesterday was the 90th birthday anniversary of the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the President pro tempore of the Senate. This is a rare benchmark for any of us to reach, particularly when leading the strenuous and tension-ridden life of Congress, and I congratulate Senator HAYDEN on achieving it.

More to the point, I congratulate his State of Arizona on having such a fine, powerful, and intelligent spokesman in Congress.

In that my father and Senator HAYDEN served together and were friends in the House of Representatives, I add a personal word of good wishes, and also a word of thanks to a senior colleague who has always been as kind and thoughtful as has Senator HAYDEN to me.

NO INFLATION IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, much has been published in the newspapers recently about the danger of inflation and of advancing food prices. As a Senator from an agricultural State, where prices received for farm commodities have been falling, I find it quite difficult to understand.

Farm prices are indefensibly low, compared with farm costs. They are lower than they were 20 years ago. I have just examined the September issue of Economic Indicators, published by the Joint Economic Committee. It shows that the wholesale price index for farm commodities was 8.7 points down from August a

year ago, and stood at 99.4 in August of this year. The wholesale price index on processed foods was off 3.6 points between August 1966 and August this year.

There is no sudden spurt in the economy and purchasing power to indicate inflation. Economic Indicators shows that we experienced a slight decline in gross national product in the first quarter this year, based on a stable price level, and that our economic growth rate in the first half of the year was only about 2.5 percent—far less than we require to maintain stable employment and a stable economy.

In the absence of any sign in economic statistics to justify inflation warnings one must conclude that if prices, and especially food prices, are advanced now it will be as a consequence of handlers increasing their markups to keep their profits stable in face of a decline in volume sold, rather than a consequence of burgeoning gross national product and purchasing power.

I certainly hope, Mr. President, that no one will have the audacity to blame rising farm prices for any increases which may be made in retail food costs, although I shall not be surprised if it happens. In the past, small increases in farm prices have been used as an excuse for much larger increases in retail food prices. But it is going to be difficult to blame farmers for any advances in food prices now when farm prices are indefensibly low and still falling. The parity index just issued shows that prices received by farmers on September 15 were 73 percent of parity—down 7 percent from September 15 a year ago and 2 percent from August 15 this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article by William H. Kester, financial editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, on the paradox of lower wholesale and basic commodity price levels, and talk of inflation.

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

INFLATIONARY INFLUENCES MOUNT DESPITE DROP IN PRICE INDEXES

(By William H. Kester)

Expectations of inflation are widespread, although wholesale price indexes have declined in the last 12 months.

The recent boom in stock prices has been attributed to investors' beliefs that further increases in the general price level are inevitable, especially in view of the reluctance of Congress to increase taxes.

Many economists inside and outside the Administration have warned of incipient inflation in recent weeks.

WHOLESALE INDEX DECLINES

But the Government's wholesale price index in August was 106.1 per cent of the 1957–59 average, compared with the record high of 106.8 reached in August and September last year.

In addition, the Government's index of basic raw material prices has dropped about 10 per cent in the last 12 months and is more than 15 per cent below the 1966 peak. The decline has been widespread, with raw industrial commodity prices off 20 per cent from the March 1966 peak and foodstuffs showing a 14 per cent decline since reaching a peak in August 1966.

The decline in the last 12 months of the over-all wholesale price index resulted from a decline in prices of farm products and processed foods that more than offset higher prices of industrial commodities.

Prices of industrial commodities were stable from last February to July after a two-year period of increases that added 4 per cent to the index. In August, the rise was resumed and recently announced price increases have apparently pushed the index to new highs.

The price level of farm products has declined this year due in large part to expectations of record harvests and increased supplies.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX HIGHER

Inflationary trends are evident in the consumer price index—which increased at a 4 per cent annual rate from April to July, after rising at a 2 per cent rate during the previous seven months, the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis reported. The index, which is not adjusted for seasonal variations, in July was 2.8 per cent higher than it was a year earlier.

The bank noted that the acceleration in the index was due primarily to food prices. These vary seasonally.

There has been no acceleration in the rise of consumer prices other than food, the bank reported. It said these prices increased at a 3 per cent annual rate from April to July, virtually the same rate as in the previous seven months.

WAGE SPIRAL ACCELERATES

Many recent price increases have been made to cover higher wage costs. Collective bargain settlements in the first half of 1967 involved wage and fringe benefit increases averaging 4.6 per cent a year, compared with increases of 4.1 per cent in all of 1966 and 3.3 per cent in 1965.

Not only have wage costs increased at a faster pace this year than in other recent years, but productivity gains have been limited by the decline in manufacturing output in the early part of 1967.

"The combination of rising labor costs and virtual stability in output per man-hour resulted in a sharp increase in labor costs per unit of output," the Federal Reserve Bank of New York said in its latest monthly review.

The Government's index of labor cost for each unit of manufacturing output in July was 106.7 per cent of the 1957–59 average, compared with 100.8 a year earlier. From 1959 to 1966 it was about steady.

Inflationary pressures will be reduced but not eliminated as manufacturing output expands. The bank said "while productivity can reasonably be expected to move upward once again as the economy expands more vigorously, it is unlikely that the growth in output per man-hour will be adequate to offset mounting labor costs."

DEMAND PUSH NOTED

Another source of recent inflationary pressures has been the increase in demand, the New York Reserve Bank said. As sales went up, producers have been encouraged to hike prices to cover rising costs and to recover profit margins.

Profits of corporations have declined this year despite rising sales for most. In the first half of this year, the ratio of profits to income originating in corporations was 12 per cent, compared with a peak of 13.5 per cent in the first quarter of 1966.

Much of the consumer price index—which is widely used as a measure of inflation—is based on consumer services, in which improvements in labor productivity are small. As a result, the consumer price index has an upward trend.

Wages in the consumer service industries continue to rise along with those in other industries, where labor is more highly unionized and labor productivity increases are larger. But the small improvements in labor productivity in the consumer service industries do not offset the increased labor costs, and prices are hiked to cover the wage increases.

SENATORS BIBLE AND CANNON HAIL ACCEPTANCE OF F–111

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the formal acceptance of the F–111 by the Tactical Air Command on September 23, 1967, at Nellis Air Force Base ranks with other significant milestones in the annals of aviation. It is a natural step ahead in the tradition of the Wright brothers' initial flight and the XF–1's breaking of the sound barrier by Chuck Yeager.

We now have a swing-wing airplane in the Air Force inventory capable of assuming any mode, flying high or low, fast or slow, and carrying weights unheard of in the history of tactical aviation. Like all aircraft, it has had its growing pains, but recent reports are most encouraging.

Although still in the category III testing stage, the present F–111 aircraft at Nellis are averaging 60 hours a month, an unprecedented accomplishment for a new weapons system, I am told. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the commemorative remarks made on September 23 by the commander of the Tactical Air Command and by the senior and junior Senators from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CANNON] during the dedication ceremony at Nellis Air Force Base.

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

REMARKS BY GEN. G. P. DISOSWAY, COMMANDER, TACTICAL AIR COMMAND, NELLIS AFB, NEV., SEPTEMBER 23, 1967

I'm delighted to be out here today for the ceremony bringing the F–111A into the tactical inventory. We always have a lot of problems with airplanes until we get them out in the field and then the people in the field seem to cure it. As an example of this, since we've had these airplanes out here we've been flying them about 60 hours a month each. This is unprecedented with a new aircraft. No matter what you read in the newspapers it does fly and that's why we flew it today so all of you could witness it in flight.

We've got great hopes for the airplane. We've got lots of things to do with it because it's in the Category III testing. At the same time we're doing that, we're going to have to upgrade our instructor pilots so that they can carry on the training of the other people who will come in as we get more aircraft in the inventory.

As you know, not only the Combat Crew Training but also the first wing is going to be here at Nellis. So we've got lots of work to do. We've got lots of testing to do in the various modes that this aircraft is capable of.

It's certainly the most advanced aircraft right now, I suspect, in the world, although the Russians, I understand, had a swing-wing at a show they had over in Moscow. I haven't asked Mr. Cosby to analyze that to see if they've stolen any of his ideas on the General Dynamics swing-wing airplane.

So, all in all, we're very happy to have it. We've got it where it belongs—with the people who're going to fly it and fight it. We're going to make a good weapons system out of it.

REMARKS OF SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, AT THE FORMAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE F–111 BY THE AIR TACTICAL COMMAND, NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, LAS VEGAS, NEV., SEPTEMBER 23, 1967

After seeing the F–111 in action, I want to say first of all that I'm glad it's on our side.

It would be a gross understatement to describe it merely as an impressive aircraft.

Based on today's demonstration, I think all of us agree it will prove a powerful addition to the air arm of our nation's defense posture.

Now that it's airborne, I for one hope the controversy which has shadowed the F-111 stage will finally subside. This pioneer aircraft should be judged purely on its merits.

I realize problems still exist in the development of the Navy version, but from what I have heard and just seen the F-111A performs very well indeed for the Air Force. Pilots have referred to it as the "Cadillac of the Air" and "the greatest thing with wings since angels."

Pilots also agree it is a remarkably versatile aircraft which lives up to its biling as a complete airborne weapons system. It flys high and low, fast and slow, throws a power punch greater than five World War II heavy bombers and is able to sniff out targets with unerring accuracy.

It sounds as if I have a great deal of respect for the judgment of our Air Force pilots. I do, because I have always had a sneaking suspicion that pilots know more about flying airplanes than anyone else. And I think it's significant that a good deal of the criticism of the F-111 has come from people who aren't pilots.

I take a great deal of interest in the affairs of Nellis Air Force Base. I am proud of the important role it plays in our effort to win the war in Vietnam as well as its role in our other defense obligations.

Assignment of the F-111 to the Air Tactical Command has meant a tremendous increase in personnel and physical facilities here at Nellis. I am happy that my position as Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Sub-Committee on Military Construction has made it possible for me to insure that the needs of this important installation are met. I intend to see that these needs continue to be met in the future, because I view the mission of the United States Air Force as vital to the defense of this nation.

This week, Nellis takes part in observances marking the 20th anniversary of the Air Force. Nothing so graphically illustrates the tremendous progress of this arm of the service than the flight of the F-111 here today. It is a remarkable plane; one which looks capable of carrying on its own private war.

But if the F-111 is a challenging aircraft, certainly its application as the number one Air Force weapon and the training of the men who will fly it is a challenge of equal magnitude.

It deserves the best possible care. And it will be guaranteed the best, because it is in the hands of the officers and men of Nellis Air Force Base. I am happy you have been chosen by your government for this important responsibility.

REMARKS OF SENATOR HOWARD W. CANNON, AT NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE OPEN HOUSE FOR F-111

Distinguished guests, I am honored by this opportunity to participate in welcoming the F-111 to Nellis Air Force Base.

I am told that the fighter-jockeys here could not wait and have already logged more than 500 hours in this great airplane. Now that I have talked with them and seen for myself, I can understand their tremendous enthusiasm.

We are delighted that Nellis has been chosen as the F-111's "home". The plane has been to the jungles of Panama and the frozen wastes of Alaska; it has traveled overseas as far as the United Kingdom and France; it has been tested at facilities across the country from California to New York. I am sure I speak for all of us in saying, "welcome to Nevada".

Over the years, we have welcomed a proud procession of tactical aircraft through Nellis—the F-86 Sabrejet, the F-100 Supersabre, the F-105 Thunderchief, the F-4 Phantom. But the F-111 is much more than just a worthy successor. It opens a new era in the effectiveness, versatility and striking power of our tactical forces. It is fitting that it has arrived at a time when the Air Force is celebrating its 20th birthday.

It is fitting on this occasion to pay tribute to some of the men responsible for this bold breakthrough, men like General Frank Everest, the TAC commander who was one of the first to grasp the untapped military potential of the variable sweep wing. To him goes much of the credit for assuring that tactical aviation would remain in the technological forefront. Even now the principle of this wing is being proposed for the advanced manned strategic bomber, the supersonic transport, and next generation fighters such as the FX and VFAX. TAC has led the way with the F-111.

Another is General Walter C. Sweeney, the TAC commander who was a driving force behind the F-111 until his untimely passing. I recall his remarks in 1964, when the first F-111 rolled out of the factory at Fort Worth. He said:

"The F-111 represents far more than just a new aircraft with greater flexibility to us. It represents a major break-through in tactical air capabilities.

"Many planes have come close. But there was always a compromise.

"The F-111 with its revolutionary variable-geometry wing will give us a combination of tactical air capabilities far beyond those we have been able to achieve up to now in any single aircraft."

General Disosway, General Taylor, and men of the USAF Tactical Weapons Center, we are proud to be here with you today to celebrate the payoff—the formal acceptance of the F-111 into the TAC inventory. The military development agencies and the nationwide industrial team led by General Dynamics Corporation have worked hard for almost five years with only one thought in mind—to deliver to you the finest tactical weapon system that has ever been built. I know you join me in acknowledging the great debt that is owed them.

In the F-111 you have the revolutionary new aircraft that General Everest was told might never work. In the F-111 you have the tactical system without compromises that General Sweeney envisioned. Their hopes are now your hardware. Yours is the high honor of being the first to cross one of the most significant thresholds in the history of tactical airpower.

Aircraft have been spanning the Atlantic unrefueled for years, but not tactical aircraft. Strategic bombers have long routinely carried payloads in the five figures, but not tactical aircraft. As tactical aircraft have improved in speed and range, moreover, there have usually been attendant drawbacks in deployment flexibility. Runways have had to be lengthened and reinforced reliability and maintainability have become more complex, and requirements for support equipment have increased.

For the first time, in the F-111, you have an aircraft that combines these capabilities into a single, multi-potent package—one that excels at both supersonic and subsonic speeds, simply by moving its wings—one that can operate from short, unprepared fields, yet carries payloads that blur the distinction between tactical and strategic aircraft—one that can deploy anywhere in the world without tanker support, but is also highly reliable, easy to maintain, and needs only a minimum of facilities.

In the F-111, you have a tactical weapon system with all-weather precision bombing accuracies and defense penetration capabilities superior to those of any other aircraft in the USAF inventory. You have an aircraft that will multiply several-fold the effective combat durations and distances available to the tactical commander, whether the mission is close-support with the F-111's internal gun or long-range strikes with the full spectrum of conventional and nuclear weapons. You have an aircraft so advanced, militarily and technologically, that other countries have been left far behind and are now seeking to catch up.

Now it is up to you. From your ranks will come the pilots and ground crews who will weld these capabilities into combat ready units. You will be the ones who rewrite the book on tactical doctrines with this extraordinary aircraft. In the process, I am sure you will be setting new records, adding to the long list the F-111 has already compiled. More important, you will be gaining the training and experience necessary to assure that your "birds" are there whenever and wherever tactical airpower is needed. I am confident that the F-111 fighting units you will form here and command will be second to none in the world today.

We in Nevada are proud to share in this endeavor. That Nellis has been selected for the F-111 speaks well for the Las Vegas climate and the excellent community relationships that have been built up over the years. An important part of the success of the training at Nellis is the support that we have given and will continue to give its personnel and programs.

I am proud to have been a part of the development and growth here at Nellis for a period predating my service in the Senate. Proud because this base has for many years placed our State in the forefront of the Nation's defense. And now—thanks to the F-111—that contribution will continue and be enlarged.

Thank you.

"THE SICKNESS OF ANACHRONISM" AND "THE AMERICAN PROMISE"

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, two extremely perceptive articles of great pertinence and of enduring worth appear as full-page editorials in successive issues of Newsweek. In the issue of October 2, Emmet John Hughes writes on "The Sickness of Anachronism." He points out that while the world moves, our foreign policy does not. It is rigid, ossified, obsolete. He points out that our actions in world affairs are dated by treaties entered into in past decades under conditions which are no longer applicable.

Walter Lippmann, in the October 9 issue, writes on "The American Promise" and points to the great distrust that now exists in the world of our foreign policy which is "accentuated by the spectacular ineffectiveness" of the administration's "resort to military force" and that "as against the military muddle in Vietnam there is, by way of contrast, the tremendous example of the American way of life."

Both of these editorials, written by two extremely knowledgeable and lucid writers, deserve wide reading. 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:

THE SICKNESS OF ANACHRONISM

(By Emmet John Hughes)

"If I were Secretary of State," a veteran of twenty years of Washington politics told me last week, "I would urgently start measuring how far the world has traveled these last two decades—and how far American policy has lagged behind. I would restudy all the premises of the 1940s and all the stale official definitions of 'aggressive world Communism.'

And I would review all commitments around the globe—to sift out the worthless and the reckless."

Such an assessment would seem not at all remarkable from an Administration critic like Sen. William Fulbright. But the critic voicing this distress stands among Lyndon Johnson's closest counselors. And such nagging unease even within this privileged circle sharply suggests the whole Capital's growing awareness that national policy betrays again a familiar American weakness: the habit of clocking history by the minute hand of a sluggish timepiece, while the rest of the world races ahead by its own calendar of the years.

The sense of this seems quickened this season by the simultaneous celebration of different but related birthdays. In Washington, the Central Intelligence Agency—a kind of American monument to the East-West conflict—has just celebrated its twentieth anniversary, with the President hailing its performance as "the best in the world." In New York, the U.N. General Assembly has celebrated its 22nd session by electing as its President the Rumanian Foreign Minister—the first Communist to be so honored. And in San Francisco, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara celebrated "the 22nd Year of the Atomic Age" by outlining a $5 billion defense screen against Chinese missiles, while plaintively appealing: "What the world requires . . . is a new race toward reasonableness."

The appeal sounds unassailable. But to many American ears, it rings hollow. For there are few voices in the land to proclaim confidently the current *reasonableness* of American policy.

The doubt hinges critically on the question of historic time. The basic U.S. commitments embrace no less than 42 countries; some U.S. military presence appears in 38 countries; and some kind of U.S. aid travels to 76 countries. These commitments find roots in a diplomacy aged exactly twenty years: the Inter-American Treaty (1947), NATO (1949), and SEATO (1954). Yet the quickest glimpse of the world of twenty years ago—this very month—suggests an almost alien world . . . In the Middle East, the British Palestine police were haplessly fighting off Jewish guerrillas sworn to make an Israel yet unborn . . . In the Far East, the Chiang Kai-shek government was shooting its own generals to stamp out corruption in Manchuria . . . In Rumania, there was heard no soft-spoken leader aspiring to preside over the United Nations, but the strident Ana Pauker lashing all Americans as "Fascists."

The insistent doubt rises: could policies apt for *then* also be fit for *now*? Yet the basic American designs seem amended scarcely at all . . . In Europe, a U.S. force of more than 350,000 men still stands watch against the most unlikely of events—a massive Soviet drive to the Atlantic. *Why?* . . . In Asia, a U.S. force of nearly 700,000, from Vietnam to Korea, is deployed to impose a political settlement by containing a China bloodily divided against itself and politically quarantined by America. *How?* . . . And in Washington, all the world of the late 1960s seems addressed with precisely the rhetoric—and the righteousness—that were the political fashion of the early 1950s. On almost any occasion, the latest apologia proclaimed by Dean Rusk could be read as the oldest anathema hurled by John Foster Dulles. Indeed, the official rhetoric insists that the war in Vietnam *is* the same as the defense of Berlin. *Really?*

It is this profound lack of discernment that marks the faltering of American leadership. Such as the bloated size of American purpose that its commitments do not merely span the continents: no less indiscriminately, they span the decades. And from this there can follow the worst kind of national policy: random, reactionary and headlong.

Even the concern voiced to me by the President's friend itself seems belated. For it called to mind a conversation in London—a full ten years ago—with the gifted Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick, then Permanent Under Secretary of the Foreign Office. "If this thing we call 'the West' is to survive," the veteran diplomat warned, "we must decide not only what to save but also what *not* to save. We cannot arm, educate, industrialize and inspire every country on earth. We must judge certain places worth little enough to say to the Communists: 'It's yours. Take it. Spend your rubles, send your technicians, pick your puppets—and waste your time!' We cannot be—or do—all things with all nations. We must fix priorities. We must make choices. What else lies within reason?"

It is this frontier of reason that American policy still seems unable to find and to heed.

THE AMERICAN PROMISE

(By Walter Lippmann)

After a summer in Europe, when for the most part I sat back and watched, I am impressed with how much Americans and Europeans are involved in the same predicament. For us all the world is disorderly and dangerous, ungoverned and apparently ungovernable. Everywhere there is great anxiety and bewilderment. This general concern about the threat of atomic war, of revolution and counterrevolution is suffused by almost everybody's preoccupation with the difficult business of living in the modern age.

The governments of the more advanced countries, those which have outgrown the first illusions of liberation and independence, are all of them unpopular governments. For they are failing to cope with disorders abroad and with trouble at home. In the more-developed countries, Communist as well as non-Communist, there are no great sustaining, unifying and inspiring beliefs, no schemes of salvation and no ardent promises of better things to come.

This dusty outlook marks, I believe, the historic fact that we are living through the closing chapters of the established and traditional way of life. We are in the early beginnings of a struggle, which will probably last for generations, to remake our civilization. It is not a good time for politicians. It is a time for prophets and leaders and explorers and inventors and pioneers, and for those who are willing to plant trees for their children to sit under.

The international order which evolved since the Middle Ages, the order imposed and managed by the Western great powers, has been shattered. There are some who think we can return to that old order, with the United States replacing the Great Britain of the nineteenth century. But all who think this, President Johnson and Secretary Rusk and Mr. Nixon for example, merely compound the confusion and anarchy of the international order. It is a naïve illusion that 1967 is 1939, that Southeast Asia is Western Europe, that Mao Tse-tung is Hitler and that Lyndon Johnson is Churchill. It is not producing a firm and free international order but the largest quagmire in which this country has ever floundered.

Unpopularity. The best that can be said for President Johnson is that the other leaders of great powers are also in trouble. The Gallup polls are bad reading in Paris, London, Moscow, New Delhi and Peking. This general unpopularity of the governments of great powers throws light on the problem. But it does not explain away what has happened in Washington. More is expected and more is demanded of the President of the United States than from any other head of government. For the United States is incomparably the most powerful country in the world. Moreover the original purpose of America has created hopes and expectations in the hearts of men everywhere. The original vocation and destiny of the American people has been, not that they should rule the world, but, that they should provide an example of how men can live in freedom.

The dislike and distrust of Johnson's America is harsh. It stems in the last analysis, I believe, from a feeling of having been let down. There is a growing belief that Johnson's America is no longer the historic America, that it is a bastard empire which relies on superior force to achieve its purposes, and is no longer providing an example of the wisdom and humanity of a free society. There is, to be sure, envy, fear, rivalry in the worldwide anti-Johnsonism. But the inner core of this sentiment is a feeling of betrayal and abandonment. It is a feeling that the American promise has been betrayed and abandoned.

Ineffectiveness. This feeling is accentuated by the spectacular ineffectiveness of President Johnson's resort to military force. After years of struggle the greatest military power on earth finds itself unable to bend to its will a small and backward people. Our hawks ascribe this lack of military success to the official strategy of wounding but not killing the adversary. The performance in Vietnam would be a military scandal were it not a demonstration, which is of enormous historic significance, that the firepower of modern weaponry can annihilate an adversary or neutralize him but it cannot bend him to its will.

As against the military muddle in Vietnam there is, by way of contrast, the tremendous example of the American way of life. An irresistible tide of Americanization is flooding the world with our airplanes and computers and supermarkets, our household appliances, with ready-made clothing, with mechanical entertainment, carrying along with it what is convenient and pleasant in our lives and also much of our vulgarity.

The fact of our example is greater than the force of our arms. If only we realized this, if only we were governed by men who realized that the age of Roosevelt and Churchill is over, we might begin to pull ourselves out of the quagmire.

OPPOSITION TO FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN BILL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, almost daily I encounter evidence of widespread opposition to the Federal Election Campaign bill that is scheduled to be reported this week by the Committee on Finance.

I have not been surprised. I cannot imagine that the American people would countenance opening the U.S. Treasury in order to pay for the election of campaign of politicians. This proposal is especially repugnant at a time when we cannot balance the budget, when we face a deficit of almost $30 billion, and when the President wants more taxes. But in my view, it would be repugnant to the American people at any time.

I invite the attention of the Senate to three editorials published in Georgia newspapers recently which express opposition to this proposal in no uncertain terms, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Savannah Morning News, Sept. 27, 1967]

DEFEAT CAMPAIGN SUBSIDY

Georgia's Sen. Herman Talmadge is congratulated for his stand against the public subsidy of presidential and senatorial election campaigning.

Sen. Talmadge last week urged the defeat

of a bill which would provide some $28 million of public funds for the presidential and vice-presidential campaigns and $26 million for Senate nominees.

Talmadge, and we, call the bill "unthinkable."

In the first place, even if financing politicians of opposing political parties were an advisable undertaking, now is not the time to do it. In the second place, there is no good time to do it.

"At a time when we cannot balance the budget—when the President is requesting additional taxes of $8 billion to saddle another burden on the taxpayers of this country to say you must finance politicians, you must turn the keys of the Treasury over to politicians is "unthinkable,'" Talmadge said.

An obvious disadvantage of such a bill is that it is similar to arming both sides in a military conflict—merely an expensive way to waste ammuntion from both sides of the public trough.

Furthermore, when the President has been in office more than four years, the voters already know what he has to offer. They do not need to waste $28 million to hear more of his promises. They might, in fact, be willing to spend twice that to support an opponent able to unseat him.

In that case, the equal slice of public funds would only serve to perpetuate an unpopular and unwanted regime in power.

If the people wish to support the campaign of their favorite Senate or presidential candidate, they are free to do this privately—and selectively—without the "unthinkable" necessity to raise taxes to subsidize both sides of a political propaganda war.

The campaign financing bill should be defeated.

[From the Augusta Herald, Sept. 27, 1967]

THE PERSISTENT RAIDERS

Political "ins" who almost had a financial bonanza, in the form of a federal presidential campaign subsidy, within their grasp, only to have it snatched away by a Congress that finally had come to its senses, do not give up a good thing easily.

Last year, a proposal by Sen. Russell Long (D-La.) to permit taxpayers to check off, in their income tax returns, a $1 contribution to a presidential campaign fund, slipped through Congress with very little fanfare. After some second thoughts, the present session of Congress voted to suspend the operation of the law, which it was estimated would pour $30 million apiece into the war chests of the two major parties. That, supposedly, was an end to the plunderers' raiding ambitions.

But the tenacity of those who sense a windfall is not to be discounted. This same subsidy proposition, in somewhat altered form, has popped up once again. The Senate Finance Committee, dominated by the same Sen. Russell Long, has reported out a modified version of Long's original "check off" plan which would permit taxpayers to subtract up to $25 from their annual tax bill for contributions to political candidates at any level. The bill would make available an estimated $54 million—$14 million to each of the two major party candidates for President and $26 million to the candidates in 34 Senate contests—all of it in federal funds.

There is a big catch, however. The money isn't there, and won't be there next year. Sen. John L. Williams (R-Del.), one of the leaders in the fight to repeal the original Long bill, has called pointed attention to the fact that upcoming revenues are already more than spoken for and that creation of this political slush fund would only make worse the overspending binge on which the current Administration has embarked.

"At a time when the federal deficit is $25 to $30 billion and we're talking about increasing taxes," he said, "it's unbelievable that Congress and the Administration would ask their grandchildren to finance the 1968 election. The money isn't in the Treasury."

Actually, cost of the proposed subsidy could be much more—well over $100 million. What the cost might be if House members also decide to hop aboard the gravy train is anybody's guess. This they can do if they choose; the campaign contribution proposal was tacked on as an amendment to a House-passed bill to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury, and in this amended form would be subject to further House approval—and further amendment.

The subsidy bill, patently a financing hedge by a party that has found itself dismally on the decline in popularity—not to mention, undercut financially—has generated strong opposition from the Republicans as well as from a number of Democrats. Among the latter are Sen. Herman Talmadge of Georgia, lone Democratic dissenter on the Finance Committee, and Sen. Frank Lausche of Ohio, who has called the proposal "unjust, wicked . . . an insult to the intelligence of every taxpayer in the United States."

And that it is. We have seen, in our times, the Treasury raided under any number of half-baked pretexts. Now, to throw the coffers—and empty coffers, at that—open to politicians whose chief concern seems to be no better than that of self-perpetuation in office, would be the ultimate in the public's surrender of its political birthright.

[From the Dublin Courier-Herald, Sept. 25, 1967]

NO TAXES FOR POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

The suggestion of using tax monies for political campaigns is about the worst ideas of the use of tax monies we can think of. By no stretch of the imagination can we see that tax monies should be spent in campaigns for political office.

And there are reasons.

In the first place, the American public is saddled with enough things for which tax monies are spent, things that range for trying to educate and train people who don't want to be educated and trained to paying for high-priced bombs that are dropped on the trees in the jungles of Vietnam.

In the second place, we shudder to think that money we pay in taxes will be used to promote the campaign of a man we don't want elected to office. We can think of nothing that would be less palatable to us than using tax money we pay to promote the campaign of the present President for reelection.

In the third place, it seems to be a dangerous precedent for taxpayers to pay campaign expenses on the national level, to be brought then down to the state level for U.S. Senators, and then certain to be brought to the district level for U.S. Representatives. It would then be only a short step for agitation to pay political expenses of state and local candidates. Somehow, we think the taxpayers of the nation have enough on their shoulders paying for the operations of the government. Paying for people to get places in the government seems a burden too great to bear.

FEASIBILITY OF THE METRIC SYSTEM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President as another session of Congress moves into its final weeks, the Nation may once again be losing its change to ascertain the benefits to our economy of switching to the metric system of weights and measures.

There are many who feel already that such a change would bring with it large economic benefits through increased efficiency at home and increased sales abroad.

The grocery industry, in its trade magazine, Grocery Manufacturer, has spoken strongly in favor of legislation which Representative GEORGE P. MILLER and I have introduced to study the feasibility of a switch to the metric system.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article, entitled "Grams for Groceries?" be printed in the RECORD.

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

GRAMS FOR GROCERIES?

Only U.S. of all major nations clings to use of pounds as basic measurement, so two bills before Congress propose three-year study of problems in conversion to metric system.

Nine out of ten people in the world use kilograms and meters as measures of weight and length, and before long the United States will be the only major nation which still measures in pounds and yards. The trend is strongly toward worldwide adoption of the metric system.

The metric system has been legal in the United States for 101 years. While its adoption has grown and some industries have converted completely to its use, grocery manufacturing in this country has barely been touched by the metric trend. Only a few packaged food producers list the contents of their packages in grams as well as pounds to use the same containers in foreign as well as domestic distribution.

All of this could change in the not-too-distant future. Legislation for a three-year study of the problems of U.S. conversion to the metric system has twice passed the Senate and has Administration support. This just might be the year for one tentative step toward conforming with the rest of the world.

The key bills are S. 441, by Sen. Claiborne Pell (D., R.I.), and H.R. 3136, by Rep. George P. Miller (D., Calif.). The stumbling block for a metric study has been the House Rules Committee, where the Miller bill has rested for months following approval by a House committee.

Both the Senate and House bills declare: "That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the impact of increasing worldwide use of the metric system in the United States; to appraise the desirability and practicality of increasing the use of metric weights and measures in the United States, and to evaluate the costs and benefits of alternative courses of action which may be feasible for the United States."

The bill calls for "appropriate participation by representatives of United States industry, science, engineering, and labor, and their associations, in the planning and conduct of the program . . . and in the evaluation of the information secured under such program." The study would be completed within three years of enactment of a law. A first-year appropriation of $500,000 would be authorized. Cost of the study would be about $2.5 million.

GMA silent. While there are some vocal business proponents and opponents of U.S. adoption of the metric system, the general attitude of American industry has been one of watchful waiting. Some trade associations have committees investigating the problems. Grocery Manufacturers of America has no policy on converting to metrics but is watching the legislative situation.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has taken no position for or against the metric system but has endorsed the study proposal, providing the legislation retains its present language guaranteeing business rep-

resentation in conducting and evaluating the government study. Some manufacturers are opposed even to a study, fearing it would lead to the change.

It is admitted by everybody that converting to the metric system would be very expensive for U.S. industry. A Stanford University survey estimated this cost at $11 billion. General Motors considers this figure is far too low and believes the price tag might be $26 billion. General Electric estimates its own conversion costs at $200 million.

Nobody really knows the price tag. However, most students of the problem agree that the longer the delay, the higher the cost. Advocates like Senator Pell argue that as much as $20 billion in foreign sales is being lost annually because the United States clings to an "antediluvian" system of weights and measures.

Not new to some. Without any push from Washington, a number of industries have already switched to metrics in whole or in part, including pharmaceuticals, electronics, chemicals, electric power, photography, optometry and oceanography. The motive in each case has been economic necessity—to get in step with the rest of the world. Some U.S. manufacturers have been using metric measurements for more than 50 years.

In 1965, the Library of Congress made a study for the House Science and Astronautics Committee, which was published as a committee print under the title "Notes on Conversion to the Metric System." The report contained this reference to grocery field:

"Many shoppers have undoubtedly noticed the increasing numbers of packaged grocery items, of food products particularly, which are now showing on their covers the weights in both ounces and grams, the latter generally being in parenthesis following the former. This is probably caused, in part at least, by the needs of their export trade. India, for example, requires that all incoming imports be labeled in metric units."

It is likely that more food manufacturers will soon add metric weights to their labels when they are redesigned to meet the requirements of the new Federal Fair Packaging and Labeling Act.

Advantages. Congressional hearings in recent years have pointed out both the advantages and the disadvantages of U.S. conversion to the metric system. The principal advantage appears to be that foreign trade would be facilitated, since metric nations prefer to deal with those employing the same standards.

There would be an educational by-product if the metric system were adopted here. One advocate claims the metric system can be learned by a schoolchild in one hour. If kilograms, liters and meters replaced pounds and feet, the time it takes to learn mathematics could be cut 25%, it is claimed.

The American Geophysical Union noted that "such monstrosities as proper fractions, denominators, greatest common divisors, and mixed numbers could be laid to rest with the celluloid collar and the oxcart."

Problems. It might take a generation to get the public to accept the new standards. Japan took 38 years to make the change and even then achieved only 85% compliance. England plans a 10-year conversion period.

Business would be forced to maintain double inventories during the conversion period, of products, parts used in manufacturing and maintenance, and specifications. These problems would undoubtedly be more serious in certain other industries, such as automobiles, appliances, and machine tools, than in grocery manufacturing.

Federal and state and local governments would face huge problems. Highway signs would have to substitute kilometers for miles, a zillion purchase specifications would have to be converted and land titles would have to be reissued, just to name a few.

A few inroads. Generally speaking, the United States now follows what is known as the English system of weights and measures, featuring inches and ounces, feet and pounds. However, the U.S. system already embodies some key parts of the metric system. The unit of time, the second, is a basic unit in the modern metric system. Electrical quantities are measured in watts, a metric unit.

The power input to an electric motor is stated in terms of metric units, but the power output of the same motor is stated in horsepower, which is outside the metric system. In our space program, the problems of conversion became so great that a major part of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has converted entirely to metric measurements.

For many years, the U.S. Navy has measured its gun barrels in millimeters. And of course all physicians write their prescriptions in terms of metric units. Scientific texts are written almost entirely in metric terms, although most engineering books use feet and pounds.

So what we have now is a hodge-podge. In temperature measurement, we have a dual system, centrigrade and Fahrenheit. We have short tons and long tons, statute miles and nautical miles, and avoirdupois, troy and apothecaries' measures of weight. We have gallons and British Imperial gallons. Our track sprinters sometimes run the 100-yard dash, and sometimes the 100-meter.

POSSIBILITIES

Would the metric system be an improvement? The rest of the world, including England, which originated our system, thinks so. The U.S. scientific community thinks so. The official spokesman for business in government, the Department of Commerce, thinks so. And for these reasons, Congress may authorize a study. If there is a study, the alternative courses to be considered are:

1. General adoption of the metric system by legislation.
2. Voluntary extension of metric usage, industry by industry.
3. Regulated partial conversion, segment by segment, in identified areas, over an extended period.
4. Solutions other than adoption of the metric system, to mitigate crucial problems.
5. A system of financial incentives to encourage voluntary conversion.

It may be a while yet before Cousin Minnie drives seven kilometers to the nearest super market to buy three liters of milk, a four-kilogram box of breakfast food, and 500 cubic centimeters of cooking oil. But that day may come and it is high time the grocery industry began thinking about the problems that would bring.

WORKSHOP ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS AND PROCUREMENT: REMARKS OF SENATOR MORSE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on September 27, 1967, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] addressed a workshop on Government Contracts and Procurement in Eugene, Oreg. The workshop was arranged with the cooperation of the Oregon congressional delegation and the Senate Small Business Committee.

His remarks emphasized the role of Pacific Northwest industry in helping to solve the problems of the Federal, State, and local governments, while at the same time strengthening the Nation's maritime programs.

The areas of fisheries, oceanography, and marine science and technology, on which the Senator commented are of great and increasing importance. They affect the health of our domestic business community, our capabilities to assist our allies and friends abroad and thus the conduct of our foreign policy.

These points have been underscored by the outstanding work of my colleague, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], who for many years has been a leader in the quest for forward looking marine legislation. This year he has brought to public attention a body of scholarly material on the potential benefits of developing ocean and fishery resources.

At the Pacific Northwest regional hearings on export expansion conducted by the Senator from Oregon at Portland in May of this year, Senator BARTLETT summarized these thoughts in the form of testimony which would be available to the Small Business Committee as a basis for its action in these areas.

Most recently, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Maritime Affairs of the Senate Commerce Committee, my Alaskan colleague conducted hearings on a number of bills to strengthen the fishery industry of the United States.

I commend Senator MORSE and Senator BARTLETT for their good work, which has a direct impact on Alaska and our other maritime States and territories. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MORSE's recent remarks be printed in the RECORD, so that his observations may be more readily available to all who seek to harness our sea resources.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE AT THE WORKSHOP ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS AND PROCUREMENT, EUGENE, OREG., SEPTEMBER 27, 1967

Chancellor Lieuallen, Chairman Sturgen, and Members of the Oregon Business Community, it is a pleasure to be able to be with you for this workshop.

I would like to make some brief observations about the procurement picture, as I see it. Then, in order to cover the subjects of greatest interest, I want to take your questions, for as long as time permits. As you realize, that turns the tables on me, because during my previous assignments in Eugene, it was my job to ask the questions. You might have noticed that I wasn't bold enough to say I could *answer* all of your questions. But I will try my best.

This conference is only the second that has been held in Oregon devoted to procurement. However, the breadth and depth of the program, and the careful preparation that preceded it will, I feel, make it a significant event.

OREGON INDUSTRY CAN HELP FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In addition to the size of this attendance, another element which is noteworthy is the nature of the group that we have here. Some of you are experienced in selling to the government; others are just beginning to learn the procedures. However, one thing you possess in common is a range of impressive resources and experience in solving the problems of business.

These qualities hold a potential for the solution of the problems of the federal, state, and local governments that is exciting to contemplate.

I have been asked whether this is a "small business" conference. I suppose that it could be called that, in the sense that small firms account for nearly 50% of Oregon's government sales and that all but a few of Oregon's firms are in that category. Nationwide, 90% of our 290,000 manufacturing companies and

even a greater percentage of food producing, general distribution, and service concerns are small, independent, or closely held companies.

CONFERENCE IS BROADLY REPRESENTATIVE

However, our workshop is not limited to small business. Among the more than 330 registrants, and panelists and briefing officers, the conference, of course, has welcomed the larger corporations. I feel I speak for all of us when I say that we are very pleased to have their executive with us.

We are interested in what these companies have to offer.

Beyond this, however, our sponsors include the business associations such as the Chambers of Commerce, which are the backbone of community business activity. We have research groups; and many State and Federal Government agencies. The great universities of this State are well represented.

Gatherings of this kind probably do not take place very often. It is thus my feeling that the whole may be a little greater than the sum of its parts—not only from the point of view of the goods and services and ideas which are available, but in the momentum which this gathering—coming from across the broad spectrum of business of our State—can develop in many areas.

While I am speaking of distinction, it should be obvious to all who are participating in this conference that many of the most highly qualified contract and procurement specialists in the United States are sitting with us and have been placed at our disposal for these two days. I have been looking forward to meeting as many of them as possible, as you have been doing. I know that their advice and counsel are invaluable and will serve our State and businessmen well. And, they have brought their shopping lists, as I understand it, for $50 to $100 million in contracts which will be awarded in the next 30 to 90 days.

As the conference announcement stated, the federal government, and the combined state and local governments both brought about $77 billion worth of goods and services during 1966. As customers, they each account for between 9 and 10% of total gross national product, so we can only benefit from getting better acquainted.

HISTORY OF PARTICIPATION IN PROCUREMENT HAS BEEN IN TERMS OF PRIME CONTRACTS

For a long time the framework of the procurement picture here in Oregon has been composed of the statistics of the low percentage of prime contracts. Let us face these figures squarely and subject them to some commonsense analysis.

During a recent one-year period, fiscal year 1965, Oregon ranked thirty-second in population, 28th in personal income, and 28th in total federal taxes paid. In R & D obligations, Oregon ranked 28th. As to total military prime contract awards, Oregon ranked 39th, with $90 million in awards. During 1966, on the strength of the 50% increase which you heard about yesterday, we rose as high as 37th.

Now why has Oregon been so far down the ladder?

As all of us on the West Coast are aware, the military prime contracts which give California 18% of the nation's total, and Washington 1.4% (in comparison with Oregon's .3%) go to the large integrated manufacturers. They are capable not only of manufacturing, but of designing, engineering, and testing the complicated large-scale weapons systems. These figures do not include civilian procurements, and they do not include subcontracts which are important areas in which Oregon has widening footholds. Our prime contractors know that a good subcontracting program improves their profits and their ability to compete.

The defense industries with which we are familiar grew up in California and Washington over many years. They were located pursuant to decisions made literally two and three decades ago. It would be interesting to go into history and review the factors that were considered, such as relation to population centers, proximity to capital, low cost electric power, other industries, research facilities and other random factors. These actions were taken long ago, however, and the consequences of the plant locations cannot be undone.

The major part of our attention during these two days is devoted to examining how Oregon business can relate to such existing contractor and government business.

PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE ARE BRIGHT IN MARITIME RESEARCH AND PROGRAMS

But it also makes sense to me to look into the future. I feel that, with Oregon's endowment of resources—geographic, natural and personal—and the start that our businesses and institutions have already made—there are areas of potential government business that are bright with promise for the coming years.

One does not have to look far from here to survey Oregon's window on the world, its more than 500 miles of ocean coastline. We have the largest reserve of standing timber in the country. In our Small Business Committee hearings on export expansion in Portland this May, we were reminded again that the Columbia is the second greatest river system in the country, giving the Inland Empire access to the continents around the Pacific basin. These rimlands contain a growing majority of world population. Beyond our coasts are the vast reaches of the Pacific Ocean.

Consider for a moment as a small example, the potential in the development of fisheries and fish protein concentrate.

As we sit here today, two-thirds of the world's population suffers from malnutrition, especially the lack of animal protein. The population of the world is expected to double in the next 35 years. Thus, if the human race is to avert disaster, protein production must be more than doubled before the end of this century. Among the States, Oregon's famous fisheries are in 12th place, with an annual catch of about $11 million. Commercial fishing also brings fringe benefits for our economy, including the stimulation of processing, shipyards, and related marine industries. But it came as something of a surprise to me that U.S. fisheries' production ranks behind Peru, Japan, Russia, and Communist China, and we may soon be passed by Norway.

Per capita consumption of fish in the U.S. last year rose 16%. In the next 15 years it is expected to increase more than 76%. At present, two-thirds of the fish consumed here was caught by foreign fisherman, whose techniques and equipment are, in many cases I am told, superior to our own.

What part will we play in exploring and developing the resources of the Pacific Ocean during the *next* two or three decades? I hope that the American reaction will be adequate. We would certainly want the ships and equipment and plants to remain in private ownership, and to be within reasonable financial means of our small, independent businessmen. These goals will not be achieved however, without pioneering in the form of research and pilot programs by the federal government and the maritime states, and imaginative participation by our business leaders.

AS THESE EFFORTS EXPAND OREGON SHOULD BE IN THE VANGUARD

The nation has hardly begun to come to grips with the implications and the potentials of the ocean resources, which are so near at hand.

From the material supplied by the National Science Foundation here today, we learn that less than 4% of the ocean floor has been accurately mapped.

The federal government's total budget for marine science and technology stands substantially below $500 million, representing less than 3% of the $17 billion of federal R&D, to be spent this year. Can anyone doubt that these amounts and percentages will climb in the years ahead?

The hard facts make it clear to me that the nation must dramatically upgrade its marine sciences, both basic and applied. We must strengthen our grasp of oceanography, of fisheries and maritime technology—including factory-ship construction, aquaculture, exploratory fishing, and the production and utilization of protein concentrates. In the areas of education and research Oregon, in my opinion, has some of its finest opportunities to expand and to contribute to these national undertakings.

Anyone who has visited the Marine Science Center at Newport, the seafood study facility at Astoria, or the biology lab at Coos Bay, as I have been privileged to do, knows that our universities have begun to respond to those challenges, and our industries have begun to respond. The Oregon legislature backed its interest this year with $500,000, to finance the entry of our State University into the new Sea Grant College program.

We are pleased to welcome to the conference spokesmen for both the civilian and defense ocean study programs: Mr. Robert Abel, the Director of the National Sea Grant section of the National Science Foundation; and Lt. Dennis MacDonell of the Naval Oceanographic Center. They are amply supplied with literature and expertise, and I think it would be well to learn as much about their activities as possible.

I would like to see Oregon in the vanguard of these programs.

OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS—IMPROVING "LIVEABILITY" OF THE ENVIRONMENT

We could cite other areas of large potential investment by governments, including state and local units. These include air and water purification and waste disposal. Through the cooperation of the Department of the Interior, we have arranged for Mr. R. F. Poston, the Regional Director of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration Office at Portland to be present and to furnish individual counseling.

There is the whole gamut of problems of the cities, including new techniques in construction, with which our forestry industries are intimately concerned. We need to have a dialogue with the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs about its experimental programs, and this dialogue has been started. In these growth industries also we find in the Northwest a natural interest coupled with a wide-open field involving federal research and prototype programs.

We have mentioned trade. It is logical to think of exports in the commercial sense of offering products for sale. However, exports can also be thought of as providing for the essential human needs which people beyond our shores share. The free enterprise system of this country has developed the greatest capability in history of fulfilling these needs.

I am proud that the leading industries of this region are involved with furnishing food and shelter. I think that it is a worthy pursuit to learn more about how the worldwide hunger for these necessities can best be satisfied. This may involve a part of the $17 billion being spent on research and development, the introduction of new products and processes, as well as the procurement of new equipment, and new facilities. We need to know what mixture of products, U.S. investments in overseas manufacturing, technical assistance, and education are best for our economy, and the economies of our friends overseas.

LAYING THE FOUNDATION—A LIBRARY OF SPECIFICATIONS

The time to lay a foundation for the future is now.

It is encouraging that, in connection with this Conference, there has been a coming together of ideas on the procurement issues that now affect the companies doing business with the government, and those who are making efforts in this direction.

For instance, there has been considerable discussion of establishing a repository of federal standards and specifications in Oregon.

I am told that there are more than 500 classes of these specifications containing about 60,000 individual items, some of which are quite long and detailed. Furthermore, they are constantly being modified. The operation of a repository to provide retrieval of up-to-date information of this sort thus involves a considerable commitment.

In the past, this information was available only at selected government contracting installations, mostly in other parts of the country. Recently, the first non-federal government public repository was set up in Seattle by the Washington State Department of Commerce.

As a result of preparing for this Conference, the Department of Defense has developed a demonstration, including a film, to show what is involved in establishing and using a repository. They have informed us that their package has already been of help to them in their dealings with contractors and government officials. The top civilian specialist has been assigned to make this presentation to us here.

Meanwhile, our people were exploring with the Department the possibility of founding a limited library in Oregon, covering perhaps 20% of the classes. If all the parties agree that such a partial repository should come into being, it could later be expanded, and could serve as a center for other procurement studies. I understand discussions are advancing satisfactorily, and that Mr. Albert C. Lazure of the Department of Defense announced this morning that he was prepared to recommend to the Secretary that certain portions of this material be furnished without cost to any Oregon institution willing to operate the facility in the prescribed manner. The Willamette Valley Research Council, particularly Jean Mater and others, deserve our gratitude for those initiatives, which I fully support.

From my contact with many of you in the past, I am also aware of other problems, such as the delay in obtaining bids and other materials from Eastern procurement activities. Communication is a problem in the procurement process under any circumstances, and it is magnified by distance. Much good work has been done in improving communications procedures by your speaker of yesterday, Mr. Douglas Strain. As a result, I can report that much has been achieved. More can and should be done.

Overall, there are two ways of improving our procurement performance. The first and easiest is through the organic growth of the businesses in the State. The second is by attracting new industry to locate in Oregon.

The challenges are rigorous, and the competition is strong, especially as to bringing in new companies. Dun and Bradstreet estimates that, for the 1,500 plant location decisions that are made each year, some 15,000 alternatives are considered. In my judgment, however, the resources within our borders and adjacent to them can support both sound expansion and new growth.

Furthermore, the type of industries we have been talking about do not pollute the water and the air. On the contrary, instead of detracting from the environment, they would tend to increase "live-ability"—in the city and in the countryside; here and elsewhere.

I feel that this is the kind of progress Oregon needs and wants, and that federal, state, and local procurement opportunities which are suitable and profitable, can play a part in this progress. It is apparent that capitalizing on these opportunities will take sustained, day-to-day effort by our State institutions and business groups. There should also be a synchronization of these activities with the Congressional delegation.

WHAT THE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION CAN DO

Certain things can be accomplished in Washington. We can keep watch on the policies of the Executive Branch. Two weeks ago we acted upon a proposal to have Navy minesweepers built abroad. I opposed this arrangement, because it sacrificed the future of small American shipyards, which urgently need the business. These yards keep alive capabilities vital for national defense. I am glad to say Congress rejected this legislation.

We can work for and support enlightened policies in oceanography and fisheries, and trade expansion—programs which take full advantage of the character of our regional industries. I can assure you that we are doing this, and we are originating these proposals when they are not forthcoming from elsewhere.

For example, as a result of the export hearings in Portland, the Administration promptly filled the position of Secretary of Commerce to provide leadership in trade promotion, which is of such importance to the Pacific Northwest. Then, just two weeks ago, on September 12 the export program of the Small Business Administration, which had been in abeyance for some time, was formally re-established.

We can also aid in straightening out misunderstandings with government agencies and assure equal and equitable treatment for our businessmen in particular cases. The Small Business Committee, of which I am a senior member, can help us in this regard.

You will recall that the Congress took the lead in establishing the Small Business Administration in 1953, and in protecting its independence since. One of the primary missions conferred by the Act on SBA, and upon all other government departments, is assuring that small firms get a fair share of government contracts and subcontracts for the purchase of goods and services. In 1958, we amended the law to add "sales" of government property, so that small companies in the forest industry would have an even break in the sales of government timber.

Each year our Committee holds public hearings to review procurement developments and to see how this mandate is being carried out. We inquire into general policies, and can also delve into particular practices. Recommendations are made for legislative or administrative changes. Our hearings, and annual and special reports are freely available as a public service.

The several loan programs, management assistance, and certificate of competency program of the SBA, which are as close as Albert Lofstrand's office in Portland, can be key factors in helping your firms to enter the procurement field or expand your capabilities. I urge you to familiarize yourselves with these resources. The same should be said for the Commerce Department field office in Portland under the able direction of James Goodsell.

In our congressional undertakings, however, we must rely upon the guidance of our businessmen and organizations, who are involved in the procurement process and may be experiencing the actual difficulties.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONFERENCE

This Conference is a fortunate opportunity for our business community, our State officials, our universities, and the Congressional delegation to discuss these prospects and problems. Out of such meetings I hope will come improved means for marshalling the constant attention, the concerted effort, and the coordination of activities that are required to have an impact on the long-term development of procurement and other business in this State.

I will be pleased to do all that I can to assist in this work, which can do so much to build business here in Oregon which is compatible with our geography, the spirit of our State and its institutions, and its people.

TV AND THE RIOTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the effect of television upon civil disorders has been a subject of increasing concern during this year of turmoil and violence in our urban areas.

Television brings events from distant places into our living rooms and has tended more and more to mold the opinions of those who watch it.

The manner in which television uses its vast influence can determine which men become heroes, and which villains. It has the power to convert a virtually unknown extremist with a handful of followers into a national figure. Each time a network decides to feature a Stokely Carmichael or a Rap Brown on its news and commentary programs, it is assisting such irresponsible agitators to achieve recognition as leaders of the Negro community both by white people and by Negroes who had never heard of them previously.

It leads young Negroes to believe that men like Carmichael and Brown are leaders to whom they should show respect, and on the other hand, it leads the general community to the erroneous conclusion that the majority of Negroes are involved in the violence of Detroit, Watts, and Harlem.

Both of these conclusions are clearly incorrect. The Stokely Carmichaels and Rap Browns are not leaders and, in fact, have no constituencies. The majority of Negroes are law-abiding citizens and are themselves the major victims of the violence such agitation has produced.

A recent article in TV Guide asks the question: "Do TV Cameras Add Fuel to Riot Flames?" Reporter Neil Hickey asked Detroit Police Commissioner Ray Girardin about the effects of television's presence in his city during this summer's riots in which 43 people died. His response was firm and unequivocal:

> The showing of films of scenes from riot-torn areas seemed to arouse the curiosity of hundreds of people who wanted to see for themselves what was happening. Almost immediately the streets were crowded with curiosity-seekers hampering law enforcement officers. TV could have performed a civic duty by informing people to stay away from the dangerous sections. Many innocent people were injured and some killed by snipers because they wandered into the troubled areas to see the action.

Negro leaders have been equally outspoken in their criticism of television coverage of the riots. Henry Lee Moon, public relations chief of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said:

> Negroes have generally been unhappy about the way television has played their affairs. It's damaging to the cause of civil rights to give a forum to somebody shouting "Kill Whitey" and cast him as a Negro leader when he represents no substantial part of the Negro population.

Mr. Hickey points out that on many occasions TV newsmen have fanned the flames of violence in order to produce a better story. Many stations have responsibly adopted standards for use in riot situations, including holding off on reporting mass violence until police establish some modicum of control, and using unmarked cars, hand-held cameras, no bright lights, and exposing the cameras to public view only when there is something to film.

Still, many stations have not adopted such a code, and codes may not be the entire answer. Mr. Hickey concludes this way:

A part of television's difficulty in this area is inherent in the nature of the medium and will never be absolved altogether. But the opinion is now abroad that networks and stations must do a great deal more than they're doing to ensure that the medium (1) does not alter the shape of events it touches and (2) does not let itself be manipulated by the show business appeal of special pleaders.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hickey's article, captioned "Do TV Cameras Add Fuel to Riot Flames?" be printed in the RECORD.

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

DO TV CAMERAS ADD FUEL TO RIOT FLAMES?

(By Neil Hickey)

A new law of television journalism is emerging in the atmosphere of civil protest, picketing, parades, demonstrations, labor strikes and the broad spectrum of public expression of discontent which has become a central aspect of American life in the last several years, and—more immediately—in the violent summer we have just weathered.

Stated most starkly, the law is: "Television, by its very presence, creates news."

Never before today has the law been more operative. Only in recent months have legislators, police officials and TV newsmen come to a suspicion of the full impact of television upon the news it is covering; of TV's power to shape events it chooses to record; of the medium's rather frightening capability of creating a cause, a public figure or a news story where—but for the cameras—none might otherwise exist.

The charge sheet against TV news is shaping up this way:

That the presence of cameras frequently transmutes a potentially violent situation into an *actually* violent one, and that mischief-makers often show their most troublesome selves at the sight of television crews.

That TV pictures of looting, destruction and mayhem create a contagion—far more so than radio or newspaper reports—which causes riots to feed upon themselves.

That TV stations and networks give too much time to the flashier and more vocal extremists—such as Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown—whose words foster violence, and not enough to the less theatrical but saner voices of moderation.

That pressure groups of all types have become extremely "savvy" in manipulating television by staging protests and parades specifically for the cameras and thereby achieving an inflated importance for their private, special pleading.

These are only a few of the complaints—some of which have been denied by broadcasting executives—being aimed at TV news in the current controversy. TV Guide asked Detroit police commissioner Ray Girardin about the effects of television's presence in his city during this summer's terrible strife in which 43 people died. His response was firm and unequivocal: "The showing of films of scenes from riot-torn areas seemed to arouse the curiosity of hundreds of people who wanted to see for themselves what was happening. Almost immediately, the streets were crowded with curiosity-seekers hampering law-enforcement officers.

"TV could have performed a civic duty," Girardin added, "by informing people to stay away from the dangerous sections. Many innocent people were injured and some killed by snipers because they wandered into the troubled areas to see the action."

Police officials in Newark, another scene of recent strife, are similarly disturbed about TV's riot coverage: "We were very disappointed by the behavior of TV crews," a spokesman says. "Doubly so since we had called a meeting as far back as June 23 and invited about 20 news organizations—both local and national—to discuss an informal 'code of ethics' for reporting trouble, should any arise. Three attended the meeting."

Sen. John McClellan (D., Ark.) plans to include testimony on TV's riot coverage in hearings currently in progress before his Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Congressman Torbert Macdonald (D., Mass.), chairman of the Communications Subcommittee, also is eager to call TV industry executives to Washington for hearings on the medium's capacity for exacerbating troublesome situations and creating new ones. Congressman Macdonald told us: "I'm not saying that Congress should interfere, but I wonder about the wisdom of what TV does in this area. Is it really news if one Negro gets up and shouts, 'Burn Whitey!'? I'd like to find out if the networks and stations have policies on these matters and what instructions they give their reporters."

The disturbances in the streets amount to rebellion, Macdonald added. "I'd like to know if this rebellion is being fed by television and radio. Television may have to take a share of the blame for spreading dangerous doctrines. I'd like to find out what steps they're taking to live up to their responsibility to their audiences."

Sen. Hugh Scott (R., Pa.) entered the controversy on Aug. 2 with a statement that he was "greatly concerned about the newspaper and radio and television coverage of the recent riots and civil disturbances throughout the country. I believe that the news media, in many instances, inadvertently contributed to the turmoil."

That salvo elicited return fire from all three networks. Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, Inc., insisted that "so far as the news presented over our radio and television networks . . . goes, I can find no evidence that this is true. On the contrary, there is considerable evidence that the exact opposite is the case." At the same time Stanton admitted that "serious problems" attend television's handling of civil disorder and that his own news officials had been duly warned of the "unsettling effect on a stimulated crowd that the presence of cameras may have."

NBC president Julian Goodman echoed Stanton's disfavor of any "code of emergency procedure" (as suggested by Scott) that might impinge upon TV's freedom to cover the news as it sees fit. ". . . A code cannot exercise judgment," said Goodman. "It cannot foresee all the variables in the fast-breaking events with which newsmen must deal."

Another quick response to Scott's statement came from James C. Hagerty, vice president of American Broadcasting Company. In a "Dear Hugh" letter, Hagerty defended his network's news practices while adding that the whole subject has "been a matter of continuing concern to all of us here. . . . The danger that news coverage can influence or inflame an event is foremost in our thoughts."

Other criticism of TV news has come from pundits and private-interest groups. Columnist Max Lerner says: "Americans seem to have struck a Faustian bargain with the big media, by which they have received total and instant coverage and have in turn handed themselves over to the vulnerable chances of crowd psychology and of instant infection."

Henry Lee Moon, public relations chief of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People told TV Guide: "Negroes have generally been unhappy about the way television has played their affairs. It's damaging to the cause of civil rights to give a forum to somebody shouting 'Kill Whitey' and cast him as a Negro leader when he represents no substantial part of the Negro population."

TV newsmen are as sensitive as anybody else to such dangers. ABC News executive William Sheehan says that he thinks "it's no coincidence that the flourishing of the civil-rights movement has occurred at the same time that television news has reached the point where every evening it literally saturates the country with reports on world happenings."

Another TV executive recalls that during the AFTRA strike of last March, when TV reporters were idle for two weeks, a sharp diminution in protests and picketing for peace and other causes was apparent. "Nothing seemed to be happening," he says. Then the TV news directors realized that—in the absence of cameras—the protestors had concluded it was pointless to mount a protest.

TV people become aware of their own influence in a variety of ways. Cindy Adams, a glamorous reporter for WABC-TV in New York, recalls the time she accepted a telephone call in her newsroom and was informed that a private group planned a demonstration at the Dominican Republic's UN mission headquarters to protest U.S. involvement in that country's affairs. "Can you cover it?" asked the lady caller.

"Well, I'm not sure," Cindy said. "How many of you will there be?"

"How many do you need?" the woman answered.

A bit startled, Cindy replied that it wasn't exactly her place to say. "What time will you be demonstrating?" the reporter then asked.

"Maybe right away. That suit you?"

"Well, we have no crews here right now," said Cindy.

"We'll have as many marchers as you want out there any time you say," the caller assured her. WABC did indeed cover the demonstration, moving Cindy Adams to recall recently: "That woman knew what she was doing; she was savvy in the ways of TV news." An increasing number of social and political activists are learning that it is possible to manipulate TV news to their own interests.

Similarly, TV people have been known to attempt the manipulation of an incipient news story to their own interests. When James Meredith was testing the University of Mississippi's exclusion policy, a potentially volatile situation grew out of the student body's tension and anger over his presence. A TV reporter from a Southwestern station drove onto the campus one day, hoping for some exciting newsfilm, and was disappointed that the students' mood seemed taut but controlled. He leaned from his car and shouted to a group of them: "Hey! Where's the action? I heard there was *action* going on around here!"

That triggered them. First, they turned the newsman's car over and burned it, sending him scrambling; the violence spread from there. At the end of it, two men were dead.

Many observers are sure that TV news (as well as newspapers) fanned the embers which erupted into the bitter riots of the Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant section of New York in the summer of 1964. During spring and early summer, almost daily interviews with "Negro leaders" predicting a holocaust were

visible on television. Many of these men were spokesmen without a following, ambitious activists eager for exposure. But their words created an air of tension and expectancy, convincing the ghetto dwellers that violence was indeed imminent. Nobody was surprised when it came.

In Los Angeles in 1965, mobile TV vans moved into riot areas of Watts and showed live pictures of looting even before the police had arrived. A police official remembers: "Television served as a terrific guide for potential looters who wanted to know where to go for some action."

Still, there's no gainsaying that TV reporters as a class are well aware of the effect of their presence on an evolving story. We asked a number of network correspondents—experienced in coverage of street demonstrations—for their thoughts:

Tom Jarriel, ABC: "There's no doubt that a camera causes pickets to act up more vigorously. They know the power of TV exposure; all these people want their story told. The camera is an attraction. The problem is to keep it from becoming a bigger story than the one you're covering.

"We often leave our cameras on the seat of the car and stand to one side while a situation is developing. When something actually happens, we film it."

Jarriel feels that the TV presence also can have a moderating influence. "I doubt that James Meredith would have completed his most recent march in Mississippi unmolested if the cameras hadn't been there. People didn't heckle him; they stayed away so as not to cause a major incident on nationwide TV."

John Laurence, CBS: "More trouble is caused by young and inexperienced wire-service reporters than by TV men. They can make a quick phone call and in minutes a bulletin is going out on their wires. The presence of a TV camera often tends more to keep a situation honest than to aggravate it. If a camera is on a policeman and his prisoner, chances are the policeman won't beat the prisoner and the prisoner won't attack the policeman."

Don Oliver, NBC: "Once a public disturbance has begun, cameras have very little effect on its progress, but in the early stages—where the possibility for violence exists—the sight of a TV crew can have a bad effect. Police and TV people work well together most of the time; but as a riot goes into its third or fourth day, the police get edgy and angry and start feeling that the cameras are drawing attention to them."

Bill Matney, NBC: "Cameras have very little effect while a disturbance is actually going on. In Detroit, I interviewed two fellows while they were actually looting, and later filmed their arrest. On one day, while whole sections of the city were going up in smoke, the TV people refrained from reporting it so as not to make it worse. That was an independently-arrived-at decision by the local stations."

CBS's Midwest bureau manager, Dan Bloom, had the job of setting up that network's riot coverage in a number of cities during the summer. "It boils down to the fact that the equipment is sometimes a magnet," he says. "But our policy is simple. If a reporter has any suspicion that a performance is going on just for the camera, we immediately pack up and move away. This is rigidly enforced. On the other hand, if you have a peaceful demonstration that goes on for 60 minutes and a bomb is thrown in the last two minutes, where is the story? We'd be remiss if we didn't put that part of the action on the air. We make a very deliberate attempt at setting the proper balance."

Before this past summer, many TV newsmen were understandably reluctant to admit television's influence on evolving news, but the proliferation of protests and riots, as well as the thoughtful criticism of lawmakers and private citizens, are forcing the subject onto center stage, where it must now be examined in full public view, and some firm conclusions arrived at. CBS News president Richard S. Salant, for example, admits, "It is certainly true that a great many events—almost all except tornadoes—are, at least to some degree, designed in time or in place or even in nature for *all* of the mass media. . . . But our job is to report news, not to shape it."

And there are no easy, self-executing rules applicable to all situations, Salant adds. "We know that one cannot simply ignore these events because indeed they *are* news. And we have come to the conclusion, then, that the wise policy is a policy of restraint and awareness of what the problems are."

For the last several years, the U.S. Justice Department's Community Relations Service has been working quietly in cities across the country getting TV people together with police officials and helping them agree on voluntary guidelines for the reporting of civil disorders. Together, they've come up with solid recommendations aimed at keeping good order in the streets while not raising the ugly specter of censorship. Scores of TV stations have agreed to:

Hold off reporting mass violence until police establish some modicum of control.

Use unmarked cars, hand-held cameras, no bright lights, and expose the cameras to public view only when there's something to film.

Avoid reporting rumors, trivia and wild statements.

Use command posts set up by police in strife areas as clearinghouses for news breaks, and not cruise about the streets aimlessly.

Refrain from using the word "riot" unless there's simply no other word to describe what's happening.

The networks and many local stations try to do many of these things out of common sense, and not from official nudging. But it's apparent that no guidelines nor agreements can replace the dispassion and detachment of a seasoned TV newsman who is determined to convey—soberly and untheatrically—the full sense of a public disorder; whose eye is not upon competing newsmen nor on the aggrandizement of his own reputation; and who is sensitive to the effect of his words upon an anxious audience.

A part of television's difficulty in this area is inherent in the nature of the medium and will never be absolved altogether. But the opinion is now abroad that networks and stations must do a great deal more than they're doing to ensure that the medium 1) does not alter the shape of events it touches and 2) does not let itself be manipulated by the show-business appeal of special pleaders.

It is apparent that the adaptation of rigid "codes" is not the answer. But, if, indeed, television's self-generating potential for news is an operative unwritten "law" of broadcast journalism, it is a law in need of prompt and drastic—unwritten but nonetheless effective—amendment.

AT LAST, POSTAWARD AUDITS ORDERED BY DEFENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Department of Defense has moved to plug a gaping hole in its procurement procedures, which has been costing the taxpayers millions of dollars a year in overcharges on defense contracts.

In a memorandum made public yesterday, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul H. Nitze issued orders which effectively translate into executive action the legislative intent of a bill I introduced 4 months ago. The Comptroller General has indicated that he is satisfied that this will do the job.

My bill—S. 1913—which would require postaward audits on defense contracts grew out of 4 days of hearings last May on Federal procurement procedures conducted by the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee.

The Pentagon's shocking failure to adequately enforce the 1962 Truth in Negotiations Act was brought out very clearly during the hearings in testimony by the Comptroller General, Congress' watchdog over the executive branch. This act, which requires that contracting officers obtain current, accurate and complete cost data from contractors, is the taxpayer's only defense against the establishment of unreasonably high cost levels in negotiated contracts.

The Comptroller General pointed out that the Pentagon's failure to postaudit contracts has been a major factor in contract overpricing. He told the Subcommittee of repeated efforts by his office over the years to persuade the Pentagon to adopt a postaudit policy which would allow them to make sure that actual costs incurred in the performance of a contract were in line with estimated costs given at the time the contract was awarded.

In minimal spot checking, the General Accounting Office uncovered a high number of shocking discrepancies between the original contract estimate and the postaudit figure. In 242 contracts checked, the GAO found 177 cases of inflated pricing for an overcharge in just this handful of contracts of $130 million.

Secretary Nitze's memorandum now establishes just the policy the GAO has been urging and the policy my bill would establish through legislation. The memorandum states that "action shall be taken to include in all noncompetitive firm fixed price contracts involving certified costs or pricing data, a contractual right to have access to the contractor's actual performance records" in order to provide assurance that "defective cost or pricing data had not been submitted prior to consummation of the contract."

The Pentagon should have adopted this policy long ago. Nevertheless, Secretary Nitze is to be congratulated for issuing this memorandum. It takes a long step in the right direction—toward providing the taxpayer with an adequate defense against blatant profiteering on defense contracts.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Nitze's memorandum be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, September 29, 1967.

Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Assistant Secretary of Defense (I&L), Directors of Defense Agencies.

Subject: Access to cost performance records on noncompetitive firm fixed price contracts.

I have given careful consideration to the arguments for and against access to contractor post-award cost performance records on noncompetitive firm fixed price contracts, for the purpose of determining the degree of contractor compliance with PL 87-653. Clearly, it has been and remains our policy that in firm fixed price contracts the cost and profit consequences are the full responsi-

bility of the contractor since he assumes all the risk of performing in accordance with the contract. Likewise, it is our policy that such contracts be used only where there exists a reliable basis for judging reasonableness of contractor cost estimates. Where such a basis does not exist, other contract forms should be used.

The Department of Defense is required to conduct a program of review and audit sufficient to ascertain that the cost or pricing data submitted by contractors in connection with the negotiation of noncompetitive firm fixed price contracts were current, accurate and complete as required by PL 87-653. It is our policy to make such audits, as fully as possible, prior to completing the negotiation of the contract. However, when it is necessary to provide assurance that defective cost or pricing data were not submitted, audits should also be conducted of actual costs incurred after contracts are consummated. To assure that such post-award audits may be conducted when deemed appropriate, action shall be taken to include in all noncompetitive firm fixed price contracts involving certified costs or pricing data, a contractual right to have access to the contractor's actual performance records.

Circumstances which may dictate the use of a post-award cost performance audit include such cases as those where: (1) factors of urgency in placing the initial procurement were clearly present; (2) material costs are a significant portion of the contractor's total cost estimate; (3) a substantial portion of the contract is proposed for subcontracting; or (4) there was a substantial interval between completion of a the pre-contract cost evaluation and agreement on price.

In directing this action, I wish to make it clear that the purpose of any post-award cost performance audit, as provided herein, is limited to the single purpose of determining whether or not defective cost or pricing data were submitted. Access to a contractor's records shall not be for the purpose of evaluating profit-cost relationships, nor shall any repricing of such contracts be made because the realized profit was greater than was forecast, or because some contingency cited by the contractor in his submission failed to materialize—unless the audit reveals that the cost and pricing data certified by the contractor were, in fact, defective.

I desire that the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) issue implementing instructions to place the above policies into effect.

PAUL H. NITZE.

VIETNAM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to share with Senators and all other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent letter I received recently on the war in Vietnam from Maryland's distinguished State Senator, Harry Hughes, the majority leader of Maryland's State Senate. His letter is an articulate expression of what I believe to be an ever-growing concern of the American people with our involvement in Vietnam. Senator Hughes' call for diplomatic flexibility instead of reliance upon false honor or pride to find a solution in Vietnam strikes the right note. Senator Hughes has again demonstrated his ability to deal with complex issues.

I had the honor of serving with Harry Hughes in the Maryland House of Delegates from 1955 to 1959. In 1959, Harry was elevated to the Maryland Senate and has served in that body with great distinction since that time. As majority leader of the senate, he has won the respect and admiration of his fellow legislators. As chairman of the committee on taxation and fiscal matters, he coauthored the "Cooper-Hughes" tax reform plan which was enacted during the last session of the legislature as the "Agnew-Hughes-Lee" tax reform proposal. That measure, Mr. President, was termed a "model of responsibility and fiscal soundness" by no less an authority than Joseph A. Peckman, director of economic studies, the Brookings Institution, and coauthor of the well-known Heller-Peckman plan for Federal tax sharing with the States.

Senator Hughes is an extremely able legislator, and I commend his view on the Vietnam situation to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that his letter to me, dated September 25, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE OF MARYLAND,
Annapolis, Md., September 25, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: I have read with interest your speech on the war in Vietnam given at the University of Maryland.

In commenting on this speech, as requested by you, I must preface my remarks with the obvious statement that my knowledge and information, like the rest of the public, emanates solely from what I have been exposed to through the press and is considerably less than yours and others in responsible positions of authority related to our foreign affairs. Consequently, it cannot be assumed that I speak from an informed position.

However, I am greatly disturbed about the war in Vietnam—the tremendous loss of American lives, the ever increasing and extremely high cost in American dollars, the restrictions and sacrifices it imposes upon meeting domestic programs, the apparent lack of enthusiasm and singlemindedness of purpose among the Vietnamese people regarding the war and its goal, the adverse effect the war seems to be having on our relations with our allies throughout the world, etc. None of these matters of concern is novel to me. They are touched upon in your speech and are disturbing to an evergrowing number of Americans. One cannot help but be aware of this in his daily contacts with people, the press and numerous periodicals.

Consequently, I am inclined to agree with the views set forth in your speech. I believe a complete and objective re-evaluation of our involvement in Vietnam is imperative. I agree with you that the election of a new government in Vietnam offers an opportunity for this re-evaluation that should not be ignored.

In making this re-evaluation (and hopefully sincere negotiations for peace), I would hope that we would not be guided by past commitments possibly made upon mistaken premises. Pride and honor are certainly not to be discounted in upholding the prestige and integrity of any country. But blindly adhering to obsolete commitments based upon the premises, of another time resulting in a tragic loss of lives and a seriously damaging financial drain, becomes false pride and false honor and the justification of maintaining prestige and integrity fails miserably. In fairness to those who have died, to those who live and to future Americans we cannot ignore past mistakes, changing circumstances, existing realities and a realistic evaluation of accomplishments and goals. In other words, our thinking must be flexible, not rigid, and our course of action must be decided by intelligent decisions based upon accurate, sound and current information, not unduly influenced by the industrial-military complex, either theirs or ours.

In closing I would like to make one brief comment about whether or not we should continue bombing North Vietnam and escalating the war. To say the least, the military success of the bombings and escalation appears to be doubtful. On the other hand, I cannot believe that they have not had some favorable effect from a military standpoint. The point, however, is whether or not whatever military success has been realized by the bombings justifies the loss of lives and planes, the damage to our image in the world and the possible damage to our efforts towards peace negotiations.

I recently read of a commission established by President Roosevelt during World War II to make a bombing survey. The purpose of this commission was to objectively determine whether or not the results of the bombing of certain cities justified the death and destruction caused by the bombing. It would seem to me that such a survey made by an impartial, well-staffed, highly authoritative and empowered commission of capable people is in order with regard to the bombing of North Vietnam. This has become a very controversial and emotional issue in this country and a complete, impartial and intelligent review of the bombings and their effect, with a report to the people, might be most helpful. I am sure you are aware of such a proposal.

This has been a rather lengthy letter but the subject matter is most serious and complicated and not subject to simple, brief comments. I hope they are helpful to you even though coming from a poorly informed source.

With best regards, I am
Sincerely,

HARRY R. HUGHES.

LABORATORY ANIMAL LEGISLATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, controversy continues to rage over the question of the best way to eliminate intolerable conditions in laboratory animal-care facilities. Despite the fact that there is already effective, though inadequately funded, animal-welfare legislation on the books, a new bill has recently been introduced in the House and the Senate which would nullify the existing law.

The most dismaying provision of the new bill calls for self-policing of laboratory animal-care facilities, thereby eliminating the requirement for Federal inspection and licensing by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the agency presently charged with that responsibility. Experience has demonstrated that self-policing does not work. It did not work in the drug field. It will not work in the laboratory animal field either. I appeal to Congress not to place regulatory responsibility in the hands of those who have a vested interest in evading compliance with presently established standards.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial on the subject, published in today's Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PROTECTING ANIMALS

Medical research leaders have suddenly become so zealous for the protection of animals involved in laboratory experimentation that they now want to take over the protecting job themselves. They have been vehemently opposed to protection in the past and were unable to find a kind word to say for P.L. 89-544, the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, when it was passed overwhelmingly by the 89th Congress. Miraculously converted and reformed, however, they have become ardent supporters of a Johnny-come-lately bill proposed by Sen. Jacob Javits and Rep. Paul Rogers.

The Javits-Rogers proposal has admirable features. It would extend protection to all warm-blooded animals, while the existing law covers only dogs, cats, monkeys, hamsters, guinea pigs and rabbits. It would widen the coverage of laboratories and protect research animals throughout their stay in a laboratory, while the existing law protects them only when they are in the hands of dealers and in the laboratory before and after experimentation. We support such protection wholeheartedly.

But the Javits-Rogers proposal would wreck the existing law by the simple device of shifting the inspection of laboratories and research centers from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Could it be that the medical research leaders prefer to entrust enforcement to HEW because they are so influential in that Department through the National Institutes of Health?

The Javits-Rogers proposal threatens to vitiate enforcement in an even worse way—by allowing HEW to delegate inspection and the licensing of laboratories to "professional bodies." The obvious "professional body" in this field is the American Association for the Advancement of Laboratory Animal Care, sponsored by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and the American Medical Association. It sounds a little like assigning Cosa Nostra to guard the banks.

If Messrs. Rogers and Javits really want to improve the protection of research animals, let them safeguard the gains made last year and take their improvements to the Senate Commerce Committee—instead of trying to circumvent that experienced body. And if the AMA really wants to promote animal welfare, let it start lobbying for the funds needed to police last year's law, P.L. 89-544.

BETTER PRIORITIES NEEDED FOR CONTROLLING FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it has been my strong conviction that if Congress is to control Federal spending effectively, it needs help in determining the relative priorities of different programs. As we are all aware, the present budget process is fragmentary; that is, each appropriation bill is considered separately, so that there is never any opportunity to take a broad view of the entire budget. This system makes it extremely difficult for Congress to make judicious cuts in the President's budget, as is so painfully obvious this year.

This great need for better program evaluation and better determination of priorities underlies my bill, S. 2032, which would set up a Government Commission to review both old and new Federal programs to determine their cost effectiveness. The Commission would provide Congress with a rational set of program priorities and would make it possible for Congress to postpone those Federal activities least needed. It would eliminate the need for desperate meatax cuts which affect good programs as well as bad.

The need for such a rational system for establishing priorities was emphatically pointed out in an editorial entitled "Priorities, Not Curbs," published in Sunday's Washington Post. I was especially gratified that the editorial mentioned the testimony received by the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economy in Government regarding the misallocation of resources by the Federal Government through use of unrealistically low discount rates.

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

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

PRIORITIES, NOT CURBS

The House action in sending back a routine financing bill to the Appropriations Committee for reduction comes as no surprise. The proposals for an income tax surcharge and the widespread feeling that Federal spending has gotten out of control are engendering a sense of frustration. But the meat-ax approach of across-the-board expenditure reductions for non-defense programs will be counterproductive. If expenditures are to be controlled in a rational fashion, Congress should establish priorities and then proceed to fund those programs which promise to satisfy the most pressing needs.

The goals that a country can realize through public expenditure—better education, more habitable cities, cleaner rivers or security from external threats—are over the longer run jointly determined by its wealth and the resources that its citizens are willing to transfer by taxation from private consumption to the public sector. This is a very rich country, but there are nonetheless limits on the rapidity with which public expenditures can grow without a concomitant reduction in private expenditures or a serious price inflation. That limit is not approached in periods of idle productive capacity, but it does exist. Congress knows through its political antennae that the electorate will at any time demand more Federal services than it is willing to pay for through taxation. So does the President. That is why there are efforts, unfortunately ineffectual efforts, to establish priorities, to decide which Federal programs should take precedence over others. Only by establishing priorities and measures of the effectiveness of Government programs can a society pursue its goals in a rational fashion.

The objection to expenditure curbs is that they fail to go to the root of the matter. Across-the-board reductions affect all programs, the good and the bad, in an indiscriminate fashion. As a result of delays, the cost of some good programs may well be increased. Furthermore, there is no sound justification for concentrating all the fire on nondefense programs. Can it be assumed that *all* the defense programs are essential? If there is waste and inefficiency in the Federal establishment, is there any reason for believing that the defense programs are somehow exempt? It is axiomatic that all the progress of the Federal Government cannot be assigned the same priority, nor are they equally effective in attaining their stated goals.

But neither the Congress nor the Executive is facing up squarely to the need for a system of establishing expenditure priorities. Three witnesses, respected economists, recently testified before the Joint Economic Committee that billions of dollars are being wasted every year because the wrong interest rate is used to determine the benefits of public works projects. Senator Proxmire put the matter bluntly when he said that: "We make no effort to determine whether the Federal Government can better invest funds . . . or whether it is wiser to leave that investment to the private economy. We have no sensible ways of determining whether we are going to get back in benefits the costs of the billions of dollars which this Government invests every year."

Curbs that are fashioned in a fever pitch of anger will not reverse the trend of Federal expenditure. At best it will check the rise for more than a single year; at worst it will disrupt effective programs. There is, in short no alternative to a rational system for establishing priorities.

HUMANE CARE FOR LABORATORY ANIMALS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, last year the Senate approved by a 85-to-0 vote the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, which for the first time, provides humane care and treatment for the thousands of animals used in laboratory research. The act, Public Law 89-544, applies to both animal dealers and research laboratories. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to administer and enforce the program.

On September 27 the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] introduced a bill with the appealing title, "Humane Laboratory Animal Treatment Act of 1967," which would repeal Public Law 89-544 and permit the research laboratories, which have fought so long and hard against any regulation or requirement for humane treatment, to police their own actions. It would take away the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to require humane care and treatment of animals by research laboratories.

There was strong editorial support throughout the country last year for Public Law 89-544. That support remains. I am delighted that leading editorial writers are so alert to the seemingly innocuous, but deadly, provisions of Senator JAVITS' bill, which would eliminate the effective regulation of research laboratories.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorials published in the Christian Science Monitor, the Evening Star, the Courier-Journal & Times, and the Washington Post, which expose the Javits bill for what it is—an attempt to undo what Congress did last year by repealing effective animal-care regulation of research laboratories.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 21, 1967]

LABORATORY ANIMAL WELFARE

When the 89th Congress, by an overwhelming majority, passed P.L. 89-544, the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, humanitarians might well have supposed that relief from intolerable conditions on dealers' premises, in transit, and in research laboratories was in sight. But behind-the-scenes opposition has been quietly at work to delay and to nullify.

Sen. Jacob Javits has circularized the Senate with a letter asking for cosponsors on a draft of a new laboratory animal bill. It has been characterized by Senator Javits as

an "extension of P.L. 89–544"; but in reality it would repeal the major coverage of that act, which is to regulate conditions in laboratories and medical research centers. Senator Javits' proposed bill would still leave with the Department of Agriculture the enforcement of that part of the law involving dealers' premises. But it would take away from that department the enforcement of the clauses involving laboratories and medical research centers and would transfer it to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This department would, in turn, be authorized to delegate the inspection to "professional bodies." The main accrediting body would almost certainly be the American Association for the Advancement of Laboratory Animal Care, which is sponsored by such groups as the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and the American Medical Association. These groups would obviously be liable to motivation by self-interest. Yet Senator Javits' proposal would use taxpayer's money to pay for this self-policing.

As P.L. 89–544 now stands, the inspection of both dealers' premises and laboratories is carried out by veterinarians employed by the Department of Agriculture—men who bring to the job an objective viewpoint, with no self-interest involved.

Senator Javits has stated that he and Congressman Paul Rogers will introduce the new bill concurrently in Senate and House. Such a bill should attract no cosponsors in the Senate, and its companion bill should receive no support in the House. Self-policing by vested interests must be no part of any law designed for the protection of laboratory animals.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 23, 1967]

ANIMAL WELFARE, ROUND 2

According to a letter he has mailed to colleagues, Senator Javits of New York plans to introduce a bill soon, similar to one by Representative Rogers of Florida, which would tinker with the sensible Laboratory Animal Welfare Act enacted last year.

On the face of it, his amendment bears a humanitarian label. It would repeal a section of the law and require laboratory researchers to administer anesthesia to animals they are using in those experiments likely to cause pain.

But this clause, apparently a sop to the antivivisectionists, carries a price tag. First, it is hedged by an exception that anesthesia needn't be used it if would "defeat the objective" of the experiment.

Other more sweeping changes also are proposed. Regulatory authority over laboratories would be taken away from the Department of Agriculture, which is impartial and has no axe to grind in this matter, and would be given to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare which fought the bill as enacted last year. Furthermore, HEW would be empowered to farm out inspection of laboratories to a private group. It seems highly likely this would be the same outfit friendly to the medical fraternity that was proposed last year in a defeated amendment.

The motive for the Javits-Rogers bills seems clear. They have bought the line that the present law is a move toward federal control over research, and that the best way to weaken this is by bankrolling a private inspection organization that will not embarrass laboratories with over-zealous inspections.

The present law, if backed with adequate funds, will do the job. It will not be improved by the Javits-Rogers amendment.

[From the Courier-Journal & Times, Sept. 24, 1967]

THIS ACT WOULD HURT, NOT HELP ANIMALS

When a long fight ends in the adoption of a satisfactory law, it is a great pity to tamper with it. Such a battle, led by dedicated and determined women all over America, resulted in the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966. Its official designation is P. L. 89–544.

Now come Rep. Paul Rogers and Sen. Jacob Javits with a joint bill which purports to improve last year's measure. Unfortunately, their bill would have the opposite effect. It would weaken the 1966 act and disrupt its administration, even before it has had a chance to prove its workability.

The Rogers-Javits bill would take the enforcement of humane standards in animal laboratories out of the hands of the Department of Agriculture and put it under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This sounds like a harmless shift from one government agency to another. What it really entails, however, is a new set of standards to replace the good requirements now in use.

Inspection and accreditation of animal laboratories, too, would pass to outside groups which have an interest in maintaining relatively lax standards of care. One visit would serve to accredit a laboratory for five years, without a second inspection.

Javits and Rogers call their bill a mere "extension" of P.L. 89–544. But what it really represents is a fundamental change, which would give less protection than more.

The 1966 bill was thrashed out after years of work and extensive hearings. It should be allowed to stand without amendment, at least for a reasonable period of trial.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 2, 1967]

PROTECTING ANIMALS

Medical research leaders have suddenly become so zealous for the protection of animals involved in laboratory experimentation that they now want to take over the protecting job themselves. They have been vehemently opposed to protection in the past and were unable to find a kind word to say for P.L. 89–544, the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, when it was passed overwhelmingly by the 89th Congress. Miraculously converted and reformed, however, they have become ardent supporters of a Johnny-come-lately bill proposed by Sen. Jacob Javits and Rep. Paul Rogers.

The Javits-Rogers proposal has admirable features. It would extend protection to all warmblooded animals, while the existing law covers only dogs, cats, monkeys, hamsters, guinea pigs and rabbits. It would widen the coverage of laboratories and protect research animals throughout their stay in a laboratory, while the existing law protects them only when they are in the hands of dealers and in the laboratory before and after experimentation. We support such protection wholeheartedly.

But the Javits-Rogers proposal would wreck the existing law by the simple device of shifting the inspection of laboratories and research centers from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Could it be that the medical research leaders prefer to entrust enforcement to HEW because they are so influential in that Department through the National Institutes of Health?

The Javits-Rogers proposal threatens to vitiate enforcement in an even worse way—by allowing HEW to delegate inspection and the licensing of laboratories to "professional bodies." The obvious "professional body" in this field is the American Asssociation for the Advancement of Laboratory Animal Care, sponsored by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and the American Medical Association. It sounds a little like assigning Cosa Nostra to guard the banks.

If Messrs. Rogers and Javits really want to improve the protection of research animals, let them safeguard the gains made last year and take their improvements to the Senate Commerce Committee—instead of trying to circumvent that experienced body. And if the AMA really wants to promote animal welfare, let it start lobbying for the funds needed to police last year's law, P.L. 89–544.

ELECTION OF NEW BOARD OF FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the New York Times of September 29 reported the election of a new board of the Foreign Service Association, an election which was apparently the product of a write-in campaign aimed at providing the association with more activist-minded leadership. This development strikes me as a good sign for the future of the Foreign Service.

The election was, however, a sign that the present state of affairs in the Foreign Service is apparently quite unsatisfactory in many respects. The New York Times reported the remark, attributed to an Association spokeman, that the election reflects "a general mood of grievance and concern, a sense of frustration and malaise about the state of morale" at the State Department and among career officers of the Agency for International Development and the U.S. Information Agency. The article went on to note that the problems which worry officers of these agencies include "the demand of career officers at all levels for more responsibility, more pay at lower grades and a more acceptable system of promotion and career planning at the upper grades."

These comments do not come as news to any of us familiar with the Foreign Service. As I have pointed out on the floor of the Senate, anyone who has more than a superficial contact with the Foreign Service, and with AID and USIA, knows that morale in these organizations leaves much to be desired. On June 20, I said on the floor that I thought that the time had come "to make a comprehensive study of this country's requirements, present resources, and future needs not only in the Department of State and Foreign Service but also in USIA, AID, the Department of Defense, and the other principal government agencies involved in foreign affairs." I mentioned that I had written the President in October 1966, "suggesting that he consider appointing a high-level, blue-ribbon Presidential committee to take a new, thorough, and objective look at these organizational problems." I added that it seemed logical to me "that the Department would be glad to see such a committee established and would feel a responsibility to its employees to see that the best available minds in the United States were set to work" on these problems.

My proposal does not seem to have been received with much enthusiasm by the Department of State. On August 2, I wrote Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach, mentioning my suggestion again and pointing out to him that the discussions in the committee on several recent legislative proposals relating to USIA and AID personnel "showed clearly that there is a growing feeling in the

committee that the time has come to drop the piecemeal approach in favor of making a thorough study."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Diplomats' Group Elects Activists," published in the September 29 issue of the New York Times, and my letter of August 2 to Under Secretary Katzenbach be printed in the RECORD.

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

DIPLOMATS' GROUP ELECTS ACTIVISTS—WRITE-IN SLATE GAINS CONTROL OF FOREIGN SERVICE SOCIETY

WASHINGTON, September 28.—A slate of activist-minded Foreign Service officers, campaigning on a write-in-ticket that promised fellow professional diplomats a chance to air their grievances, took control of the 7,000-member Foreign Service Association today.

A spokesman said the slate's victory in what had traditionally been routine annual elections of the professional group reflected "a general mood of grievance and concern, a sense of frustration and malaise about the state of morale" at the State Department and among career officers at the Agency for International Development and the United States Information Agency.

Lannon Walker, the new board chairman of the association, said the mood had developed over the last 18 months.

"This has been going on for some time in small groups—talking, writing papers, open letters and so forth," said Mr. Walker, 31 years old, a middle-level officer. "A couple of us decided about six months ago that we'd better stop talking and start organizing."

A SAY IN THEIR CAREERS

"Our decision to run for office was to give ourselves a more powerful position from which to take independent positions to that foreign affairs professionals would, for the first time, have a say in what their careers should be and how the foreign affairs community should be organized," Mr. Walker said. "And we feel these views should be stated clearly and forcefully."

Mr. Walker and other new officers shied away from calling their campaign a "Young Turk" movement, noting that three of the 11 new directors of the association were senior officers.

But they acknowledged that much of the impetus had come from junior-level and middle-level officers who had been dissatisfied with the relative inactivity of the association.

The association, a private organization for career officers in the State Department, the A.I.D., the U.S.I.A. and the Peace Corps, was established in 1918.

In the past, the State Department and other agencies have consulted association officers on personnel and administrative matters affecting career officers.

SPIRIT OF FRATERNITY

Its purposes have been to promote the spirit of fraternity among professional foreign affairs officers and to project their good name and well-being. The association had a voice in the preparation of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. Nonetheless, many Foreign Service officers say that until now the association has amounted to what one called "a company union."

The new board of directors, chosen indirectly in worldwide balloting between July 1 and Sept. 10, has an average age of 36. It includes two junior officers, equivalent to Army captains; six middle-grade officers, equivalent to Army majors and colonels, and three senior officers, equivalent to brigadier and major generals.

Mr. Walker, who joined the Foreign Service in 1961 after serving in the Air Force, is chairman. Theodore L. Eliot Jr., 39, who has been in the State Department for 18 years, is vice-chairman.

KOHLER PRAISES ACTIVISM

The president of the association, re-appointed by the new board, is Foy D. Kohler, Deputy Under Secretary of State and the ranking career diplomat in the Foreign Service.

In a speech to an association meeting today, Mr. Kohler praised the bold spirit of the new board. He observed that in the past the Foreign Service had "given the appearance of dreading change."

He said he was "pleased" by the new spirit of activism.

"I refer to an inclination to look the world straight in the eye, take its measure without flinching or equivocation and to respond to its challenges," he said.

He also praised a number of transitional studies started under the auspices of the out-going board.

One, he noted, recommended that the association concentrate "on becoming an organization with a serious intellectual base and an active—even combative—concern for the people at the heart of foreign affairs, regardless of their agency affiliation."

Mr. Kohler also referred to exploratory talks with labor unions of comparable professional or Government employes such as the American Federation of Government Employes and the National Federation of Professional Organizations.

The new board of directors has not yet made public any specific program, other officers said. But the private comments of several new board members and other diplomats indicated the following general areas of concern:

PERSONNEL PROBLEMS

This includes the demand of career officers at all levels for more responsibility, more pay at lower grades and a more equitable system of promotion and career planning at the upper grades.

The situation is aggravated, new leaders maintain, by the top-heavy structure of the Foreign Service, which is now overloaded with senior officers. Some of these say privately they are concerned about new regulations that would force them into early retirement if they remain in any individual grade for too many years.

"In some cases," said a sympathetic middle-grade officer who asked to remain anonymous, "this would penalize some of our brighter lights. These were the guys who were promoted fast to the top ranks ten years ago and then, because of the logjam at the top, have had to stay there."

Others worry in private about what they consider to be a shift toward the military career system, in which many officers count on leaving after 20 years of active duty.

"If this is what is going to be expected. We want to know about it in advance," the middle-grade officer explained. "But most of us count on a lifetime career in the foreign service.

STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS

In his speech, Mr. Kohler alluded to the feelings of many officers that the foreign affairs community, consisting of the several government agencies dealing with foreign affairs, could be better organized.

Privately, some middle-level State Department officials express frustration at their inability to exert the leadership role that they think the State Department should have. New board members say they would like to see the association come up with proposals for improving the situation.

THE PRESTIGE PROBLEMS

The underlying feeling, as one of the new board members put it, is that there is an unfair gap between the public view of the foreign affairs professionals and the feeling of the Foreign Service corps that they represent a highly qualified, well-educated, dedicated elite group of government servants.

This viewpoint was spelled out by six middle-level officers in a letter to the Foreign Service Journal in November, 1966. The letter was headed, "Are We Obsolete?" The Journal is the monthly publication of the association.

AUGUST 2, 1967.

Hon. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Under Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KATZENBACH: It occurred to me that now that you have been Under Secretary of State for some ten months, you might have had some second thoughts on my suggestion, made in a letter to the President last October, that a blue-ribbon Presidential commission be established to examine thoroughly the organization of not only the Foreign Service but all government agencies involved in the conduct of our foreign relations. I know that when I talked to you about this proposal last January you felt that you would prefer to undertake this task yourself. I can fully appreciate the fact that more pressing problems have prevented you from devoting your attention to this complicated matter; in fact, I was skeptical from the beginning that you would ever find the time to do so.

Since our talk, there have been several legislative proposals before the Committee relating to U.S.I.A. and A.I.D. personnel. The discussion of these measures showed clearly that there is a growing feeling in the Committee that the time has come to drop the piecemeal approach in favor of making a thorough study of this country's requirements, present resources and future needs with respect to personnel engaged in foreign affairs.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

U.S. SUPPORT OF U.N. SULLIED BY FAILURE TO RATIFY HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—CIL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] has been joined by a growing number of Senators in requesting United Nations action as a possible means of bringing peace and stability to Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

I welcome the majority leader's suggestion of an enlarged role of the United Nations in working toward a just and honorable peace in Vietnam.

I would also suggest that the support of the United Nations by the United States is somewhat suspect in view of this Nation's failure to ratify a single human rights convention. Our national failure to ratify any of these conventions stands in direct contradiction of our stated allegiance to the U.N.

Everyone is for human rights. The human rights conventions constitute an honest attempt to translate cherished human rights into international legal rights: to establish minimum universal standards of human dignity. The question can rightly be asked: "Just how much does the United States care about the work of the U.N. when the United States can ignore the Genocide Conventions for 18 years?"

This is a valid question and one which is not easily answered. Our unexplained failure to ratify any of these conventions embarrasses our allies and provides tons of propaganda for unfriendly nations.

The United States does not have to

take a back seat to any nation in human rights. I am proud of our Nation's continuing struggle to extend and guarantee human rights to every American citizen. Yet we have failed to ratify Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery—treaties that guarantee freedoms which are already the birthright of every American.

I urge the Senate to reaffirm this Nation's support of the United Nations in a very meaningful way by giving our advice and consent to all the human rights conventions before us.

By so doing, we will put the United States squarely on record on the question of international human rights as well as give the United Nations a real lift when that world organization badly needs our endorsement.

THE NATURE OF OUR INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I have read with interest the remarks in the RECORD made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] concerning the nature of our involvement in Vietnam.

The Senator has in his usually able fashion pointed out what is to me the single most important facet of our involvement there—the fact that our presence in Vietnam is welcomed by our Asian friends and the neighbors of South Vietnam. They welcome our involvement there because they realize, as Senator McGEE notes, that we are the wall—the umbrella—that shields them from Communist aggression.

As the Senator succinctly put it:

> They do not want to be confronted by a new regime forced upon them by the mobilizing of terrorist groups from the outside. It is as simple and as elementary as that.

I agree. It is that simple. There has grown up around the entire question of Vietnam a body of nebulous charges as to who involved us in Vietnam, why we are involved in Vietnam, and the nature of our national interest in Vietnam. The remarks of Senator McGEE have helped to put the problem back in perspective.

In this same connection, I should like to recommend to the Senate an article written by the distinguished author Mr. Eugene Lyons, and published in the October issue of the Reader's Digest. In the article, Mr. Lyons quotes Senator McGEE as saying:

> To understand Vietnam, it is necessary to understand that the issue is not Vietnam. Rather, it is the chance to achieve stability in all of Eastern Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, appropriately, "Vietnam: The Charges and the Facts," be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM: THE CHARGES AND THE FACTS

(By Eugene Lyons)

(NOTE.—In Vietnam the United States is fighting a bloody war that has not been officially "declared" by Congress. Consequently there are none of the legal restraints on domestic dissent that prevail in wartime, and opponents of the military action have made the most of this situation. It is easy to overestimate the magnitude of the opposition because of its emotionalism and sheer decibel power. The fact is, nevertheless, that the majority of the American people, if polls are to be credited, support the war. But even among supporters the dissenters' arguments have generated confusion and skepticism. Here, then, are some of the critics' principal charges—and the hard facts that overwhelmingly refute them.)

Charge: "If we were not already involved as we are today in Vietnam, I would know no reason why we should wish to become so involved," George F. Kennan, former ambassador to Moscow and Belgrade, testified at Congressional hearings. Our policy makers, Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota wrote, "have distorted history to justify our intervention in a civil conflict." These claims imply that U.S. commitments to defend the life of South Vietnam were exaggerated and did not bind us to intervene with military force.

Fact: Through its adherence to SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization), the United States in 1954 pledged explicitly to use "appropriate means" (a diplomatic euphemism for military force) to meet any threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of South Vietnam. Thereafter, three successive Washington administrations consistently committed themselves to protect the national independence of that newborn nation, and economic and military aid to the Saigon government has been approved by Congress year after year.

The purpose of all this, as President Eisenhower explained to President Diem of South Vietnam in October 1954, was to assist in developing a "strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means," Six years later, Eisenhower again assured Diem that "for so long as our strength can be useful, the United States will continue to assist Vietnam in the difficult yet hopeful struggle ahead." President Kennedy reaffirmed this pledge in a letter to Diem on December 14, 1961, adding, "If the communist authorities in North Vietnam will stop their campaign to destroy the Republic of Vietnam, the measures we are taking to assist your defense efforts will no longer be necessary." The promise was sufficiently clear that if the campaign did continue, so would the American commitment to frustrate it.

In early August 1964, two U.S. destroyers were attacked by North Vietnamese torpedo boats in the international waters of the Gulf of Tonkin. Congress responded to this act of war at once. On August 7, it passed a joint resolution, with only two negative votes, authorizing the President to "take all necessary measures to prevent further aggression." The United States was prepared, it said, to use armed force "to assist any member or protocol state of SEATO requesting assistance in defense of its freedom." (South Vietnam, while not a member of the organization, is a "protocol state" under its protection.) That Congressional authorization remains in effect today.

Since then, of course, the record is replete with further official commitments to prevent the extinction of South Vietnam. At a White House press conference on July 28, 1965, for instance, President Johnson said, "We are in Vietnam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American nation. We cannot now dishonor our word or abandon our commitment or leave those who believed in us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow."

There may be room for dispute on the wisdom of the commitments and the actions taken to implement them, but not on their compelling reality. Solemn obligations have been assumed at the highest levels of government and approved by Congress. In the course of the years, moreover, these commitments have acquired moral dimensions. Ever since 1954, American pronouncements have encouraged the South Vietnamese to persevere in resisting communism. To leave them now to the mercies of the enemy would be close to betrayal. American credibility and honor are clearly on the line in Vietnam.

Charge: The United States has no business being in Vietnam. In the words of Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau, "the war has no rational political purpose." We are acting, some critics say, through "a psychotic fear of communism," though communism has long ceased to be a real menace.

Fact: As far back as June 1, 1956, Sen. John F. Kennedy, at a conference of the American Friends of Vietnam in Washington, emphasized the great American stakes in Vietnam. "Vietnam," he stated, "represents the cornerstone of the free world in Southeast Asia, the keystone to the arch, the finger in the dike. Burma, Thailand, India, Japan, the Philippines, and obviously Laos and Cambodia would be threatened if the red tide of communism overflowed into Vietnam. The fundamental tenets of this nation's foreign policy, in short, depend in considerable measure upon a strong and free Vietnam."

Hanoi's conquest of South Vietnam could touch off a chain reaction of those "wars of liberation" which Red China and the U.S.S.R. equally have defined as their main technique for encircling and strangling the world of freedom. As Secretary of State Dean Rusk said on August 3, 1965, "If we were to fail in Vietnam, our adversaries would be encouraged to take greater risks elsewhere." Confirmation of this prospect comes constantly from the communists themselves. They candidly acknowledge that Vietnam is the test case for their liberation-war plans. "Within a short time," a delegate from North Vietnam declared at the Tricontinental Conference of world communism in Havana in 1966, "there will be not one but many Vietnams."

"To understand Vietnam," Sen. Gale McGee of Wyoming said at American University in Washington last June, "it is necessary to understand that the issue is not Vietnam. Rather, it is the chance to achieve stability in all of eastern Asia. What is happening along both sides of the 17th parallel might well have happened instead in the Philippines or in Thailand or Burma. It just happened to happen in Vietnam." And in his last recorded words, only half an hour before he died, Adlai Stevenson touched the heart of the matter. "My hope in Vietnam," he said, "is that resistance there may establish the fact that changes in Asia are not to be precipitated by outside forces."

Already the mere American presence in South Vietnam has raised the political morale in the small countries within the shadow of Red Chinese power. Those countries are showing new courage in tackling common social and economic problems through collective action. "If the Americans succeed in Vietnam," Thanat Khoman, Thailand's foreign minister, has declared, "there will be no second Vietnam, no third Vietnam." In the course of his recent American visit, Harold Holt, prime minister of Australia, told the press that American steadfastness in Southeast Asia had indirectly helped the defeat of communism in Indonesia.

Ugly and costly as the war has turned out to be, Vietnam was the right place and the right time to meet a life-and-death challenge in a critical part of our shrinking world. The argument that "we have no business" to be in Vietnam is a formula that opens wide the gates to aggressive communism—a virtual guarantee of bigger and more dangerous challenge elsewhere.

Charge: "While calling for negotiations,

we are practicing military escalation and diplomatic rigidity in such a fashion as to foreclose negotiations." This assertion by Senator McGovern reflects the fact that millions at home and abroad are honestly convinced that the United States has evaded peace talks. The demand that the United States "negotiate now" has been inscribed on myriad antiwar placards.

Fact: Never before in history has the stronger nation in a war pleaded so persistently with a weaker adversary for peace talks on almost any terms short of surrender, only to be repeatedly repulsed and insulted.

The State Department in late April made public an inventory of 28 proposals for talks made by the United States and intermediaries. An unofficial accounting by *U.S. News & World Report* placed the peace feelers between February '65 and March '67 at 45. But whatever the score, the common element in every case has been a firm rejection either by North Vietnam or by Red China in its behalf. Hanoi actually boasted that it had turned down the 28 U.S. peace initiatives listed by the State Department—five of them directly from the President—as mere "imperialist tricks." In these same years not a single direct feeler looking to negotiation or deescalation of the conflict has come from North Vietnam.

In view of this record the continuing clamor for instant negotiations surpasses understanding. Strangely, the demands are directed not to reluctant Hanoi but to overeager Washington. It is easy to understand the note of frustration in President Johnson's speech before the American Physical Society in April: "I want to negotiate. But I can't negotiate with myself."

At one point in 1964, it is true, the United States failed to respond to what U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, reported as willingness by Hanoi to make contact with Americans in Rangoon, Burma. At that juncture the cards were so heavily stacked for the communists that few even among the so-called doves saw any sense in the meeting. The Vietcong was then at the peak of its victories and the Saigon government tottering; the American forces in Vietnam, still in an advisory role, were extremely minor. Negotiations then could only have been a cover for surrender.

Early in 1965, a more reasonable ratio of strength was attained. But at that point North Vietnam was indicating an impossible precondition for negotiation: the withdrawal of all American forces. Thereafter, when the United States began selective bombing, it switched to insistence upon permanent and unconditional cessation of that bombing, but without offering so much as a token move to match the American reduction in the level of fighting.

From that time forward, not only have the pressures for negotiations been entirely one-sided, but every American offer has been tailored to overcome previous communist objections. In an address in Baltimore on April 7, 1965, President Johnson consented to "unconditional discussions." Hanoi promptly denounced it as "a smoke screen to cover up the U.S. imperialists' military adventures in Vietnam." Then, when Hanoi charged that the U.S. was not willing to deal with North Vietnam's political arm in South Vietnam, the National Liberation Front, and its Vietcong terrorists, Washington made it clear that they would indeed be acceptable as partners to negotiation. Yet approaches to Hanoi, as well as Washington attempts to submit the issues to the U.N., have consistently been rebuffed.

On February 20, 1965, Britain proposed that Soviet Russia join her in seeking a settlement of the war. A spokesman for the NLF replied that first "the U.S. imperialists must withdraw all their troops." Ten weeks later, on April 1, seventeen nonaligned nations appealed for unconditional negotiations. Washington approved their initiative, but again the reply was, in substance, "Nothing doing while American forces are in Vietnam."

During and after the Christmas truce in December 1965, the United States prolonged its cessation of bombing for 37 days. Against this background of unilateral restraint, it mounted a dramatic peace offensive. U.S. diplomatic envoys visited 34 capitals to seek support for negotiations, and the President addressed many heads of state to the same effect. U.N. Secretary General U Thant and dozens of governments begged Ho Chi Minh to agree to talks. Not only did Hanoi denounce all of it as "a large-scale deceptive peace campaign," but it raised the ante with a demand that the bombing be called off not merely unconditionally but permanently.

Then, in August 1966, the foreign ministers of Thailand, Malaysia and the Philippines sought an all-Asian effort to set talks in motion. They, too, were dismissed by Hanoi as "third-class henchmen of the United States" engaged in a "cheap farce." At the United Nations in the following month, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg offered the withdrawal of troops and a halt to bombing, and possible admission of the Vietcong to peace talks. The United States and six of its allies, meeting in Manila in October 1966, proposed a six-point plan for peace, which the communists at once condemned as "a swindle."

This is only a partial accounting. Hoping that North Vietnam might be more amenable to secret talks, Washington has made a number of unpublicized approaches. All in vain. If anything is clear it is that all possible paths to the conference table have been blocked not by Washington but by the communists.

Charge: U.S. bombing is the stumbling block on the path to peace. At an international *Pacem in Terris* conference in Geneva last May, the Rev. Martin Luther King called for an "end of all bombing of North Vietnam in the hope that such action will create the atmosphere for negotiations." A Canadian delegate, Chester A. Ronning, saw cessation of bombing as the first step toward "a dialogue among the parties to the conflict." "Stop the Bombing" is the No. 1 antiwar slogan.

Fact: On five occasions American bombing was halted as part of a holiday truce. In each instance Hanoi found excuses for evading peace talks. Instead it has exploited pauses to speed up its flow of supplies to the South. After the six-day cessation of bombing last February, for example, the Pentagon disclosed that the enemy had transported 23,000 tons of materials—"the largest resupply ever detected."

Under the circumstances Washintgon can hardly be blamed for resisting the demands for an unconditional and permanent end to bombing. American authorities have made plain that to bring about peace talks they are prepared to suspend bombing, provided Hanoi will suspend further infiltration of men and supplies into the South. They are urging, in substance, a freeze on the force levels of both sides, preferably with a cease-fire, but without one if necessary.

It should be obvious that, without such reciprocal action, the United States and its allies would face a constantly strengthened Vietcong as the hoped-for peace talks dragged on month after month. (It should not be forgotten that aobut one half of American casualties in Korea were sustained after the start of peace talks.) North Vietnam would again become a privileged sanctuary. And if obliged to resume air operations above the 17th parallel to stem the tide of enemy reinforcements, the United States would inevitably be accused by the whole world of disrupting the negotiations. These are the realities ignored by those who urge cessation of bombings and no questions asked. Even columnist Walter Lippmann, a relentless opponent of American policy on Vietnam, concedes that to promise a *permanent* suspension of bombing would be an "absurdity." Yet the enemy will accept nothing else.

In a secret letter to Ho Chi Minh on February 2 of this year, President Johnson went close to the limit on this issue. "I am prepared," he wrote, "to order a cessation of bombing against your country and the stopping of further augmentation of United States forces in South Vietnam as soon as I am assured that infiltration into South Vietnam by land and by sea has stopped."

Ho's response, on February 15, accused the United States of "crimes against peace and against mankind." The United States, he said, "must cease this aggression, must stop unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war." Only after that could his government "enter into talks."

In the light of such communist rigidity, only wishful thinking could justify another unconditional cessation. Surely, if Hanoi really had a change of mind, it is resourceful enough to convey that fact to Washington. The stakes are too high for another round in a murky guessing game.

Despite the clouds of confusion thrown around the issue, Hanoi knows it can get a cessation of American bombing at any time for the asking. The sole condition is a reduction in its own level of operations to match. This is not only reasonable but the least the United States can do to protect its own forces and those of its allies.

NEW YORK TIMES CALLS SPENDING CUT, NOT TAX HIKE, BEST ANTI-INFLATIONARY MEDICINE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times argues very persuasively that the tax hike proposed by the administration will not do the big anti-inflationary job that the administration says it will.

The Times points to the size of the tax increase—only about 1 percent of the gross national product—and also says that the tax might very well persuade corporations and labor to raise the price of what they sell.

I might add, Mr. President, that because the tax hike itself tends to slow down the economy and reduce income and jobs, it will yield far less than the amount the administration has indicated. Indeed, as some economists have told the Joint Economic Committee, it could have precisely the reverse effect of the 1964 tax cut which, in the view of most economists, actually increased revenues by increasing jobs and incomes.

Similarly, the 1967 tax hike could reduce, not increase, revenues and increase the size of the budget deficit.

Furthermore, as the New York Times has said, a spending cut can accomplish the same effect as a tax hike without the explicit inflationary impact of higher taxes contributing to higher prices. And, as the New York Times points out, there are plenty of places to cut without turning our backs on our social or international responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Inflation Insurance," published in this morning's New York Times, be printed in the RECORD.

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

INFLATION INSURANCE?

President Johnson's warning that his proposal for tax increases is essential if the hidden tax extorted by a future inflationary spiral is to be avoided overlooks the fact that the nation's consumers are already suffering the evil effects of inflation. This year's upsurge in prices, coming on top of the sharp rises of 1966, has shrunk consumer purchasing power and provoked organized labor's swollen wage demands.

Unfortunately, the President's proposal for a 10 per cent surcharge will do nothing now to halt the present wave of inflation. A tax increase might still be justified if it would really eliminate the threat of inflation in the future, but it is highly doubtful that Mr. Johnson's admittedly small request, averaging about 1 per cent of the present tax and providing only about $7 billion in added revenues, is adequate for the purpose.

If the economic situation is as critical as Administration spokesmen say it is, this much of an increase in revenues is not going to be enough to curb inflationary price rises or prevent a fresh escalation in interest rates. Certainly it is too small to make much of a dent in a Federal budget deficit estimated to run from $19 billion to $29 billion. The surcharge might in fact prompt industry to raise prices in order to maintain profits and cause labor to press for even bigger wage increases. So instead of acting as a deterrent, it could be another spur to inflation.

A safer and surer way to guard against price rises is to reduce Federal spending that is not absolutely required to support the war in Vietnam and the fight against poverty. Mr. Johnson has observed that it took political courage to press for tax increases, but it would require even more courage to bring down spending by cuts in the Congressional pork barrel and other entrenched sources of waste and extravagance. By waging a fight for spending cuts, the President would not only lessen the threat of future inflation. He would also be doing something positive to cope with the inflation that is already here.

SELF-EVALUATION OF POVERTY PROGRAMS OF SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHOE TRIBES OF WIND RIVER RESERVATION, WYO.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, recently I received in the mail a rather concise self-evaluation of the poverty programs which are being carried on among members of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indian Tribes on the Wind River Reservation of Wyoming. The overall community action program on the reservation is broad-based and popular and covers much ground, ranging from the publication of an excellent and informative newsletter to self-help housing. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report from Mr. J. C. Sollars, reservation director of the community action program.

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

SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHOE TRIBES,
Fort Washakie, Wyo., September 26, 1967.

Senator GALE MCGEE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: On July 11, 1967, the O.E.O. Committee met for the purpose of evaluating our existing O.E.O. Program, its components and allied activities.

These items included Conduct & Administration, Newsletter, Agricultural Extension, Head Start, NYC (Out of School, Summer & In School). Adult Basic Education, Upward Bound, Job Corps, Alcoholism, Legal Aid, GSA Surplus Property, Educational Survey, Community Survey, Industrial Developments, Self Help Housing, Low Rent Housing, Rural Area Redevelopment Funds and MDTA Programs plus five VISTA workers.

This meeting lasted over four hours and persons responsible for each aspect gave a report and answered questions for the group.

The principal goal of our overall C.A.P. Program has been education and employment. Following this hearing it was moved and passed by a unanimous vote to recommend to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Joint Business Council that continual support be given to the O.E.O. Program. This recommendation was endorsed by a unanimous vote of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Joint Business Council the following week.

From an administrative position, it becomes difficult to rate one program over another so let me put them all together and list some details of each program.

All our employees have been hired locally except our professional employees: three Head Start teachers, one attorney and one director. We also have one Japanese employee, three rehabilitated employees, one alcoholic, one war veteran and one with a felony record. We further have one person who has been through a bankruptcy charge and two people who were previously on welfare. All of these employees are currently doing an excellent job for us. Our staff is composed largely of family people who are supporting 68 children.

We have had a waiting list for our NYC Program since it has been in operation. We have also had a waiting list for work stations which indicate how well the program has been received. Transportation has been a problem for us in a rural area. Our greatest pleasure from our NYC Program has come from the permanent job placement these young people have secured. Twelve NYC enrollees who were in this year's quota of 38 Out of School (drop outs) have returned to school. Six have found regular work, five have gone into the military service, two boys and one girl entered Job Corps, two enrollees went on job relocation and two were placed in MDTA Programs with several applications pending for the new Datel Training Program.

Our Legal Services is our newest component and we have had a very heavy work load for our attorney over the past eight weeks.

We are currently operating two Head Start centers with 60 children and we have requests and interest to establish a third center should funds be made available.

We have ten students in the University of Montana Upward Bound Program of which we are very proud. We have been trying to get a quota from the University of Wyoming as we have an additional 20 students who qualify and are interested.

Our Conduct and Administration Component, which administers all the programs listed, consists of a director, two assistant directors (one from each tribe) and one clerical person. With the exception of an assistant NYC Director, no other administrative personnel is employed.

We have contracted the firm of Raab-Raush & Gaymon to audit all our financial records under O.E.O. grants.

Our newsletter has been very well accepted and has proved very useful as shown by our Legal Services questionnaire which showed 70% of the people who used this service had gained their information from the newsletter.

This publication was so well accepted that the Joint Business Council agreed to finance additional copies for Service Men, Institutionalized tribal members and children away to schools.

We have completed an Educational Survey in conjunction with the new Junior College in Riverton. We conducted an Adult Basic Education Program in English and Math for 13 people which ended in May. We also conducted a program under MDTA Funds for 30 heads of families. This program was completed in June.

Our Agricultural Extension Program includes home repair & construction, home management, consumer buying gardening, landscaping, cloth construction and home appliance use and care.

Our evaluation causes us to feel we are making good progress in our goals of education and employment. With better education or training, employment will increase and family income will be raised as a result. With an increase in income, living standards and personal motivation will also be raised.

In conclusion, on behalf of our O.E.O. Committee and the Shoshone and Arapahoe Joint Business Council, it has been our opinion based on the work of the Community Action Program during its first year, that it has been an excellent agency in helping to eliminate poverty on the Wind River Indian Reservation.

Sincerely,

J. C. SOLLARS,
Reservation Director, Community Action Program.

EXCESSIVE COST OF PHILADELPHIA EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT CORP.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on September 26, 1967, I spoke in support of the Emergency Employment Act. Throughout my statement I called attention to the need for proper implementation of that program if enacted. Indeed, we have all too often been in the position of seeing worthwhile programs by the somewhat less than inspiring level of their implementation. We would do well to consider the degree to which opponents of the Emergency Employment Act are influenced by situations such as that described in the following article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 17, 1967. The article details the fruitless efforts to obtain information about the Philadelphia Employment Development Corp. It is a sad story when the north Philadelphia area which most needs help has a program which lists $1.8 million for staff salaries, travel, and expenses. Let me ask again the question asked in the article: Why is it going to take $4.9 million and 480 persons for Philadelphia Employment Development Corp. to place 3,000 in jobs?

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:

DIRECTOR SIDESTEPS QUESTIONS ON JOB

(By Ward Welsh)

The new $375-a-week director of a $4.9 million program to find jobs for the poor in North Philadelphia said this week he thought his major problem would be "one of communication" with the public and private agencies.

Norman T. Russell, a 57-year-old North Jerseyite who has been in Philadelphia six weeks, knows what he is talking about.

For in a 45-minute interview with The Inquirer, he:

Clammed up when asked how the Philadelphia Employment Development Corporation's (PEDC) $4.9 million in Federal funds would be spent, at first insisting it was "confidential information."

Refused to comment on Mayor James H. J. Tate's job-mobile program, even though the 500 persons it put to work for the city are being paid through Russell's office.

Could not recall when he had attended the University of Pennsylvania or Columbia University, although he noted both in his resume.

Russell, who had directed a training project for the National Committee on Employment of Youth in New York for about a year before coming here last month, will be coordinating the activities of six existing city agencies in an effort to find employment for about 3000 residents of North Philadelphia.

What makes Russell's PEDC different from other job development agencies is that Russell will be going after the real hard-core unemployed—those who have never been motivated even to apply for a job.

He'll be coordinating the efforts of the North City Congress, the Opportunities Industrialization Center, Urban League, Manpower Utilization Commission, Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment and Security and the Jewish Employment Vocational Service.

Richard Olanoff, director of the Manpower Utilization Commission, who outlined the program for The Inquirer after a fruitless interview with Russell, said Russell's program would be limited to the North Philadelphia area bounded by Vine st., Susquehanna ave., 5th st. and 25th sts.

Here are some excerpts from the Russell interview:

Q. Then you went to Penn?

A. Yes.

Q. What did you take at Penn?

A. Pre-med. I was interested in medicine then.

Q. What years were you there?

A. 1932. For two years. (Records indicate Russell attended Penn in 1930–31, as a predental student.)

Q. Then you went to Columbia later?

A. Yes.

Q. When?

A. Ummm. I don't really remember. That's going back 30 years or so. (Columbia records indicate he attended the university in 1938–39.)

Q. Did you continue pre-med at Columbia?

A. No, I took business. I became interested in personnel (School records have Russell as an engineering student.)

That was the way it went.

Russell, who has two married daughters and a son, 12, said he'd rather not have it published that he and his wife live in Leonia, N. J.

Q. Why not?

A. Well, because that will be incorrect information.

Q. But you live there, don't you?

A. Just say I'm relocating.

"How is this $4.9 million going to be spent" Russell was asked.

"Well, it's all here in this budget," he said, picking up an inch-thick notebook from his desk.

"I'd like to look at it."

"Well, this is confidential information," Russell said.

He was told that the budget involved the expenditure of public funds and The Inquirer was interested in knowing where the $4.9 million was going.

"I don't think it's necessary that you review my books," he said, looking at his watch to suggest time was up. "You'll have to get budget information from our auditors," he said. "I could meet you at the accountant's on Monday."

"But you are the executive director of this program. I presume you can give me *some* idea how you are going to spend this money," he was pressed.

"Awfully sorry, but I'm so busy," Russell said graciously.

"I want you to get the right interpretation of the budget," he said.

"I'm not interested in interpretation. I just want to see the figures."

"Well, what do you want, everything down to the last dollar?" Russell said, restarting an earlier merry-go-round.

"No, maybe you could break it down into $500,000 blocks."

"Oh, no, it can't be broken down that way."

In an effort to make up for wasted time, the interviewer asked Russell what the real "gut-problems" of his job-finding effort were going to be.

He reeled off something about "recruitment . . . two weeks' orientation . . . see if they're ready for placement . . . skill training . . . placed in OJT situation."

But hadn't Mayor Tate's jobmobile drive already placed several hundred hardcore unemployed in jobs in recent weeks?

"No comment," Russell blurted.

"Well, I mean, you must be familiar with what's been going on here in this field," this reporter said.

"I only know what I read in the papers," Russell said. "I can only speak about PEDC." (Olanoff said later the 500 persons employed by the city in the jobmobile program are being paid with PEDC funds, through Russell.)

Russell finally agreed to show The Inquirer one page of his budget. It showed $1.7 million allocated for recruitment and enrollment, $1.8 million for staff salaries, travel, and expenses, and $914,000 for operations, including $423,000 for "training."

"You'll have to hurry," Russell said, as the reporter scanned the complex page of figures, taking notes.

"Could I look at the figures in your secretary's office so I won't hold you up?"

"No," Russell said.

Olanoff said the Mayor's program had placed 2100 persons in jobs in the last six weeks and that indications are that about 1800 of those are still working.

Then why is it going to take $4.9 million and 480 persons for PEDC to place 3000 in jobs.

"Well, Russell is going after the people who have given up, who won't even come out if a job is offered them," Olanoff said. "They're at the bottom of the barrel. They don't *want* jobs.

ASKING HO TO BEG FOR MERCY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President the latest pronouncement of President Johnson on the war in Vietnam took no new ground in the arena of possible peace negotiations. I had hoped that this might be an occasion on which we would hear an important announcement—it was even my hope that the time had come when the President would decide to halt the bombing of the north unilaterally and wait for the overtures we have so often been told would be forthcoming in due course if we should do so. Instead, the reiteration of a demand for assurances in advance results again, predictably, in no response from Hanoi.

Carl T. Rowan has put the situation into this summary sentence:

> To ask Hanoi publicly to pledge peace talks if the United States stops the bombing is equivalent to asking Ho to beg for mercy in front of the whole world. It just isn't going to happen.

Mr. Rowan, in the column from which that quotation is taken, discusses not only the realities of the approach but the reactions of the public, particularly as seen in a discussion with college students and faculty. Most, he found, believe that in spite of our peace protestations "President Johnson really wants to solve the Vietnam war only by giving the Communists a military drubbing."

Whether the conclusion is valid or not, the truth is that this interpretation is a most central factor in the credibility gap. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Rowan's column, published in the Washington Star, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ON CLOSING THE CREDIBILITY GAP

(By Carl T. Rowan)

WEST CHESTER, PA.—"I'm convinced that Lyndon Johnson will settle only for complete surrender by Ho Chi Minh and the Communists," the young professor said. "I'm convinced that no other end to the Vietnam war is acceptable to him."

I looked down the dinner table as a couple of students at West Chester State College nodded weakly, as if inclined to agree, but not quite sure.

"But how does that make sense," I asked, "when you have just told me what a totally politically animal Lyndon Johnson is? And when you have said Johnson is in deep political trouble because of this war?

"Wouldn't logic suggest that a politically sensitive President, desiring re-election, would want out of this war almost as much as he wants to breathe?"

This led to a discussion of the recent controversy over the claim by former editor Harry Ashmore that the President undercut a major peace effort by Ashmore and Miami editor William Bagge by dispatching a tough letter to Ho. There was talk of other alleged "peace rejections" by Washington.

Then a couple of dinner guests chimed in with comments that "Johnson is in an impossible dilemma"—that however badly he wants peace in Vietnam, he must get it on terms good enough to prevent the Republicans from filling the 1968 campaign with charges that the Democrats are "soft on communism."

When the talking was all done, it was clear that most of the people at that dinner believed President Johnson really wants to solve the Vietnam war only by giving the Communists a military drubbing.

This I found both surprising and disturbing, particularly in view of the fact that only hours earlier Ambassador to the U.N. Arthur Goldberg had said to the U.N. General Assembly:

". . . This conflict can and should be ended by a political solution at the earliest possible time. A military solution is not the answer. For our part, we do not seek to impose a military solution on North Vietnam or on its adherents. By the same token, in fidelity to a political solution, we will not permit North Vietnam and its adherents to impose a military solution upon South Vietnam."

These students and faculty members to whom I talked at dinner were no wild-eyed placard bearers, no irrational demonstrators. They were just ordinary Americans troubled, confused, looking for help in staking out an area of true belief—and not finding enough help from their government.

It seems to me that there is a lesson in their suspecting the worst about their President and their government—even in the face of those pretty plain words by Goldberg. That lesson is that, if Americans found the Goldberg speech unconvincing, so did foreigners at the United Nations and the decision-makers in Hanoi, Moscow, Peking.

The truth is that millions of Americans have come to think that the United States plays the game of foreign relations the same

way the Russians do: That we talk one track, even as we roll resolutely down another.

The people seem to think that, with deliberate cynicism, we talk peace even while delivering death in ever-larger doses.

Thus, it is easy even for Americans to believe that Goldberg could deliver his peace appeal, for propaganda effect, with a certain knowledge that Hanoi would reject it. And this rejection would become justification enough for further escalation of the bombing of North Vietnam.

Well, there surely was no doubt in the White House or State Department that Hanoi would respond negatively. To ask Hanoi publicly to pledge peace talks if the United States stops the bombing is equivalent to asking Ho to beg for mercy in front of the whole world. It just isn't going to happen.

I said months ago that if the United States stopped the bombing without any implied threats—or promises—we would get a real clue as to whether a political solution is possible. I said we could make our next moves in good conscience once we had made an honest, bold move that many wise men say is the absolute key to peace. I said that the potential benefits far outweigh the potential dangers. I still believe this.

A major potential benefit might be restoration of the credibility of the President and of the United States government among people like those I saw here. And that is a benefit not to be passed over lightly.

FISCAL 1968 AND REDUCING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we are in a period when it is essential to the economy, to the people, and to the country that Government exercise restraint and good judgment in Federal spending.

In fiscal year 1968 we face a possible budget deficit of $30 billion. With the war in Vietnam, the likelihood of an even higher deficit is undeniable, and the people here at home are facing an even more inflated market. Each wage increase is lost in the spiral of price increases, and the consumer is questioning the administration's demand for a 10-percent tax increase.

In an effort to ease the economy, the administration has announced it will cut all nonessential spending possible. In 1966, the administration sought to reduce expenditures in the fiscal 1967 budget. President Johnson told Congress:

> We intend to reduce or eliminate every possible federal expenditure provided in (the 1967 fiscal appropriations) consistent with the well-being of our citizens . . .

Just last month the President sent another message to Congress concerning the 1968 appropriations. He said:

> The executive branch pledges to take every proper action within its power to reduce expenditures in the January budget . . .

He continued:

> I pledge to the country and the Congress that I will make every possible expenditure reduction—civilian and military—short of jeopardizing the Nation's security and well being.

Secretary of the Treasury Fowler echoed the President's promise before the House Ways and Means Committee on August 14, when he said:

> This program includes both tax measures to increase our revenues and action by the Congress and the Executive Branch to restrain, cut and control expenditures so as to reduce the prospective deficit on fiscal 1968 and thereafter to manageable levels.
>
> I appear today to ask for taxing authority for the same purpose and to plead through this Committee to the Congress that it join with the President in making every possible expenditure reduction—civilian and military—short of jeopardizing the nation's security and well being.

I agree with the intent of the administration, but question its actions. From what I have seen in the past few weeks, the requests and promises of the administration are a veneer of words. They have called for a cut in Federal spending, yet they act to the contrary. When the chips are down, few stand on the side of reducing Federal expenditures. But now, of all times, is when we need to face the reality of our fiscal spending. Now is when we must cease our constant increasing of Federal expenditures and, if not reduce them substantially, at least hold the line at the present level.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Last week the Senate considered the Independent Offices appropriation bill. As approved by the House, the bill contained $10 billion. This amount was $435 million more than the $9.5 billion appropriated in 1967 for the same agencies. The figure sent to us from the House was a substantial increase over last year, yet was $807 million under the administration's estimated budget for fiscal 1968. To the appropriation sent over from the House, the Senate reported the bill out of committee with an increase of $446 million, making the total appropriation more than $10.8 billion.

When the estimated participation sales are added to the Senate's recommendation, the money available to the offices and agencies for spending increases by $3.3 billion over fiscal 1967, rather than the $880 million figure of actual appropriations. The amount of increase over the House appropriation similarly expands from $446 million in actual appropriations to $2.8 billion with the addition of the participation sales.

Collectively, I supported the total bill, since the offices and agencies involved perform vital functions within the governmental structure. But as I mentioned earlier, this is a time to hold the line on continued increase in spending. I cannot see unlimited appropriation for each and every office and agency of the Government when our task as responsible legislators is to protect the economy and provide sound fiscal policy. If we must cut spending, why not now? When is there a better time to start?

The consideration of the Independent Offices appropriation bill was an excellent time for the Senate to begin cutting nonessential items from the budget. Nothing in that bill was an essential military expenditure; therefore, it was right to review and question any item. Yet when questions were raised on the floor and record votes were called to reduce spending, they were defeated by 2-to-1 margins. The reductions, if approved, would have decreased Federal spending authority by $3.5 billion—including participation sales—but not one of the proposed reductions passed. As shown by the record I supported the reductions and opposed the increases.

THE 1968 OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY BILL

Having reminisced the activities of last week, I find we stand at the same familiar crossroads again. Our attention is now on the appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In fiscal year 1967, the original appropriation for that Office was $1.6 billion, to which a later supplement of $75 million was added. The OEO thus received $1.7 billion for that fiscal year.

The original plan for fiscal 1968 called for an appropriation of $2.258 billion. This represents an increase of $570.5 million over last year. Now, as we consider this request for appropriations, a call is made not to reduce the level of spending, but to increase the appropriation by more than twice as much. An amendment to add $2.8 billion to the original appropriation request is made by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. This additional sum would boost the total OEO appropriation to more than $5 billion, which is more than three times the fiscal 1967 appropriation.

If our need to cut Federal spending is as necessary and imperative to the economy as the administration and its advisers indicate, then how can we in good conscience allow appropriations of such magnitude and increase to be authorized? If we must act to help the economy, let us act now, before we create conditions which will require our future attention and action to eliminate.

Frankly, Mr. President, my concern is that this administration not only has spent money it has not got yet; it has spent money it is not going to get either.

CHAIN DRUGGISTS MOVING TO GENERIC PRESCRIPTIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am happy to be able to say that recognition of the importance of generic drugs in making dramatic savings—and still affording the consumer the excellent care to which we have all become accustomed—is becoming an accepted fact.

Just recently, two large drug store chains announced that they are going to maintain complete inventories of generic drugs. Soon in two of the Nation's largest cities, whenever a doctor prescribes generically, he can be assured that the prescription will be filled with a high quality, low cost generic drug.

Peoples Drug Stores, Washington, D.C., a chain of 241 stores representing $154 million in gross annual sales, filled 7 million prescriptions in 1966. In a letter written to 5,000 area doctors, Peoples announced that they are dropping their brand-name policy.

> From now on—
>
> They said—
>
> should doctors choose to prescribe by generic name, the (your) prescriptions will be welcome and will be filled with quality drugs at competitive generic prices.

The choice still remains with the doctor to choose whichever drug he wishes.

In a full page newspaper ad in the Cleveland Press, Gray Drug Stores preceded People's change in policy by announcing that it was taking steps to

carry a full line of generic drugs for those medical doctors who "would like to save their patients money."

In supplementary letters to the doctors of the area, Gray, whose 173 stores grossed $83 million and filled 4 million prescriptions in 1966, ranking them number five in order of size in the country, said M.D.'s "can prescribe generic drugs with confidence that they will be products of a reliable manufacturer."

The ad stressed the 133 years' experience of the generic manufacturer who will supply Gray, and added that along with the use of the professional fee, the generic prescription would cost "less than half of the price of equivalent 'brand name' drugs."

Gray intends to expand its generic policy into other cities shortly. Neither drug chain so far has reported any opposition by the doctors.

As a matter of fact, both actions by these two large mercantile establishments merely endorses the policy of the American Medical Association which is in favor of "quality drugs at lowest possible price," leaving the choice to the doctor.

It is interesting to note in Gray's advertisement that the particular generic drug manufacturer Gray will be buying from also manufactures "brand name drugs" for many of the best known pharmaceutical firms in the country—a point stressed by several witnesses who have appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

I feel that this dramatic policy change to generic prescriptions by two of the largest drug chains in the country, representing more than 400 stores and $230 million in gross annual sales, and filling over 11 million prescriptions per year, is a major breakthrough in knocking down ridiculous prejudices against quality generic drugs.

No level-headed businessman is going to jeopardize his business by trying to sell faulty drugs. Peoples and Gray have built huge businesses based on public confidence and favorable prices.

I anticipate that other drug retailers and community pharmacists will soon follow suit and that the consumers' demand for better drug buys will soon bear fruit.

If millions of dollars a year can be saved for the American patient by the use of high quality, inexpensive, generic drugs—as I am confident will be demonstrated by these two chain druggists alone—then the committee will be amply rewarded for its efforts.

MODINE BEGINS ANOTHER 50 YEARS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Modine Co., of Racine, Wis., is to be congratulated for becoming the Nation's leader in keeping industry cool.

In 50 years, Modine has grown to a work force of 2,500 persons, nine plants, and $59 million in annual sales.

The company is the largest independent manufacturer of radiators and oil coolers for engines. It is an industrial leader in building specialized heat exchangers, institutional heating, air conditioning, and ventilating systems.

Modine has achieved a major breakthrough in technology by developing a thermochemical process for bonding aluminum components into an integral heat exchanger structure.

I ask unanimous consent that an article describing Modine and its achievements published in a recent issue of the Wisconsin Business News magazine, be printed in the RECORD.

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

KEEPING INDUSTRY COOL FOR 50 YEARS

It's a little over 50 years since Arthur B. Modine started out with a handful of employees, a small rented space and a firm belief in an idea . . . the right way to cool an engine.

Today Modine, an acknowledged leader in its industry, has a work force in excess of 2500 operating nine plants producing and selling 59 million dollars worth of products in the past year.

Progress from the Spirex radiator (above left) to today's ultra modern and highly diverse devises has been accomplished through a series of research developments that has seen Modine grow to the largest independent manufacturer of engine cooling products for the O.E.M. market, supplying radiators and oil coolers to major producers of agricultural and earth-moving machinery, trucks, buses and passenger cars. The company also builds specialized heat exchangers for air compressors, electric generating sets, stationary power plants and hydraulic systems.

Additional, and entirely different, markets are served by Modine heating, ventilating, air conditioning and air handling equipment designed for human comfort. Typical of these products are unit heaters, fan-coil air conditioners, unit ventilators, central station air handlers and make-up air units. Primary markets for this product group are factories, schools, hospitals, commercial buildings and apartments.

Typical of Modine's policy of progress through research is the development of Alfuse. Alfuse, one of many Modine patents, is a thermochemical process for bonding aluminum components into an integral heat exchanger structure. Ten years in development Alfuse has proved to be a revolutionary advance in new high-production aluminum fabricating wherein the bonding achieved through the process is so superior that the resultant bonds are actually stronger than the parent metal itself.

A NEW CONCEPT IN ALUMINUM EXCHANGER DESIGN

Application of the Alfuse bonding process to heat exchanger fabrication permitted Modine to develop a new type of coil having special performance, durability and application advantages. The new design concept offered engineers far greater flexibility in adapting condensers and evaporators to their end products.

This major difference between standard round-tube, plate-fin coil construction and the new Modine process is that Alfuse coils are aluminum extrusions which incorporate internal struts and finning for greater heat transfer. In addition to being relatively inexpensive, it is possible to fabricate extruded tubes in a variety of shapes at moderate tooling costs. And since each coil has a single continuous serpentine tube with a brazed inlet and outlet at either end, the potential for leaks is minimal when compared with conventional coils having from ten to a hundred brazed tube joints.

The secondary heat transfer surface is made up of a type of serpentine air fins which have long been used successfully in automotive radiator designs.

After assembly, tubes and fins are completely bonded by the Alfuse process into a solid structure. The Alfuse process, in addition to producing an extremely rugged coil, has several side benefits. For example, alloying which takes place during the process, serves to harden the aluminum fins. And because the Alfuse process metallurgically bonds fins to tubes . . . as opposed to the mechanical bonding used in conventional coils . . . gradual deterioration of the fin-tube joint and subsequent loss of heat transfer capacity over a period of time are eliminated. Experimental condensers installed on cars in 1956 now have 180,000 miles of service and have retained their original heat transfer performance.

DESIGN FLEXIBILITY SOLVES PROBLEMS

Designers of air conditioning and refrigeration equipment have found Alfuse coils of particular value in solving critical problems created by space, weight and configuration of the required heat exchangers. Recognizing the need for coils of a predetermined capacity, their efforts to achieve new styling concepts have been hampered by the bulk and shape of the standard coils previously available to them.

Because Alfuse coils can be formed into a variety of shapes ranging from a figure 8 to a complete circle, they do not restrict the creative ideas of the designer.

Greater heat transfer capacity in a given space . . . or the same cooling capacity in less space offers further design and styling flexibility.

Esthetically, Alfuse coils are pleasing to the appearance when painted in colors to match or contrast with the end product. Therefore, they can be used for both decorative and functional purposes.

Alfuse represents one of the longest and most complex development projects ever undertaken by Modine. Entirely new and untried manufacturing techniques had to be developed and perfected. New manufacturing facilities had to be designed and built in order to apply the process for high production. Existing laboratories and research required substantial expansion with increased emphasis on thermochemistry. Testing procedures under aggressive environmental conditions were developed, involving product life tests in the field and in the laboratory extending up to six years. A new plant specifically devoted to aluminum products was built to separate the processes required to produce aluminum products from those required for the company's other copper, copper-aluminum, brass and steel products. This plant has since been expanded three times to accommodate the increasing aluminum product volume.

In all of these activities, Modine ran into many blind alleys and headaches, some of which proved extremely costly in time and money. Organic chemistry of the highest order has had to be employed.

Further development of the Alfuse process and product design continues in Modine laboratories, on its drafting boards and in its manufacturing facilities. Currently, another complete plant for Alfuse manufacturing is being constructed.

The dollars Modine has spent and continues to spend in process and product research and development and the required additional personnel and manufacturing facilities are a sound investment . . . even to the ever-watchful controller.

McGRAW-HILL ECONOMICS VICE PRESIDENT OPPOSES A SURTAX NOW

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of the most respected corporations dealing

with the affairs of the business world is McGraw-Hill, Inc., to whose business publications leaders of the economy look for guidance with the greatest of respect.

It is therefore especially significant that the corporation's vice president for economics, Dr. Gordon W. McKinley, has added his voice to those of economists who fail to see wisdom in the surtax proposal in view of the current economic situation.

Dr. McKinley finds that there has been "a serious lack of careful economic analysis in connection with the timing and size of the tax increase." He believes that a 10-percent surtax could be, as I have stated repeatedly, self-defeating under the circumstances—that it "could bring about a smaller output of goods and services, a lesser revenue to the Treasury, and a greater deficit in the Federal budget."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. McKinley's views, as set forth in a speech made by him in Cincinnati on September 19, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE BUSINESS OUTLOOK AND NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY IN 1968

(Address by Gordon W. McKinley, Vice President, Economics, McGraw-Hill, Inc., before the seventh annual distribution conference, sponsored by the American Supply and Machinery Manufacturers' Association, in Cincinnati, Ohio, September 19, 1967)

There are three questions which I should like to discuss with you today: *First*, is the Johnson Administration correct in believing that business activity will surge ahead very strongly in the closing months of this year? *Second*, should Congress enact the proposed surtax on corporate and personal incomes? *Third*, what is likely to happen to business activity in 1968?

During the past year and a half, the American economy has been subjected to stresses and strains of tremendous magnitude. The most obvious of these has been the sharp redirection of economic activity caused by the huge increase in Government expenditures. From the beginning of 1966 to the middle of 1967, spending by the Federal Government has jumped by $20 billion, and spending by the state and local governments has increased by $14 billion. In this short space of time all forms of government have called on the economy to divert an extra $34 billion of goods and services to defense and other public needs.

Government has also been responsible for severe stresses imposed through fiscal and monetary channels. The great swing in Federal Reserve policy, from moderate ease at the end of 1965 to an almost unprecedented degree of tightness in the autumn of 1966, had its most obvious casualty in the housing industry but the remainder of the economy did not by any means escape unharmed. In the field of fiscal policy, the suspension of the investment tax incentives in October, 1966 and their hurried restoration in 1967 produced a completely unnecessary hiatus in investment plans as well as administering a sudden and ill-timed shock to the economy as a whole.

In addition to these strains imposed by Government, the economy in 1966 and 1967 has struggled through a huge inventory adjustment and a period of unusually cautious consumer behavior. From the spring of 1966 to the spring of 1967, consumers retreated into their shells, saved a very high proportion of their incomes, and appeared disinterested in durable goods of any kind. Retail sales simply leveled off for an entire year. Partly as a result of the leveling in consumer purchases and partly as a result of the enforced downturn in capital expenditures, inventories increased in the final quarter of 1966 by an all-time record annual rate of $18.5 billion. The attempt to work off these huge inventories, at a time when consumers were reluctant to buy, when capital spending was falling, and when housing had been cut to a very low point naturally exerted a tremendous depressant force on production during the opening months of this year.

The stresses and strains which I have been describing could hardly fail to have left their mark on the economy. If economic systems could have nervous breakdowns, certainly the American economy should have had such a breakdown during the last year and a half as it was buffeted by conflicting forces, private and government, and twisted this way and that by demands for greater output here, and less output there.

As we know, our economic system in the opening months of this year did exhibit some of the systems of an incipient breakdown. In the first quarter, national output rose by only 0.6 per cent, and when allowance is made for price increases, real national output actually fell slightly. In the second quarter, output gained 1.1 per cent, but this was still below par. Reflecting the slow growth in output, unemployment has risen slightly, overtime has been cut, real weekly earnings in manufacturing have slipped, and corporate profits have turned down.

But despite these unfavorable developments, the really surprising thing is that the economy was able to stand up as well as it did under the tremendous stresses placed upon it. Despite the slowing in the pace of business activity, the fact is that economy did grow, it did not fall into a recession, it did make the unusual adjustments required of it, and at mid-year was once again beginning to exhibit its characteristic resiliency.

There is no question that the economy is now gathering speed and strength. The automobile strike has introduced an element of uncertainty, but the economic indicators are nevertheless rising. Manufacturers' new orders have exceeded shipments in each of the past three months, and order backlogs are rising. Retail sales in the most recent six months have risen by 6 per cent, an exceptionally rapid gain. The drop in corporate profits appears to have been arrested, and personal incomes are rising more rapidly. Housing starts have regained almost all of the loss suffered in 1966, and nonresidential contracts are signaling a rise in commercial and manufacturing construction. The money supply is increasing at an above-average pace, and individual savings are at record levels. The inventory correction has now proceeded to the stage where the downward pressure on production will be relieved; a small accumulation of inventories is likely to occur in the closing months of this year.

My guess is that national output is now running at an annual rate of $792 billion, and will surge forward to an $810 billion pace in the closing quarter of this year. Gross national product for the full year 1967 is likely to exceed $785 billion, a good increase of almost 6 per cent over 1966—particularly good in the light of the poor performance early in the year. In other words, I believe that the Administration is correct in anticipating a strong recovery in the closing months of this year.

THE PROPOSED TAX INCREASE

Now let's move on to the second question—Should Congress enact the proposed surtax on corporate and personal incomes?

Because of the huge deficit in prospect for the Federal budget and because of the strain that deficit might impose on the capital markets, some increases in taxes is probably unavoidable in the year ahead. *But there has unfortunately been a serious lack of careful economic analysis in connection with the timing and the size of the tax increase. As a result, the surtax proposed by the Administration is both too much and too soon.*

The Administration has argued that there is an immediate need for a substantial tax increase because the total demands on the American economy will in the near future outstrip the maximum capacity of our productive resources. Government economists have painted a picture of an economy so fully employed that excessive demand will result in serious inflation. They have argued that a substantial tax increase is needed to curb demand and hold inflation in check.

Is this an accurate picture of the American economy today, or several months from today? I do not believe so. At present, our manufacturing industries are operating on the average at 83.5 per cent of capacity, unemployment is higher than a year ago, and there is little resort to overtime. Even if the recovery over the rest of this year is fully as strong as the Administration has predicted, it will nevertheless be true that there will be a great deal of slack left in the system. Real output in the closing months of this year may rise as much as 3 per cent, but industrial capacity in the United States is also growing steadily and rapidly. For this reason, even a sharp increase in output will raise the operating rate to only 85 per cent of capacity by the end of this year. This is far below maximum capacity and well below the preferred, or most efficient, operating rate of 91 per cent. To put it briefly, at the end of this year there will be no strain on manufacturing capacity and no economic reason for a tax designed to curb demand for manufactured products. Furthermore, it is difficult to conjure up a threat of any materials shortages, and quite obviously the economy will not be short of inventories on hand.

It might be argued, however, that although goods will be plentiful and productive capacity will be ample, there may be a shortage of labor. Again, the argument is unconvincing. There are almost always shortages of highly skilled and particularly able workers, but the contention that we are approaching a general shortage of workers just does not stand up under examination. The labor supply at present is increasing rapidly, and the number of hours worked per week can be increased by almost 2 per cent without exceeding the 1966 average. The increase in output expected over the rest of this year is likely to be accomplished simply by absorbing most of the growth in the labor force and by returning workers who are now on part-time to a full-time schedule.

It thus seems reasonable to conclude that at the end of this year neither our resources of plant nor our resources of labor will be strained by the expected rise in output. There will still be considerable slack in productive capacity, there will be few materials shortages, there will be abundant inventories, and there will be an adequate supply of labor.

Under these circumstances, an increase in taxes before the end of the year would be self-defeating. Even by the beginning of 1968, a tax increase will not be needed to curb demand. A small increase at that time will perhaps be necessary in order to lessen the burden imposed on the capital market by large Treasury borrowing, but even this argument appears a bit strained, depending as it does on the assumption that the Federal Reserve would permit a sharp tightening in the capital markets at a time when manufacturing industries are operating at only 85 per cent of capacity.

Fortunately, Congress does not seem in a mood to be rushed on the tax question. The

legislators will show good judgment if they defer action on the tax bill until the economic trend is clearer than it is today. As that trend unfolds I believe that it will indicate that the surtax should not exceed 5 per cent, that it should be applied equally to corporate and personal tax liabilities, and the effective date should not be prior to January 1, 1968.

DEMANDS ON THE ECONOMY IN 1968

Now let's turn to the final question—Assuming a 5 per cent surtax effective January 1, how well is the economy likely to perform in 1968?

I think the year will be good, but not exuberant. I seriously doubt that at any time during the year the economy will be pushed to its maximum capability. Here are the main demand segments which I believe will join to produce a moderately prosperous year for 1968—

Government Spending. First, government spending. In 1968, government purchases of goods and services will rise rapidly, but not as rapidly as in either 1966 or 1967. State and local government spending will continue its steady upward climb, and expenditures of the Federal Government will expand by about two-thirds as much as in 1967. By the fourth quarter of 1968, total purchases by all forms of government will reach a $200 billion annual rate, accounting for 23.5 per cent of total GNP. The increase of $16 billion in government expenditures in 1968 will be a principal force driving the economy upward.

Inventories. A second force, which can on occasion exert a strong impact on national output, is business inventory policy. During the past year, inventory policy has fluctuated widely, from the final quarter of 1966 when total business inventories in the United States were growing at an $18.5 billion annual rate, to the middle of 1967 when inventories were falling slightly, and now back to a policy of moderate inventory accumulation.

In the first half of 1968, the rate of inventory accumulation will be speeded up, and this will stimulate increased production. Part of this rise in stocks on hand will be a natural rebound from the cautious policy of 1967. In addition, there will be stockpiling of steel in the first half of 1968 as a hedge against a possible strike in that industry following the termination of the wage contract in July. In the last half of next year, however, the subsequent rundown of steel inventories will exert some dampening effect. For the year as a whole, inventories will constitute a mildly buoyant factor calling for an increase in national output of about $3 billion.

Housing. A third force which will provide a steady, though modest, addition to national output in 1968 will be residential construction. Housing has recovered well this year, rising from an annual rate of only 880,000 units in October, 1966 to almost 1,400,000 at present. In 1968, there is no question that the underlying demand for housing will be strong. The number of young people coming to the age when they are likely to establish separate living quarters is exceptionally large. Marriages have been rising steadily in the past several years. More and more single persons, both young and old, are able to afford separate living quarters. The inventory of unoccupied housing units has declined sharply over the past year, and rental vacancy rates for the nation as a whole are lower than at any time since 1959.

The principal doubt about housing in 1968 does not arise from a lack of demand, but rather from the possibility of a lack of mortgage money. With the 1966 tight money experience fresh in mind, many economists have pointed out that, if open market interest rates in 1968 are permitted to rise much above their current level, funds could once again flow out of the mortgage market and the housing industry could once again be brought to its knees through a lack of financing.

Such a development could occur but I do not believe it is likely. The situation facing the Federal Reserve in 1968 will be quite different from that in 1966. On that occasion, both financial and nonfinancial corporations were starved for liquidity, whereas the economy will enter 1968 in a fairly liquid position. In 1966, manufacturing industries were operating at better than 90 per cent of capacity, whereas the operating rate in the opening months of 1968 will be about 85 per cent. In 1966, the growth in government spending was accelerating, whereas in 1968 it will be slowing. In 1966, inventories were piling up at a record pace, whereas in 1968 inventory accumulation will be moderate.

For these reasons, I believe that a tight money policy in 1968 would be unjustified and unsound. The fear of a new credit squeeze is likely to prove unfounded. Mortgage money should remain sufficiently plentiful next year to permit a rise in housing starts to a 1,500,000 unit level. Residential construction expenditures are likely to rise in 1968 by about $2 billion—not a tremendous increase when matched against the capacity of the construction industry, but nevertheless one which will provide the housing we need as well as contributing to the rise in overall business activity.

Business Capital Spending. Now let's turn to the fourth major segment of the economy in 1968—the broad area encompassed by what are usually called the capital goods industries.

Business expenditures on plant and equipment are at present slowly recovering from the unfortunate effect of the suspension of the investment tax incentives. From a peak annual rate of $83 billion in the closing months of 1966, capital spending dropped to an $81.5 billion rate in the second quarter of this year. Following the restoration of the incentives, new orders for durable goods rose in May, June, and July, and deliveries of capital goods have now begun to increase. By the fourth quarter of this year, the pace of business capital expenditures will probably have moved back to an $83 billion rate. There will thus have been no growth in capital expenditures during 1967, a strong contrast to the average 15 per cent growth in the two preceding years.

I would like very much to say that in 1968 business capital expenditures are due for a new and tremendous spurt upward. I would like to make that prediction because America's economic strength, its ability to wage both the battles of war and of peace, and its ability to avert inflation, all depend on the quantity and the quality of the capital equipment.

The evidence, however, suggests that although plant and equipment expenditures will rise next year the increase will be quite moderate. It will be moderate: *first,* because the downturn in profits in 1967 has limited the funds available for fixed investment; *second,* because even a small surtax imposed on top of corporate tax liabilities will further limit investable funds; *third,* because the dominance of Government as a buyer, along with the restriction of consumer expenditures through higher taxes, limits the growth of the peacetime economy and the industries serving the peacetime economy; *finally,* because the economy in 1968, contrary to the predictions of the Administration in Washington, is not likely to operate at so high a percentage of capacity as to encourage extraordinary capital investment.

My guess is that plant and equipment expenditures will increase from an $83 billion rate in the closing months of this year to about $88 billion in the fourth quarter of 1968, a rise of 6 per cent.

Consumer Purchases. The final main buying segment which will determine the course of the economy in 1968 is that presided over by the consumer.

Fortunately for the business outlook, consumer spending now appears to be on the upside of a cycle. Following the caution of late 1966 and early 1967, consumers in recent months have shown an increased willingness to buy both durable and nondurable goods. Retail sales have grown by a larger amount in the past six months than in the preceding sixteen months.

In 1968, the cyclical upswing in consumer purchases will continue, but enthusiasm will be somewhat dampened by the extra burden imposed by higher taxes. The surtax, plus the increase in the social security tax because of the rise in the taxable wage base, will more than offset the effect of increased social security benefits. Consumer expenditures next year are likely to rise at a somewhat restrained $7 billion per quarter. Although this is a lesser rate of gain than at present, it will nevertheless amount to a large overall increase. Total consumer spending in 1968 is likely to rise by about $28 billion, providing a steady boost to the economy as a whole.

THE ECONOMY IN 1968

Now what does this all add up to for the 1968 business outlook? I have pointed out that government spending next year will increase by $16 billion. Consumer purchases are likely to be up by $28 billion. Housing, inventories, and capital expenditures will all rise moderately, providing a total boost of about $10 billion. Adding together these major buying segments, we come up with the conclusion that total demand for the output of the American economy in 1968 is likely to increase by about $54 billion. National output for the full year 1968 is thus likely to total $840 billion, a gain of almost 7 per cent above 1967.

The economy which I have pictured for the year ahead is a prosperous economy. A surtax of 5 per cent effective at the beginning of 1968 will not unduly depress our growth. I should like to repeat, however, that there is little evidence at this time that the demands on the economy next year will outstrip our productive ability. If Congress should mistakenly accede to the Administration proposal for a heavy surtax, the business outlook would be much less favorable than that which I have presented. The result could be a smaller real output of goods and services, a lesser rather than a greater revenue to the Treasury, and a larger rather than a smaller deficit in the Federal budget.

I believe that the economic experience of the past two years suggests that we must attempt in the future to apply fiscal and monetary policy with a lighter, and steadier hand. An extreme monetary policy which produces a credit "crunch" has proved to be undesirable both because of its uneven pressure on various segments of the economy and because of its disruption of overall economic growth. The on-again, off-again application of taxes, as illustrated in the case of the investment tax incentives, has been shown to be bad economics quite apart from the ill-timing of the 1967 experience. We have recently overcontrolled the economy in much the same way that the novice driver nervously swings the wheel first in one direction and then in the opposite direction as his vehicle lurches down the road. What is needed is a steadier and more gentle pressure at the helm.

In 1968, the revenue of the Federal Government will grow substantially even without any increase in the tax rate. A modest surtax will provide ample insurance against excessive demand. We are not on the verge of a wild boom, nor a financial catastrophe, as some have testified. If we can resist the temptation to once again push fiscal and monetary policy to the extreme, the economy will move forward in an orderly and prosperous fashion in 1968, setting a firm base for continued economic progress in the years beyond.

THE MILWAUKEE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the State of Wisconsin has achieved a notable high in the field of education.

Along with its several large distinguished universities—both public and private—and its eminent smaller, liberal arts colleges, stands the Milwaukee School of Engineering.

Industry owes much to the large core of skilled craftsmen and technicians upon which it can draw. Milwaukee School of Engineering has educated over 65,000 of these trained brains, a noteworthy number of whom hold key positions in our industries.

It offers over 300 courses leading to certificates and degrees in 2-year, 4-year, and advanced programs.

The institution owes its success to its president, Karl O. Werwath, who succeeded his father, Oscar Werwath, Milwaukee School of Engineering's founder, in 1948.

I wish Milwaukee School of Engineering continued success in helping to make Wisconsin a good State in which to do business.

I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the Milwaukee School of Engineering, published in the August issue of the Wisconsin Business News magazine, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE VITAL COMMODITY

The most important commodity developed in Wisconsin is the human mind . . . the highly and specially trained brainpower that has for years, is now and will continue to in the future, have a key position in the control of our industrial destiny and the direction of our overall national wellbeing.

Here in Wisconsin are trained and educated the men and women of key responsibility in the running of the machinery of the world.

They come from all parts of the state . . . of the nation . . . they come from many foreign lands. They come seeking the answers to many questions in many divergent areas of specialized interest. They come to learn how to live in the world of today and to learn how to solve the problems of the future. They come in huge and growing numbers each with a separate need, a separate requirement, an individual goal.

Yet as highly individual, as highly specialized as these brilliant minds are, many of them . . . actually more than 65,000 of them . . . have one major thing in common—Source of Knowledge.

Widely diversified, and highly successful, specialists—such as:

T. W. Bruner, President, Bruner Corp., Milwaukee.

T. S. Bilbo, Flight Director, Jet Propulsion Lab.

J. L. Gordon, Ch. of Board, Central Illinois Electric and Gas Co.

Shahpoor Farhadi, Ch. Technical Ministry, Teheran, Iran.

R. E. Fieulleteau, Sup. Electronic Engineer, N.Y. Naval Shipyard, U.S. Navy.

E. F. Webb, President, Webb Engineering Associates.

G. O. Henderson, Chief, Navigation & Guidance Project, Grumman Aircraft.

H. A. Hogan, Dir., Test Engineering, AC Electronics, Milwaukee.

W. Van Zeeland, Penetrations Aids Branch, Office of Secretary of Defense, U.S. Govt.

Dr. G. J. Murphy, Ch. Elec. Eng. Dept. Northwestern University.

H. U. Hjermstad, President, Electro-Seal Corp.—have one thing in common:

Each one of these men . . . and 65,000 more . . . received training at Milwaukee School of Engineering.

IT BEGAN IN 1903

At 11th and Winnebago Street. And it began with Oscar Werwath. Although only 22 years old, this rarely gifted young man had already achieved a singular recognition both academically and industrially. Graduating at 18 with degrees in both electrical and mechanical engineering Oscar Werwath had, in four years, risen to a position of supervision in the installation of major electrical projects in principal cities throughout northern Europe. In 1903 he brought to Milwaukee the key ingredients for the establishment of the foundation of advanced technical instruction in this part of the country and through his association with the Mechanical Appliance Company (later to become the Louis Allis Company) was formed MSOE.

Four years and 250 students later the School went through the first of a long and still continuing series of physical expansions. At this time just two full time day school, two semester courses, were offered, but evening courses and 4-semester courses were soon added and the faculty expanded to six instructors.

Success and growth became a way of life with Oscar Werwath and success and growth came because of his dedication to the delivery of a superior product. The development of the superior mind through the application of superior methods. The result—the continuing result—we have in Milwaukee today in the impressive form of one of the principal pillars of the technical academic structure of the most highly technological nation in the world.

LOOK AT THE FACTS

The School is internationally recognized. Over 300 subjects are offered in 2-year programs for engineering technicians, 4-year programs for graduate engineers and advanced degree programs for Master's degrees.

The faculty and staff exceed 200 with present enrollment approximately 3000. The current annual operating budget exceeds 2½ million dollars and assets have grown to $7 million. The School is chartered by the state of Wisconsin and is governed by a nonprofit, nonstock, corporation of 83 businessmen and industrialists headed by Ch. Fred F. Loock, President, Allen Bradley Co. Student services are the finest and most complete including counseling, health, housing, loans, scholarships, financial aids, part-time employment and full-time placement.

Degrees are available in the following engineering and engineering technology courses: Computer, Electrical Power, Architectural Engineering, Electronic Communications, Air Conditioning, Building Construction Technology, Fluid Power, Industrial Engineering, Internal Combustion Engines, Metallurgical, Welding, and Chemical Production. General courses include Economics, Industrial Psychology, Marketing, Management, Accounting, Industrial Relations, Finance, Engineering Graphics, Languages, Speech, Logic, Ethics, Business Law, and Creative Thinking. And many more.

RESEARCH

For over 32 years Milwaukee School of Engineering has been a primary contributor to the advancement of industrial research. Organized in 1935 the MSOE Industrial Research Institute has conducted continuous research projects in engineering and allied fields to provide training for industrial scientists and engineers. This Institute serves as an experimental station for industrial research investigation in applied engineering and as a clearing house on specific scientific information.

Similarly, but in more specific areas of industrial application, the Institute of Leather Technology and the Fluid Power Institute provide the most modern and the most complete facilities for advanced areas of education and research. The M.S.O.E. Computation Center serves the dual purpose in both educational and industrial research programs and is available to industry and business for sponsored projects. Most recent of this type of addition is the Institute For Non Destructive Testing put into operation in the fall of last year. This new department will, in addition to adding a two year program in Non Destructive Testing Technology and Radiology to the curriculum, open new vistas of non-destruct-test research and consultation to industry through sponsored conferences and seminars.

So the Werwath tradition of developing the vital commodity of the educated human mind continues in rising tempo and in phase with the accelerating demands of today's . . . and tomorrow's . . . industrial and economic complex. Under the direction of Karl O. Werwath, president of the institution since the death of his father, founder Oscar Werwath, in 1948, the school has virtually doubled annual enrollments, materially enlarged the faculty, staff and physical facilities and increased assets by seven fold. And while the basic philosophy of developing the superior mind through the use of superior means remains the keystone of the entire educational structure, a new dimension in the process of learning is taking on importance and momentum both by plan and by necessity.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

More truly than ever before, if you don't keep going ahead you start going backwards. This is particularly and vitally true in terms of education and in recognition of the growing demand for the continuous further development of the already educated businessman and industrialist, M.S.O.E. began a program of accelerated continuing education 25 years ago. Today the benefits of this penetrating analyses of future needs are tangible in multiple form as three basic types of program in continuing education are available to the man ,and the organization) who recognizes the imperative demand of keeping up with the state of the art in his particular fields of activity. These three basic types of program are:

Supervisory and management for the Individual

Here, on a regular one-evening-a-week basis, individuals from many areas of business and industry meet in groups to learn improved methods of handling typical and general supervisory and management problems. In this type of program a selection of specific technical subject matter particular to the individual's needs are elective. Credits are applicable to degree.

Special company programs

For corporate groups, these programs are custom designed to meet the needs of a particular firm. Courses may include both technical and supervisory subjects and may be presented in seminar form or in prescribed weekly meetings. Such special company programs have already been developed in the areas of physics, chemistry, standard costs for manufacturing, metallurgy, welding, statistical control, materials testing, basic economics and engineering graphics.

Selected subjects and degree programs

Here the businessman-student can choose an individual subject or series of subjects in a particular field, earning a subject or course certificate upon completion. This type of program can be continued to the completion of a Degree of Associate in Industrial Manage-

ment and, in addition, credits earned in the physical sciences may be applied to a Bachelor of Science degree. Programs leading to the degrees of Master of Science in fluid power engineering and in engineering management are also offered.

Here in Wisconsin are trained and educated the men and women of key responsibility in the running of the machinery of the world.

Have you taken the time recently to examine and evaluate your own individual, and corporate, continuing education needs?

During this period Karl Werwath achieved, among many other awards, the distinction of being the only member of the American Society For Engineering Education to receive both the James H. McGraw Award for Outstanding Contribution to Development of Technical Institution Education and the Arthur L. Williston Award for the Publication of Literature on Technical Institution Education.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

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. PROUTY. Mr. President, last week the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] moved to strike title II from the pending bill, S. 2388, the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, and later offered a motion which would have the effect of recommitting the bill to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee with instructions to strike title II.

The amendment which I have offered, Mr. President, will, if adopted, change the instructions in the motion to recommit. It removes the requirement that title II be stricken.

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. 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, the effect of this amendment, if adopted, would be to change the instructions of the motion to recommit. It removes the requirement that title II be stricken. Instead, the amendment instructs the Labor and Public Welfare Committee to report back the bill, S. 2388, forthwith with the following changes in title II.

First. Instead of a 2-year program totaling $2.8 billion, the authorization would be limited to $875 million until expended.

Second. A provision would be added which would have the effect of giving priority for jobs under all parts of title II to eligible persons who are heads of families. By heads of families, we mean a person who contributes more than one-half the support of one or more other persons.

Third. A provision would be added which would earmark not less than 10 percent nor more than 20 percent of the $875 million authorization to be used by the Secretary of Labor for the purpose of expanding the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962.

Finally, a provision for reserving from $100 to $300 million for use by the Secretary of Labor as incentive for private industry to engage in job training programs would be included. The Secretary would be authorized to make grants to private industry for employee training expenses of an employer.

Mr. President, I shall discuss each of these provisions in some detail and then explain, why with these changes, title II of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 is acceptable to me.

Under the provisions of my amendment, the authorization for the Emergency Employment Act of title II would only be for 1 year. The total authorization for 1 year has been cut by $500 million. I have not suggested a greater reduction because the need for jobs and job training is pressing and grave. The expense, although great, is justifiable because by training and retraining men, we are investing in their future productivity and contributing to the wealth of the Nation. By creating jobs for those who cannot be trained, we are enabling people to have self-respect and to at least earn a living rather than merely receive welfare.

However, Mr. President, this is a large program involving a great deal of money. Rather than to authorize it for 2 years, I think it might be worthwhile to reevaluate effects of the various parts in 1 year's time and perhaps make some changes in programs before expending additional funds.

One of the objections I have had to the programs already created under the Economic Opportunity Act is that they have not been properly examined, and once established, we have been reluctant to cut them back much less to eradicate them. Let us not make the same mistake with the Goliath of an employment act. By authorizing expenditures for 1 year, we commit ourselves to an examination and reevaluation next year. We retain flexibility.

Mr. President, it has been estimated that some 3 million able-bodied Americans are for the most part unemployed. In addition, there are some 5 million Americans who work for less than the minimum wage.

The cost of providing merely the 3 million with jobs at the minimum wage has been estimated at $12 billion annually. Obviously at this juncture we are not able to expend such a vast sum of money. But who is to decide which of these people is to receive either job training or public service jobs to the exclusion of the others?

I suggest, Mr. President, in view of the limited authorization that priority be given to one particular group of Americans; namely, the head of the family.

Garth L. Mangum, in a paper entitled "Government as Employer of Last Resort," presents some excellent reasons for giving priority to heads of families. He states that there need to be more programs offering job opportunities for youths under 20, but notes that out-of-school, out-of-work youths are not often always attracted by minimum wage make-work jobs or motivated to retrain in them. Basic education and training are far more important for them. He goes on to say:

> A little over one half of the long-term unemployed men and one-fourth of the long-term unemployed women in 1966 were married family heads. So were 60 per cent of the out of the labor force males and half of the involuntary part-time workers. Limiting the employment guarantee to family heads would therefore be a defensible initial approach.

Family heads, Mangum presumes, would be more motivated to remain in jobs, especially if training were provided.

By giving priority to family heads, we provide the out-of-work fathers or mothers with children an opportunity to regain both self-sufficiency and self-esteem. In this way, a better family environment can be encouraged which will have a beneficial effect on the children who will be tomorrow's providers. The concept of the family is basic to our society and whatever we can do to uphold the integrity of that institution will contribute to the well being of all of our citizens and our Nation. There is increasing evidence that a broken home is detrimental to children. It inhibits the learning process and perhaps contributes to juvenile delinquency.

Thus, by giving priority to heads of families, the older generation is directly benefited and the younger generation receives indirect benefits.

Mr. President, the second section of my proposed amendment which I would like to discuss in part C, authorization for Manpower Development and Training Act. In essence, this section requires that not less than 10 percent or more than 20 percent of the funds authorized for title II must be used through the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

I have earmarked this proportion of the funds for Manpower Development and Training Act, Mr. President, for several reasons. First, I believe that it is the most effective training program in existence today. Second, it can easily, and, in fact, needs to be expanded. Finally, it can be incorporated into the type of comprehensive manpower and training approach which I have been advocating.

The Manpower Development and Training Act has been widely acclaimed because of its flexibility and because of its achievements. Secretary Willard Wirtz, speaking at hearings before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower in 1965, cited the "basic

soundness of training programs under Manpower Development and Training Act" and recommended that the act be put on a more permanent basis. He said:

The effectiveness of an active manpower policy as carried out under the MDTA is now clear from the record of proven experience. There is no doubt that the training and retraining of unemployed workers is a sound social and financial investment.

In 1966, Congress enacted substantial amendments, demonstrating that Manpower Development and Training Act was a "living, changing law" with "flexibility and capacity to adapt quickly to changing needs." The amendments substantially changed Manpower Development and Training Act to make it more effective an instrument for combating unemployment among the poor.

The Manpower Development and Training Act was redirected in 1966 toward the poor, by specifying that 65 percent of the training effort would be "person-oriented" or directed toward the reclamation of hardcore unemployed. The groups which were to receive the greatest attention were enumerated. They included: "culturally impoverished and poorly educated youth, the unemployed of middle age or older, minority groups, persons with low educational attainment, the long-term unemployed, and the rural poor."

Further, in 1966, the on-the-job training component of Manpower Development and Training Act was expanded. In fiscal year 1967, the on-the-job training program will constitute 50 percent of all Manpower Development and Training Act training. This is a vast increase from 1963, when the on-the-job training portion of Manpower Development and Training Act was only 6 percent. In addition, participation by private industry has increased. In 1963 only 400 businesses were involved, while today over 2,000 are involved.

VALUE OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

The amended act has been highly praised. Sar Levitan in a paper entitled, "Alternative Approaches to Manpower Policies," states:

During its five years of operation, MDTA has demonstrated its effectiveness. Available studies, though limited, indicate that benefits exceed costs; and the program has proven adaptable to changing policy goals and labor market conditions.

Stephen Kurzman, in a paper entitled "Private Enterprise Participation in the Antipoverty Program" concludes that:

On-The-Job Training stimulated by the cost reimbursement treatment method under the MDT Act appears to be a highly effective tool for training and placing the unemployed and under-employed in satisfying jobs.

Available statistics substantiate the fact that both institutional and on-the-job training components are relatively successful in placing graduates in jobs. Institutional trainees averaged 73.6 percent initial placement over the first 3 years and on-the-job training averaged 93.1 percent initial placement. Both of these figures contrast favorably with 50 percent of all those public assistance recipients who entered work training and experience programs only to return to welfare roles upon completion of the program.

Prof. Garth Mangum, in an interview recently, stated that a much higher percentage of Manpower Development and Training Act enrollees than he had thought were actually extremely disadvantaged. He declared he had evidence that one-half of the family heads in Manpower Development and Training Act had incomes of less than $3,000 a year when they entered the program.

Manpower Development and Training Act has been very successful in both meeting particular skill shortages and in establishing skill ladders. It has alleviated skill shortages in jobs which require less than 2 years of training and has made significant contributions in the fields of machine operators, welders, motor vehicle mechanics, and body repairmen, secretaries, and draftsmen.

The on-the-job training part of Manpower Development and Training Act has been particularly successful in meeting skill shortages. The President's manpower report to Congress describes one such example:

The OJT program in the tool and die industry is an outstanding example of this industry-Government approach to a skill shortage situation. Since early 1964, a project sponsored by the Department of Labor and conducted by the National Tool, Die, and Precision Machining Association has provided opportunities for preapprenticeship or apprenticeship entry training for unemployed persons as tool and die makers and machinists. The project was so successful that in March 1966 the Department extended it to provide training for 1800 workers, bringing the total number of trainees under the project to nearly 3000.

The same report gives two examples of programs which are particularly successful in upgrading the skills of workers, many of whom are disadvantaged:

For example, under a national agreement with the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, 1,000 journeymen are to be given training which will upgrade their skills, and 2,000 unemployed men are to be trained as carpenter apprentices. About half the trainees will receive preapprenticeship training in a coupled project and the other half will enter apprenticeship directly. The employers will receive on-the-job training assistance for 26 weeks of the four-year apprenticeship term.

The same pattern is seen in a major pilot project, launched early in 1967 in New York City, to upgrade the skills of 2,500 employed workers. The four major unions and industrial leaders involved are committed to filling the vacated less skilled jobs with entry workers drawn from minority groups and the ranks of disadvantaged and long-term unemployed.

Because of the facts which I have cited, Mr. President, I think it is fair to conclude that the Manpower Development and Training Act has been an effective and highly successful program. Obviously, it would be advantageous to expand such a program. However, we must first consider whether or not the Manpower Development and Training Act program can easily be expanded to the degree to which I recommend.

I believe that it can be expanded. Stephen Kurzman, in his report which I quoted earlier, stated:

The present level of the on-the-job training program is . . . both highly fortuitous and considerably lower than its apparent potential.

A noted authority in the job training field who has been intensively studying the Manpower Development and Training Act around the country, continually asked the question: "Given your present capacity, how much could you expand the Manpower Development and Training Act immediately?" He reported that he never was given any figure less than double, saying:

They have people who are available in general to go into the program and they have the capability in general to expand it very rapidly. But nobody has made that kind of proposal for MDTA.

I am making that kind of proposal, Mr. President.

I have indicated that the Manpower Development and Training Act has been successful, and I have quoted several authorities who believe that the Manpower Development and Training Act can and should be expanded. These facts alone justify my inclusion of 10 percent to 20 percent delegation of title II funds to Manpower Development and Training Act. However, there is still another reason why it is important to expand this program.

Last week, when I addressed the Senate, I spoke of the desperate need for a coordinated, comprehensive approach to the problems of poverty. I indicated that this kind of approach was particularly imperative with regard to unemployment and underemployment problems in order to alleviate the recent piecemeal efforts.

In order to be truly comprehensive, a job training program must treat the multiple ills of the disadvantaged unemployed or underemployed person. The Manpower Development and Training Act, with the enactment of the 1966 amendments began to supply supportive services—namely, medical services to enrollees. Increased attention has been given to the necessity for reclaiming individuals as well as merely training them. The President's manpower report to Congress notes that—

With the funds available, the target set for fiscal year 1965 was training for 250,000 individuals—a reduction from the 275,000 total for the previous year, since it was recognized that the new emphasis on the disadvantaged would require more intensive effort with many individual trainees. Training emphasis was to be equally divided between institutional and on-the-job training, and special attention was to be given to enlisting greater assistance from industry in training for upgrading and in providing opportunity for the disadvantaged.

It was recognized that no sharp dividing line could in fact be drawn between the two aspects of the training program—human reclamation and the remedy of skill shortages.

I have noted time and time again, Mr. President, that there is much duplicity and overlap in job training programs. I believe, however, that if the best programs can be expanded, some of the ineffectual ones can be phased out. Then perhaps we can coordinate the remaining ones. Sar Levitan, in "Poverty and Human Resources Abstract" of September–

October 1966 decries this lack of integration:

The fragmentation of federally supported training programs assumes crucial significance when the impact upon clientele is considered....

The defects of the present system have become particularly pronounced as labor shortages develop in an increasing number of communities and occupations. In a looser labor market, when jobs are scarcer, a training program may become a holding operation. But in the present labor market, as the demand for labor intensifies, the training programs should become an integral part of labor supply, as activities of the training programs are increasingly a concern of broader sections of the population.

An increased emphasis on Manpower Development and Training Act and its endorsement and inclusion in the Economic Opportunity Act could perhaps be a step in the integration process.

Finally, Mr. President, I have stated time and time again that the poverty war cannot be won by the efforts of the Government alone. The involvement and participation of all segments of the community must be sought. On-the-job training in particular encourages the participation of private industry. An expanded Manpower Development and Training Act program along with the enactment of the human investment provisions of my amendment could achieve this to a large degree. The combination of these two approaches has been recommended by many, including the President's manpower report, which stated:

Various methods or combinations of methods of Government financial assistance for privately administered training programs have been proposed. MDTA on-the-job training, for example, provides one form of current assistance which has been highly successful, although on a limited scale. Large-scale expansion of this program might constitute one approach to the problem. Other suggested approaches would involve incentives such as special taxes coupled with tax credits for business expenditures in connection with on-the-job training programs.

Mr. President, only 290,000 of the 3 million Americans who are unemployed are currently being reached by Federal manpower and training programs. Obviously, this is insufficient performance if we really want to win the war against poverty.

I submit, Mr. President, that the primary reason for this insufficient performance is that we have failed to significantly involve the private sector of our economy. Secretary of Labor Wirtz, in a statement submitted to our committee, acknowledged this deficiency when he said:

The most underdeveloped aspect of the manpower program (and possibly the poverty program as well) involves the potential for increased private participation.

In April of this year the manpower report of the President also recognized this difficulty when it stated:

If the enormous occupational training task which will face the Nation during the next several years is to be successfully accomplished, greater Government-industry effort in the area of skills training will be required. Basic issues should be jointly examined—such as the better coordination and division of training responsibility between private industry, Government, and the educational system; the need for broad planning and coordination of the Nation's total training effort; and the possibility and desirability of financial assistance to employers to help them continue to carry the largest share of the training burden.

But, Mr. President, a mere recognition of the fact that greater Government-industry effort is needed is not enough. Our poor performance in the area of skills training points up the need for substantially greater participation by industry. We in Congress must enact legislation which will stimulate private industry to increase job training for unemployed or low income Americans.

It was with this need in mind that I, together with 120 other Republicans, sponsored the Human Investment Act. Unfortunately, legislative action on the Human Investment Act has been delayed primarily because of its provision for a general tax credit incentive. Apparently the tax credit is alien to the philosophy which presupposes the need for direct Federal control over all Government-subsidized manpower training programs.

Since I believe the need for a substantially increased effort in manpower training is now acute, I have made an effort in this amendment to set aside philosophical disagreements over the tax credit approach. Consequently, I have modified the human investment approach to remove the tax credit feature.

Even with this modification, I believe the human investment approach represents a major step forward. It offers possibilities for widespread involvement by private industry.

Primarily, Mr. President, the human investment approach is based on the premise that job training under the direct auspices of private industry is generally preferable to institutional training conducted by Government. There are a number of reasons why I believe this premise is sound.

First, job training by private industry minimizes the necessity for Government intervention and regulation in the economy. The Government does not need to get into the business of screening instructors, determining curriculum, supporting trainees, and other such appendages of Government-run programs, beyond the point of assuring that useful training is, in fact, being imparted by the employer.

Federal-State complications, elaborate placement procedures, and general administrative problems are largely avoided. It is interesting in this connection to note that the British Government, faced with the identical problem in 1963, chose to promote job training through private industry instead of setting up an elaborate Government-operated program.

Second, the great majority of those trained by private business are actually employees on the payroll. A number of studies, notably that by Prof. Richard Cloward of Columbia University's School of Social Work, reported in the January 1965 issue of American Child, have shown that the motivation of an unskilled and unemployed person to complete a training program bears a different relation to his perceived chance for obtaining employment promptly at the conclusion of his training.

Much of the dropout problem in such institutional programs as the Job Corps and the Manpower Development and Training Act are traceable to a sense of discouragement and uncertainty felt by the trainee with respect to his job chances after training. When the trainee has been positively assured that he will be hired for a given job if he satisfactorily completes the training, the chances that he will abandon the program decrease drastically.

One of the most pitiful spectacles to me, Mr. President, is the spectacle of a man who has completed a Manpower Development and Training Act institutional program, only to find that there are no job openings for him in his area. When private firms are responsible for the training, however, the trainee is almost invariably either hired at the beginning or given a firm promise of employment when his training is complete. This point has been driven home ably by Mr. M. S. Hutcheson, general president of the Carpenter's Union, in his editorial in the February 1966 issue of the Carpenter. Mr. Hutchinson writes:

A realistic approach to training programs ought to be a fundamental part of the governments attitude toward eliminating poverty. Any program undertaken ought to be based on a reasonable assumption that there will be a place for a youngster when he has completed his training. Any other approach is neither fair to the youngster, to the industry, or to the nation.

I believe it is indisputably true that private industry people, far more than the Government or institutional personnel, know where and what the jobs will be.

Third, when private industry trains a man it invests in him. That investment is made with the expectation that the trainee can contribute to the company's productivity as an employee following training—else it would be difficult to justify the expense to the stockholder. Thus there is a built-in bias in favor of the employer giving top quality training, carefully designed to prepare the trainee for a position for which a worker is needed.

It would make little sense for a firm to train men and women as a public service project, and then see its investment wasted because the company has no appropriate job openings. Speaking on this point, Prof. William Faunce of the Labor and Industrial Relations Center of Michigan State University has said:

A retraining program which did not involve retraining with respect to specific job openings is not a meaningful retraining program.

Here training by private industry has a great advantage over solely Government-run programs.

Fourth, the instructors in on-the-job training programs are directly involved in the latest day-to-day developments in the field. Unlike instructors in schools, they are in the forefront of innovation and technological change, and thus can give, by and large, more up-to-date instruction to trainees.

Fifth, private industry can train workers on the latest models of machines without necessarily investing in new equipment for the purpose. Faced by

the rapid pace of innovation in many training fields, schools too often are left with the choice between trying to train people on obsolete equipment or obtaining new equipment, with a resulting increase in the cost of the training program. This fact accounts for a large part of the cost savings that can be realized by utilizing the resources of private industry for job training.

Sixth, by training the trainee in the context of an actual job situation, private industry provides a more realistic preparation for continued employment. The trainee is spared the problem of making what may be a difficult adjustment from a simulated to an actual worksite. To many trainees at the bottom end of the ladder, the prospect of regular employment with a company is a strange and bewildering experience. To have to adjust to this situation at the moment of maximum subconscious anxiety—just when training in an institutional program has been completed—puts an additional psychological burden on the worker, which may be reflected in poor performance.

This factor does not apply, of course, in the case of longtime workers who are merely changing from one line of employment to another via retraining. In the case of a hard-core unemployed person, however, it merits consideration.

Seventh, on-the-job training has conclusively proven to be more economical than the equivalent institutional training. Experience of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training in comparing per hour costs of trainees in institutional and in on-the-job training programs shows that where the average cost of the former runs over $5 per hour, the latter cost the taxpayer only 55 cents per hour. Even when the wage of the trainee, paid by the employer, is added on, it is still obvious that the on-the-job programs are more than twice as economical as the school programs.

Indeed, Labor Secretary Wirtz, in reply to my question submitted at a Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee hearing last February, stated:

> There is considerable economy in on the job training over institutional training. The average cost per trainee in on the job training is approximately one third that of the average total cost of institutional training.

At the same time he presented new figures from calendar year 1965 experience, showing the average cost to the taxpayer of on-the-job training programs to be $26 per week per trainee, while the cost of institutional training ran about $60 per week per trainee. Even though the two types of training are not directly comparable without some qualification, it is still clear that from a taxpayer's point of view, training on the job means money saved.

Eighth, on-the-job training is adaptable to any size training class and to any location, urban or rural. Institutional classes are limited to minimum numbers which may not exceed the required number of workers in a given occupation. Institutional facilities are not often available at all in rural areas; private business, however, can design programs for even one trainee—small firms with one apprentice in training are not uncommon. In fact, as of spring 1962, more than half of the apprentices surveyed in a national survey conducted by the Labor Department were employed in establishments with fewer than 100 workers.

Industry, as well as unemployed and low income persons, would greatly benefit from the human investment approach. My amendment would provide an incentive to private industry for improving its manpower efficiency and to fulfill its social obligations.

Many businessmen are faced with employee inefficiencies because they cannot afford the total cost of adequate job training or retraining. This amendment would provide enough incentive for many businessmen to intensify training programs thus increasing business efficiency.

Equally important, severe manpower shortages plaguing many parts of the country could be eased. New York State, for one, has suffered severely from skill shortages. According to the New York Times of January 8, 1967, State Senate Majority Leader Earl W. Bridges reported alarming shortages of skilled personnel in a number of areas, including skilled and semiskilled trades. In doing so he announced the formation of a special ad hoc committee of the State Senate to survey the manpower problem and recommend means for its solution.

LABOR SHORTAGE NOW

Sylvia Porter, the well-known financial columnist, reports in her column of January 12, 1967, in Burlington, Vt., Free Press:

> So severe are some skill shortages, in fact, that corporations, schools and government agencies are now raiding each other to fill job openings, paying bonuses of up to $300 to employees who can deliver new job recruits, scouring Canada and Europe for employees.

Miss Porter concludes:

> The basic, long term answer to skill shortages can only be drastically improved and increased vocational education and job training by private industry as well as by government agencies.

Industry could not only prosper economically from this amendment, but also better fulfill its social obligations. In recent months we have all sensed a willingness by many businessmen to become involved in the war on poverty. In Rochester, N.Y., for example, I understand businessmen have agreed to provide jobs for over 2,000 unemployed. These businesses have carried out obligations to society without subsidies or monetary incentives. However, realistically we cannot expect all businesses to follow the lead of the Rochester businessmen without some incentive. I believe this amendment would encourage substantially increased participation in the war on poverty by businessmen throughout the country.

The human investment approach, Mr. President, would benefit unemployed or low-income individuals. It would also benefit industry. And finally, Mr. President, it would benefit the Federal Government by relieving some of the burdens of the war on poverty.

Mr. President, I have just described the four significant changes in the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 that my amendment would make. I believe that I have demonstrated the desirability of limiting the authorization to 1 year, gearing the program to heads of families, utilizing the excellent experience we have had under the Manpower Development and Training Act, and initiating a human investment approach as an incentive for greater participation by private industry.

Now, Mr. President, I imagine that many are wondering what has prompted me to change my mind concerning the enactment of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967. On this floor last week I noted that the title II program was reminiscent of New Deal days and only a make-work program which did not represent a long-range solution to unemployment problems.

Even though I had doubts concerning the advisability of enacting title II as originally proposed, I was aware that large segments of the American population desperately need assistance. I realize, Mr. President, that the number unemployed and looking for work in the United States has averaged nearly 3 million during the first half of 1967. I realize, Mr. President, that to reduce unemployment to a rate of 3 percent would take 600,000 new jobs. I realize, Mr. President, that meeting unemployment with jobs is central to solving the crisis of our cities and rural areas.

While these statistics, Mr. President, demand constructive action during this session of Congress, I could not see instituting a $2.8 billion work relief program for a 2-year period.

After taking a hard look at the provisions of title II, I am convinced that if my amendments to it are adopted it could have a beneficial impact on our Nation.

First of all, Mr. President, it would get down to the serious work of training thousands of unemployed persons to become productive members of our society. In years to come, taxes from these individuals alone would more than pay for the Emergency Employment Act of 1967.

Second, Mr. President, it would provide industry with a real incentive to become a fullfledged partner with Government in this war on poverty. As I have pointed out so many times on this floor, the Federal Government alone cannot do the job of eliminating poverty. There must be a coordinated and comprehensive effort by the Federal, State and local governments, and above all both the private sector of the economy and organized labor must become fully involved.

Third, Mr. President, I fully realize that there are some unemployed persons who would not respond to job training in any way, shape or form. What do we do with this type of individual, Mr. President? Do we give him relief checks and let him sit on his front porch playing cribbage and drinking beer? Do we forget about him and let him become a beggar? Do we ignore him and hope that some way he will disappear?

Realistically, Mr. President, I think that we have to realize that for some individuals the Government must become the employer of last resort. I know, Mr. President, that considering the Govern-

ment as the employer of last resort conjures up the image of the "shovel leaning" WPA worker of the 30's. I am sure that part of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 would generate a few "shovel leaners." But, also, Mr. President, it will restore the dignity which can only come from productive work for thousands of individuals who have become accustomed to hopelessness, despair, and laziness in that order.

EMPLOYER OF LAST RESORT

Prof. Garth Mangum points out in a recent paper that:

> Ways may be found to attract employers to depressed areas and neighborhoods, or to get the unemployed and underemployed out of them. Until then—and the day appears far off—reasonably adequate solutions to the social and personal problems of the employable but competitively disadvantaged will require the government to act as "employer of last resort."

Finally, Mr. President, I have pointed out numerous times that the administration has been plagued by a definite performance gap between promises and results. Part of the reason for this performance gap has been an apparent inability to attack any one area of poverty with the determination and drive necessary to eliminate that particular problem. In the area of job training the performance gap is all too apparent for thousands of unemployed and low income indivduals who continue to become more economically disadvantaged each day. For too many of them federally sponsored job training programs have been but an illusion. Their lives have remained unaffected in any way, shape or form.

I believe, Mr. President, the enactment of the Emergency Employment Act as changed by my amendment would diminish the performance gap now plaguing the Federal Government. More important, Mr. President, it would enable thousands of individuals who have become victims of abject poverty and the welfare dole to lead a meaningful life.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I point out briefly the effects of this proposed amendment.

First, it would cut title II authorization from $2.8 billion to $875 million, plus $50 million for interest-free repayable loans for purchase of training equipment and supplies.

Second, it would permit the Secretary of Labor to use up to $328,125,000 of the $875 million for human investment training programs by private industry, pursuant to plans approved by the Secretary.

Third, it would permit the Secretary of Labor to use up to $175 million of the $875 million for on-the-job training and other programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Fourth, it would require the Secretary of Labor to give priority in filling all employment and training openings created by title II programs to unemployed and low-income persons who are the heads of families.

Fifth, it would expand the definition of "eligible areas" to include rural areas with problems of outmigration.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this represents a reasonable compromise between the positions of those who favor the adoption of title II of the bill in its present form and those who would eliminate it entirely. Also, Mr. President, my amendment concentrates more on training programs, making it possible for the unemployed and the underemployed to acquire skills necessary and essential to enable them to become productive, self-supporting citizens.

I very much hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will look with favor upon my proposal.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am very much interested in the Senator's proposal. As he knows, he and I have discussed it, and I have discussed it with some of my Democratic colleagues on the subcommittee which held the initial hearings on this bill.

I should like to see whether the Senator and I are in accord—and I will not detain him long—as to the basic principles of his amendment.

I understand, first, that the amendment would cut the authorization from a 2-year authorization to a 1-year authorization. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. In the original Emergency Employment Act which I introduced, and which the committee brought to the floor, the authorization for the first year would have been $1.3 billion, of which $300 million would have been set aside for tooling up, hardware, and making available the facilities through which the program would operate.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. What the Senator has done has been to reduce that $1.3 billion to $925 million, of which $50 million would be set aside for tooling up and hardware?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; and I think it should be pointed out that the $50 million is in the form of loans which will be repayable.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct; and they are non-interest-bearing loans?

Mr. PROUTY. That is right.

Mr. CLARK. My third point would be that the Senator's amendment puts greater stress on the job training than does the original Emergency Employment Act.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. As the Senator knows, I feel very strongly about that. It is one of the most important things we must do if we are to enable people who are now unemployable to learn skills and becoming self-supporting.

Mr. CLARK. I share the Senator's view that on-the-job training needs as much emphasis as we can reasonably give it, and the on-the-job training emphasis is directed at the hard-core poor who are unemployable, is it not?

Mr. PROUTY. That is true.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand, the Senator intends, under part (b) of his amendment, which I think is referred to as the human investment part of the amendment, to give encouragement to private industry to employ hard-core poor after adequate on-the-job training. In order to do that, there is an inducement to private industry in the form of the payment of a subsidy—perhaps the Senator would prefer some other word; that is the first word that occurred to me—represented by the difference between what it costs to train a hard-core poor individual and what it would cost to train an ordinary employee.

Mr. PROUTY. That is the purpose of the amendment, and of my approach in the human investment program.

Mr. CLARK. With respect to part (b), the Senator's amendment leaves a good deal of flexibility to the Secretary of Labor, does it not, in that the Secretary would have discretion, within a limitation of a low of 12½ percent of the $875 million and a high of 37½ percent of the $875 million, as to how much should be utilized for the human investment program and how much should stay within the original conception of the Emergency Employment Act?

Mr. PROUTY. That is within the discretion of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CLARK. So without being very adept at doing mathematics in my head—perhaps the Senator or his staff has done it—what does the 12½ percent figure come to, and what does the 37½ percent figure come to?

Mr. PROUTY. The 12½ percent figure is $109,375,000; the 37½ percent figure is $328,125,000.

Mr. CLARK. So, roughly speaking and rounding out the figures, if the Secretary has to take the lower amount, there would be a high in excess of $700 million left for the emergency employment part of the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Offhand I think the Senator is approximately correct.

Mr. CLARK. If the Secretary were to take the higher figure of 37½ percent, there would still be in excess of $500 million, would there not, for the emergency part of the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. I think that is true.

Mr. CLARK. I overheard the colloquy between the Senator and his able staff member about the MDTA. Perhaps the Senator will explain to what extent, if at all, that enters into this discussion.

Mr. PROUTY. Certainly in addition to the human investment part of the amendment there is a 10 percent minimum earmarked under MDTA which would amount to $87.5 million. The maximum which could be spent would be $175 million.

Mr. CLARK. That would be in addition, would it, to the $109 million and the $300-odd million we spoke about before?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct. I point out to the Senator, however, that while this is a 1-year authorization, the amendment contains a provision to make funds available until they have been expended.

Mr. CLARK. I understand. Would the Senator, as an experienced legislator, agree with me, it now being the first week in October—and since we are expecting problems in the House and a conference which could be long winded, and a possible veto, although we hope not—that it is not very likely that this legislation will become law much before the end of the year.

Mr. PROUTY. I think that is a fair assumption.

Mr. CLARK. So one-half of the fiscal year 1968 would have passed before this money could even begin to be made available.

Mr. PROUTY. That is very true, and quite frankly, that is one reason why I felt we could reduce the funds rather substantially without curtailing the effect of the poverty program which the Senator and I favor.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator has a good point there. I am more favorably disposed toward his amendment, although I might say quite candidly that I am not in a position to accept it tonight.

I am not at all sure that I can accept it at all. However, I do want to think about it very hard, because it would be very difficult for the Secretary to spend in this fiscal year all the money provided in the original Emergency Employment Act.

Mr. PROUTY. I think that is true. I appreciate the fact that the Senator is going to give appropriate thought to the proposal which I am sure he appreciates is offered in good faith.

I am very much concerned about what I consider to be our No. 1 domestic problem which is the prevalence of poverty. While the Senator and I do not agree on everything, I think philosophically we feel that this is a problem which we must approach along the lines which he and I both seem to feel is desirable and essential.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator and I are in accord that something must be done to give employment potential to the hard core poor who are of employable age. And I agree with the Senator that something more needs to be done with respect to training them in employable skills.

The Senator and I are both realists, and we know that there are limits to what we can expect the Senate to do in this regard, and perhaps even greater limits to what we can expect the House to do.

I commend the Senator for the efforts he has made in working out what may well become an acceptable compromise for the Senate.

So that we can have an appropriate record, I wonder if the Senate would permit me to ask him a couple of additional questions so that I can be sure I understand the full purport of the amendment.

Section 214 of the Senator's amendment would prohibit financial assistance by the Secretary except upon approval of a plan submitted by an employer who desires to receive financial assistance under part (b), the human investment job training part of the Emergency Employment Act.

I take it that refers to a written plan.

That plan is required to include under section 214(g):

> Information respecting the cost of usual training and other usual services provided employees other than those described in Section 206 of this title, in order to make them fully productive.

They are there described as hard-core corps.

Reading this section in conjunction with section 213 which authorizes financial assistance for training and employment costs including "unusual training and other unusual services for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive" would require the Secretary of Labor to determine the unusual training and employment costs by first requiring the establishment of the usual training and employment costs under the plan.

In other words, to make a figure available, we have to know what it would ordinarily cost them and then how much it would cost for this hard-core corps.

Mr. PROUTY. That is absolutely true. We think this is set forth under section 214(g) of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. In this connection I would think it appropriate for the Secretary to take into account in determining such usual training and other employment costs the following information in addition to other information which the Secretary might require:

First, it would seem to me that the employer should provide the Secretary with a description of the training and services usually provided its new employees. That description should include the usual duration of such training and an analysis of the employer's training costs during a substantial period prior to the submission of the plan.

Second, it would seem to me relevant for the Secretary to consider the normal turnover rates of the employer's employees information on work injuries and absenteeism of employees performing work similar to that which is expected to be performed by low-income or unemployed persons who are to be employed under the plan.

Third, I think some information should also be provided on the productivity and efficiency of the employer's employees.

Lastly, the Secretary may wish to require that the employer provide other information in order to enable the Secretary to determine the amount and rate of financial assistance to be provided an employer for the hiring of poor people under the Senator's amendment.

I am wondering whether the Senator would agree with these observations?

I think it important that the Secretary of Labor have enough flexibility in determining the employer's usual training and other services costs and in determining the information necessary to be included under the plan so that the Secretary would be able to exercise an informed judgment as to the amount of financial assistance to be provided.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct. And I think this is still at the discretion of the Secretary. I think the language is sufficiently clear so that there is no doubt about certain restrictions which may be placed upon him.

Mr. CLARK. I have another point which disturbs me a little, but I suspect that the Senator is in accord with me on this.

Further, in connection with subsection 214(g), I am concerned that there are no specific legislative safeguards prohibiting the use of the financial assistance provided under the Senator's amendment to assure that this assistance is not used by an employer who typically and normally has a high turnover rate for his employees. I would hope that the Senator from Vermont would agree that the human investment job training program should not be used by employers which have typically high turnover rates. I do not think it would be advisable, for example, to have a small shop of one sort or another which normally hires persons on a short-term basis receive aid under this act. I am sure the Senator would agree that the purpose of his human investment job training amendment is to create permanent jobs and not merely temporary jobs in industries where turnover rates are particularly high.

Mr. PROUTY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. The third point is that section 213(a) authorizes financial assistance to employers for "training and employment costs incurred pursuant to the plan described in section 214. I think the act is quite clear what the term "training and employment costs" refers to for sections 213(a), (1) through (4) indicate the kinds of reimbursements which would be made by the Secretary to an employer. I would like to ask the Senator from Vermont if he would not agree with me that the language on its face is quite clear that employment costs refers to matters contained within section 213(a) and does not refer to wages, and that his amendment would not authorize a wage subsidy.

Mr. PROUTY. I believe that is the Senator's understanding and I believe he is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to have the Senator make that point.

My semifinal point I wish to raise, as a matter of legislative history, is that subsection 213(a)(2) authorizes the payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income persons. Would the Senator from Vermont agree that this provision is not intended to duplicate or replace existing recruitment efforts by the U.S. Employment Service and the State public employment offices or other public or private agencies which are currently engaged in the recruitment of unemployed or low-income persons?

Mr. PROUTY. No, it would not duplicate their efforts. It would be an additional means of finding some of the people, if necessary, who need this help. It would not in any sense supplant the activities of the U.S. Employment Service or of State employment services.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, there is an analogy between the human investment job training amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont and the present practices of the Department of Labor in connection with the on-the-job training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Would not the Senator agree that, where appropriate, the rules and regulations established for training under MDTA by the Department of Labor be made applicable to the human investment job training provisions proposed by the Senator from Vermont where such rules and regulations could be adapted to fit the provisions of the Senator's amendment, so

we will not be establishing another jungle of bureaucratic rules with situations which in many ways are substantially identical?

Mr. PROUTY. I believe that is a logical approach, but I should say to the Senator that the final decision must be up to the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator very much for his candid answers to my questions and I assure him that overnight I will give prayerful consideration to accepting his amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I hope very much that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will find it possible to accept the amendment, after he has had an opportunity to think about it.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his support of this proposal and for his having worked out what I believe is a very useful alternative, which I hope will be favorably acted upon by the Senate.

I support the proposal. I have joined in it with the Senator from Vermont. I hope for its success, and I hope that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania may find that he also will be able to support the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania. I must say that his cooperation and help in drafting this amendment have been extremely valuable. I share his hope that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania will find it possible to accept our proposal.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In title II of the bill before us, the language would authorize $1 billion for fiscal year 1968 and $1.5 billion for fiscal year 1969.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. There would also be an authorization for loans in the amount of $300 million.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As I understand the distinguished Senator's amendment to my motion, one of the changes that would be embodied in the instructions which he proposes would be a limitation on the authorization to $875 million until expended.

Mr. PROUTY. Plus $50 million for repayable loans, which are noninterest loans but are repayable.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. This brings me to the question I was about to ask the Senator. I have not had an opportunity to read his statement, but I was going to ask whether or not he intended to provide any monies for loans.

Mr. PROUTY. There is $50 million in the amendment for loans.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So there will be $50 million instead of the $300 million as provided in the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. There is $50 million in addition to the $875 million authorization.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So the $875 million would be in grants, and there would be a total of $50 million in loans?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, although I am a cosponsor with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] of the original bill which is sought now to be amended, it is my judgment that the scheme adopted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] sharpens and makes even more specific the private enterprise job which I had in mind in effecting several amendments to the bill in its original form which I worked out with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I think that the Senator from Vermont has rendered us all a valuable service by sharpening and committing specific sums of money for that purpose. In many respects, this amendment proposes incentives to private industry like those I sponsored under section 123(a)(8) of title I of the act, and extends those incentives to something beyond a pilot program in size.

He has limited the program to 1 year. I think that program is more important than that limitation. Therefore, it shall be my intention to support the Senator from Vermont, and I hope very much the majority of the Senate will do the same. I have examined the needs closely and I am more than ever convinced that jobs must be our first priority in attacking the problem of poverty. This bill would provide those needed jobs.

OPPOSITION TO TITLE II

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there can be no question about the desirability of eradicating poverty, and no question at all about the necessity of helping those who are in genuine need. Speaking as one who knows about the pangs of poverty from firsthand experience, I can say that improving the opportunities for all Americans to share in the fruits of an affluent society—and I emphasize the word opportunities—is a commendable and worthwhile national objective.

But in my view, there are serious questions about the validity of some of the premises and some of the statistics on which the war on poverty is based. And there are even more serious questions about the effectiveness of a number of phases of the effort which the Office of Economic Opportunity is making. I have serious reservations about continuing to fund some of these programs in the amounts sought, or, for that matter, in any amount whatsoever.

In many instances the results we had hoped for as a consequence of the enactment of the Economic Opporutnity Act of 1964—which I supported—have not been attained. And they may not be attained, for it is doubtful to me that the OEO, or any other agency that can be devised, is going to be able to wipe out poverty in this or any other country. I believe that eradicating poverty is much more related to the individual and his own efforts than it is to federal undertakings of this nature. This is not to say that the Federal Government should not assist.

A thought-provoking article entitled "Is United States Really Filled With Poverty?" appeared on page 50 of U.S. News & World Report for September 4, 1967, which I believe could profitably be read by any person concerned about the problem of poverty in this country. I ask unanimous consent that this article be labeled exhibit A and be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Before additional billions are voted for the war on poverty, there are many facts that should be weighed. I shall call attention in these remarks to a few of them.

The word "poverty" has emotional connotations. Our sympathies are stirred at thoughts of the less fortunate and the disadvantaged, and properly so. Providing equal opportunity for all is among the noblest ideals which we profess.

But reality should guide us, and it is my opinion that a good many misleading or at least questionable statistics have been advanced as to the number of individuals and families that actually live in poverty in America and who can be motivated to make the effort to lift themselves out of the poverty strata.

In the U.S. News article to which I referred, John B. Parrish, professor of economics at the University of Illinois, does much, I think, to put this problem in proper perspective and focus. The author has been on the Illinois faculty for 20 years and, before that, was an economist and statistician with the War Labor Board and the War Manpower Commission in Washington. For 3 years he was Chicago regional director of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

He brands as "poverty fallacy No. 1" the estimates of the number of Americans living in poverty. The figures I have heard most commonly quoted place this number at 30 to 35 million. But some members of what Dr. Parrish calls the "poverty cult"—meaning those persons, or groups, who go the farthest in advocating antipoverty measures—put the number at 40 to 50 million, and a few, using some yardstick that is utterly incomprehensible to me, would contend that as many as 80 million Americans are victims of poverty. Here is part of what Dr. Parrish wrote:

> Poverty fallacy No. 1 got its big push from the 1964 report on "The Problem of Poverty in America," by the Council of Economic Advisers. CEA determined that households with less than $3,000 annual income were in poverty. Using this income yardstick, it was determined that 20 per cent of U.S. households containing 30 million persons were in the poverty class.
>
> The truth about poverty-income statistics is this: Under no reasonable assumptions does income below $3,000 indicate poverty status. It may or may not, and to say otherwise, is not only erroneous but absurd.
>
> Let's take as an example a young married couple, the Smiths. They are attending college. They constitute a statistical household. Their annual income is $1,500 a year. They are not being "hopelessly" shut out from the good things of life. They are, along with other American youth, enjoying a rate of access to higher education greater than the youth of any country, any time, any place. They enjoy electric lighting, refrigeration,

adequate if not fancy food, and a second-hand automobile or motorcycle. They would like a new Cadillac, but will manage without one. They aren't "poor" and need no crocodile tears shed in their behalf.

At the other end of the life cycle are the Joneses. Mr. Jones has been a machinist all his life. He and Mrs. Jones had always wanted to visit the country's great national parks after the children had grown up and left. So he has opted to retire at age 60. The retirement income will come to only $2,000 a year. Are they poor? The poverty cult says, "Yes," these people are suffering from deprivation. They have been "hopelessly" cast aside. Yet the truth is they have a small home paid for, a modest automobile paid for. They enjoy refrigeration, automatic cooking equipment, inside plumbing, TV, enough clothes to last for years—the accumulation of a lifetime. And now they propose to enjoy more leisure, in more comfort, for more years than similar working-class families of any country, any time. The Joneses think the Council of Economic Advisers is statistically wacky.

And take the Browns. They are in the middle years. Both Mr. and Mrs. Brown work. Their three children are in school. They have a modest new home, partially paid for, some savings, some insurance, good clothes—yes, and a paid-for refrigerator and TV set. They have a new car and six installments still outstanding. Mr. Brown becomes ill. Mrs. Brown quits work to take care of him. Their income drops to below $3,000 for the year. Are they in trouble? Yes. Are they in desperate consumer poverty? Are they "hopelessly trapped?" By no means. After a tough year they will resume as members of the affluent society even by CEA's definition.

These cases could be multiplied endlessly, I think. If poverty is to be measured or defined on the basis of income and size of family alone, or the difference between low and high income brackets without taking into consideration all the other factors which are pertinent, then we will, indeed, always have poverty with us.

I do not believe that poverty can be predicated solely, or even mainly, on the basis of income or on family size. Such data form an insufficient basis on which to proceed, for they omit such estimates, which Dr. Parrish cites, as these:

Ninety-five percent of U.S. families have an adequate minimum daily diet; 99 percent of all U.S. households have adequate cooking equipment including those living in both urban and rural "ghettos"; 99 percent of U.S. households have refrigeration; 96 percent of U.S. families who want it have television; 98 percent of U.S. mothers give birth to their babies in hospitals; 95 percent of U.S. households have telephones.

Moreover, America's vast resale market makes all kind of consumer-type durable goods available to those in low-income groups at a fraction of their original cost. Refrigerators, automobiles, TV sets, record players, furniture—these and other items are sold and resold as used goods. Instead of being shut out, our low-income families are, in many instances, gaining more in the way of necessities and conveniences than they have ever had before.

I do not contend that they, the low-income families, have everything they need or should aspire to. Far from it. But I do say emphatically that it is my opinion that the bleak picture of 30 to 35 million Americans living in the depths of poverty, existing on a bare subsistence level, is a badly overdrawn and distorted picture.

Now, let us look briefly at three of the more controversial programs of the war on poverty about which I have the strongest reservations. I refer specifically to the Job Corps, some of the community action programs, and the activities of the VISTA workers.

In the case of the Job Corps, the data are confusing and conflicting and tend generally to indicate that the program is not doing what it was intended to do; namely, to fit disadvantaged youths for holding other than make-work jobs.

Some educators and sociologists believe that the theory behind the program is faulty. They question the wisdom of removing youths from their homes and training them for situations that may or may not exist in their home communities or anywhere else.

Many who are best versed in this phase of the war on poverty believe that not enough use is being made of existing educational and vocational training facilities; that the "education" these youths are receiving is poor; and that there has not been enough involvement of State educational agencies in the program. It seems evident that there is too much overlapping and duplication of both Federal and State educational and manpower training and retraining programs.

But most seriously I question the great cost of this program when viewed in the light of the results it has produced so far.

The figures on the cost annually per enrollee have been widely discussed. The committee report on the pending bill shows that during the first 3 fiscal years $715 million has been allocated to the Job Corps for its operation. The direct operating cost per enrollee was $6,900 for the 1967 fiscal year for the centers in operation 9 months or more, which is under the ceiling of $7,500 per enrollee imposed by a 1966 amendment to the 1964 act, and which the new bill would reduce to $7,300 per enrollee.

But additional overhead and capital costs raised the cost for each enrollee by an average of $600. The direct operating costs for men's urban centers averaged just under $7,500 and for the women's centers just under $8,500. The cost for the conservation centers was $6,100 plus $854 per conservation center enrollee, or a total of $6,954 per enrollee.

Without making any invidious comparisons with other private educational costs, it must be obvious to all that, when no one knows exactly what results are being achieved, these costs are inordinately high.

Statements which one sees now and then in the public press and elsewhere to the effect that the youths trained in the Job Corps centers will return more than the cost of their training in the future taxes they will pay and the good they will do for society are, at best, only guesses. Assumptions that welfare costs for the youths involved will be reduced or eliminated are equally nebulous, for, as the minority report on the bill notes, many who have received public assistance receive it again after finishing their "training."

As the U.S. Chamber of Commerce noted in its comprehensive study of the Job Corps earlier this year:

> The Job Corps is doing very little directly to aid the graduates in job placement. . . . About 60 percent of the Corpsmen found their jobs themselves. Even when the Job Corps did assist in placement, responses from graduates indicate that an effort was not always made to match previous training and job specifications.[1]

The chamber of commerce study made the additional point that employers hold the graduates of the Job Corps in low regard. The most disturbing result of its investigation, the chamber said, was that roughly 74 percent of the Job Corps graduates covered by the study were no longer employed in the job in which the Job Corps indicated they were placed.

Moreover, the press has reported many incidents, occurring both at the Job Corps centers and in neighboring cities and towns, in which enrollees have participated in unlawful or disruptive activities. Often it has been reported that enrollees who have committed crimes were not subjected to punishment. This has evoked criticism and antagonism, especially from citizens residing near Job Corps centers.

Many of the incidents that have marred the image of the Job Corps probably have been due to poor screening methods. The Job Corps has said that it has no way of checking whether a man is on parole or probation when he applies. They refuse to require fingerprints from enrollees—despite the fact that members of the Armed Forces and Government employees have their fingerprints taken automatically.

I do not say that the Job Corps should accept only those boys with clean records, but I do say that the Job Corps administrators should know enough about each boy's background to be able to reject him, if need be, or, once enrolled, to handle him effectively. Many of the scandals and riots that have plagued the Job Corps may have been avoided if the camp leaders had known which boys had the most serious problems and had helped them accordingly or had rejected or dismissed them.

Turning to the community action phase of the war on poverty, I have been disturbed by reports reaching me from my State that in some instances these programs are being subverted by "leadership" which seems to be ideologically opposed to what it openly refers to as "the power structure," or contemptuously calls "the establishment." The objective of some community action leaders in some communities appears mainly to be the overthrow of this "establishment."

I have had reports that in some communities persons associated with the poverty programs are openly talking of "running candidates for office," who presumably would be amenable to the points of view of "do-gooder" or extremist types of leadership, whether that fitted into a community pattern or not. I regret to say that some reports reaching me indicate that social misfits and mal-

[1] "Youth and the War on Poverty," February 24, 1967, The Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

contents have, in some cases, infiltrated the war on poverty and have become its leaders.

Local initiative and local participation in Federal programs are rightly regarded as essential in the effective development and carrying out of many such programs. But in some communities responsible leaders have shied away from having anything to do with the war on poverty. In my judgment, the OEO has failed significantly to involve progressive yet sound local leadership in many communities.

The objective in some instances appears to have been to incite hatred and anger, to build up class consciousness and to foment unrest instead of to provide constructive leadership. In one West Virginia city—Bluefield—a mimeographed notice of a community action meeting circulated in a predominantly Negro neighborhood began with these provocative words:

Are you tired of being stepped on? . . . Are you satisfied with the prevailing conditions?

I ask unanimous consent that this item be included as exhibit B at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, other inflammatory pamphlets and literature have been circulated in what seems to be a deliberate effort to take advantage of the community action programs to agitate for increased welfare benefits and to gain other similar ends. As an example, I have some literature which was recently sent to me by an elected State official and which has been circulated by poverty workers to welfare recipients. I ask unanimous consent that this literature be inserted as exhibit C at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is fine, in theory, to involve the poor in community endeavors for their own purported betterment. But where the poor have had little experience and practice in such matters, they all too often can be misled by persons who have their own, not the poor's, interests and welfare in mind.

The issues appear to me to revolve around poor implementation of a number of the poverty programs, ineffective operation, loose administrative control, and the weaknesses inherent in the concept of such programs as the Job Corps, some of the community action programs, and some of the VISTA activities.

The legislation before us amends and revises the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It broadens the program at the same time it purportedly seeks to correct the weaknesses to which I have referred. I do not believe that some of them have been corrected. Too often it appears that special interest groups coming into a community from outside it have seized the initiative at the local level, and that they are using the communtiy action setup as a vehicle for their own special purposes, which all too often do not coincide with the basic purposes and aims of the war on poverty. As a result, a great deal of social dissension has been stirred up, a new class-consciousness has been introduced, much public disenchantment has resulted, and, in my judgment, a great deal of money has been wasted.

I cite a letter, dated August 14, 1967, from Gov. Hulett C. Smith, of my State, to Director R. Sargent Shriver of the OEO, in which the Governor of West Virginia states that he would not give his permission or approval "today" to the VISTA and Appalachian volunteer phases of the war on poverty which he has approved for the past summer.

In his letter Governor Smith said:

Earlier this year, I approved for the second summer the placement of Appalachian Volunteers in the State of West Virginia under the auspices of the VISTA program. In so doing, I approved the return of the AV's in the face of a considerable amount of public protest from communities where they had served before, with some persons taking exception to the philosophy and activities of the group in the community, but with a majority protesting alleged immorality, uncleanliness, unconventionality and personal obnoxiousness by some of the AV's working in the State during the summer of 1966.

However, it was my feeling at that time that the good being done by these young people outweighed the flaws and peccadilloes being manifested by some of them.

In recent weeks, incidents have occurred which—to be quite frank—cause me to question whether I exercised my best judgment in approving the 1967 AV contract.

Briefly related, these incidents are:

1. A group of persons identified as AV's and VISTA personnel staged a riotous all-night party on July 22 at Babcock State Park—destroying park property, interfering with the exit and entrance of other park guests, tampering with automobiles and generally disturbing the peace. This is documented in the attached report from the park superintendent, which points out that several of these persons used Federal Government automobiles, raising the possible question of misuse of U.S. Government property (as well as being abominable public relations for the national Administration). The superintendent's report has been carefully checked, and verified in almost every detail.

2. Reports from Wyoming County, West Virginia, indicate that confidence in, and effectiveness of, the VISTA-AV program has been seriously weakened by immoral conduct on the part of several of those volunteers. While these persons logically argue that their personal lives are their own affair, the fact remains that promiscuity, particularly when it crosses racial lines, is not accepted by the community as a whole and damages public respect and support for the VISTA and AV program.

3. On August 6, pickets protesting U.S. participation in the Viet Nam war staged a demonstration on the lawn of the State Capitol. The protest, which was peaceful and orderly, included five VISTA-AV workers from Raleigh County. While I affirm their right to their own views on the Vietnamese situation, the fact that they drove to Charleston in a clearly-marked U.S. Government car, which was parked near the Capitol, attracted considerable attention, as the attached State Police report reveals. The use of a Federally-owned car for such purposes certainly is open to question.

4. A respected State Senator, Carl E. Gainer, from central West Virginia has protested formally to me about the activities of VISTA and AV workers in Nicholas County. These persons apparently have called for the mass dismissal of a number of the county's elected officials and school personnel. While such social protest might be valid, the absence of constructive alternatives to the problems of the community has led to a general feeling that the VISTA-AV group is composed of "trouble-makers" who offer only negative solutions to community problems. Charges of teaching "ideas that are Communistic" have been made. Enclosed are copies of the letters outlining this problem.

5. The arrest of a group of VISTA-AV workers in a nearby county of Kentucky on charges of sedition, and their alleged possession of Communist literature and paraphernalia, has been widely reported by West Virginia news media, and has served further to undermine confidence in the VISTA-AV program.

Since I was given assurances that the 1967 Appalachian Volunteer Program would be more tightly controlled to the extent of picking persons of greater maturity and judgment and screening out those individuals whose Bohemian habits might render the program effete, I feel I have no alternative but to call this evident breach of those assurances to your attention.

It remains my contention that a program such as the Appalachian Volunteers can be a positive force for community betterment and assisting the poor to higher standards of living and aspiration.

However, it is also my contention that the poor—and the image of your office—both would be far better served if these persons were oriented in the common courtesies; inspired to set a truly good example for the people they serve in grooming, manners, dress and demeanor; and that they be impressed with the fact that they are representative of the Federal Government (and, in the eyes of many persons, government and authority in general), and as such, should try to be circumspect to the point of extreme prudence in their personal appearance, conduct and attitudes.

In conclusion, may I state that I feel the guarantees given me in the spring by VISTA officials and Mr. Milton Ogle, director of the Appalachian Volunteers program, have been disregarded or abrogated. In the light of the summer's developments, I certainly would not give my approval to such a program if it were before me today.

I believe you personally should know of these problems and incidents, for I am certain we share a desire to make the Economic Opportunity program as effective as possible in West Virginia.

The sedition charges to which Governor Smith referred made some very unfavorable national news for the poverty program. Charges that antipoverty workers were seeking the overthrow of the government of Kentucky and of Pike County were involved.

It is true that these charges of sedition were voided by a three-judge Federal court, which held that the Kentucky law on which they were based is unconstitutional. Nevertheless, a Pike County, Ky., grand jury found enough evidence to indict five persons for sedition, and a wide area of eastern Kentucky has been wracked by destructive controversy as a result of the activities of antipoverty workers.

Excuses, explanations, and defenses too frequently have been offered by the OEO as a result of criticisms and charges such as this.

The New York Times reported on September 4 that—

An inspector for the Office of Economic Opportunity has concluded that a sedition charge against Joseph Mulloy (one of the five persons involved), a poverty worker in the

mountains around Pikeville, Kentucky, is based entirely on local issues.

The news story said further that the inspector for the OEO stated that he found "no basis for the sedition charges."

This sort of defensive report has come from the OEO many times when it has been criticized, which indicates to me that the agency actually has little control at the local level over a number of activities carried on in its name.

But it will not be sufficient, in my opinion, for it to say that it has no control, or little control, over volunteer workers such as the Appalachian volunteers, for they are paid in part by poverty funds and are thoroughly identified in the public mind with the poverty program.

The five persons in Kentucky were not directly employed by the OEO, but they were identified in the public eye with its activities, and at least one of them, Mulloy, was supported in a substantial degree by Federal funds. So the damage is done. The poverty program, by the very nature of the way in which it is set up, is given another nationwide black eye.

In a feature article, the Sunday, August 27, 1967, Washington Post stated in the opening paragraph:

> Are Federal tax dollars paid to antipoverty workers subsidizing sedition in Kentucky?

This is a serious question to raise in the minds of the public which must support the antipoverty endeavors if they are to be successful.

But even more important than this, in the case of Pike County, Ky., which borders my own State, is the fact that outside agitators in the guise of seeking to help the poor natives have, instead, brought on deep dissension and set neighbor against neighbor. In the process they have helped no one. They have certainly not eradicated poverty.

There is no doubt in my mind that the persons indicted for sedition in Kentucky, along with many of those who have stirred up controversy in West Virginia and elsewhere, whether they realize it or not, are virtually revolutionaries bent on destroying the present order of society instead of trying to improve conditions within the framework that exists.

I am happy to say that Director Shriver subsequently cut off all funds for the Appalachian volunteer program in Kentucky at the request of Gov. Edward T. Breathitt following the charges of sedition.

All too often, complaints to the Office of Economic Opportunity regarding community action activities elicit only defensive responses. Charges of misconduct on the part of poverty workers are seemingly sloughed off, casually brushed aside, and made to appear as nothing out of the ordinary with regard to citizen conduct. The OEO response to Governor Smith's charges seemed to me to conform, in some respects, to such a pattern. I ask unanimous consent to insert the OEO reply as exhibit D at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit D.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I must also say, in all fairness, that I have had some good reports, as well as bad, regarding the VISTA program. I would not want it to appear that I condemn this antipoverty program in its entirety—a point about which I wish to say a few words more in order to clarify my position.

In the field of mental health in my State, for example, I am informed that Dr. Mildred Mitchell-Bateman, West Virginia's State director of mental health, has been publicly quoted in the press to the effect that the VISTA program has been effective and valuable.

In fact, she said that the work of VISTA volunteers with emotionally disturbed West Virginians, in their communities and in the State's mental hospitals, has saved the State an estimated $486,000 in custodial care, funds that are being used to help provide better services.

Dr. Bateman said that the VISTA's also had helped to organize Boy Scout troops in rural areas for the first time, as well as day-care centers for children, tutoring programs for elementary and high school pupils and services for the retarded.

Dr. Bateman said:[2]

> In all these activities, the VISTAs are training local people to take over when they leave. This is really a program in which VISTAs try to work themselves out of a job.

Governor Smith, I believe, concurs in this evaluation.

However, I have received may complaints from dependable sources concerning the activities of some of the VISTA workers. Just the other day, on September 22 to be exact, through questions addressed to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] I expressed some concern and reservations anent VISTA. The Senator subsequently, on September 25, submitted for the RECORD certain documentation in support of VISTA, including exhibits attesting to the value of VISTA's mental health program in West Virginia.

I was, of course, aware of the complimentary reports concerning the mental health program, having heard directly from Dr. Mildred Mitchell-Bateman, West Virginia's director of mental health, and from a few county directors of mental health programs in the State.

But the part does not make the whole, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed, as exhibit E at the conclusion of my remarks, a sampling of the correspondence which has reached my office from so many people of my State and which reflects in the opinion of many persons, a poor image of VISTA workers in general, as observed in West Virginia.

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

(See exhibit E.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, these reports include, for example:

First. Strong criticism of the VISTA program in his county by the sheriff of Raleigh County and a plea for an investigation of the actions of VISTA workers. Seven months later, after what he characterizes as a "job of whitewashing" by OEO officials, he still urged investigation.

Second. An expression of belief by a well-known real estate operator that VISTA workers 18 or 19 years old, untrained, and "looking in most cases more in need than our own people," cannot accomplish much in the promotion of a "better life for those in the rural areas," and a request that something "be done about this reckless spending of our tax money."

Third. An expression of alarm by a member of the West Virginia Senate who characterizes the VISTA workers in his district as "a bunch of improperly misguided misfits who are endangering our concept of law and order in this Nation."

Fourth. A protest by a high school librarian in Nicholas County of the "smirching of our schools with dope raids, long-haired, rude, and untidy students, moral problems, and the like," resulting from the presence of anti-poverty workers, who sought the forced resignation of duly appointed school authorities.

Fifth. A report by a grocery store manager of VISTA workers headquartered in Mingo County, driving a Government car, exhibiting rude and intimidating manners in his place of business.

Sixth. A request from a postmaster that an effort be made to "get these people—VISTA workers—out of here," since "they are telling the people here that they are not getting what is due them."

Seventh. A report by the chief of police of Huntington concerning attempts to "set up black power movement meetings" by individuals believed to be OEO employees from New York City and Norman, Okla. If OEO, they may or may not be VISTA workers; OEO has not reported the facts.

Eighth. Reports by an outstanding lawyer regarding slovenly, unclean VISTA employees inciting political disorder and stirring up dissatisfaction against "the taxpayers of this country" who are paying the bill and "have a right to expect better treatment."

Ninth. A sampling of letters from interested citizens, who will be identified by their initials.

In summary, the picture of VISTA in West Virginia is one of certain individuals who have come to our State from other parts of the country, some of whom are carelessly dressed and look worse than even the poorest of our people, and who have sometimes served to create and foment unrest, dissatisfaction, and trouble. If VISTA is to continue, its image and its programs would be far better served if these workers were, in the words of the Governor, oriented in the common courtesies; inspired to set a truly good example for the people they serve in grooming, manners, dress, and demeanor; and circumspect to the point of extreme prudence in their personal appearance, conduct, and attitudes.

I have had excellent reports on the adult basic education program, and the Headstart program, both of which are other components of the community ac-

[2] *Charleston Gazette*, p. 3, August 23, 1967.

tion phase of the legislation before us. The basic criticism I have heard regarding Headstart is that it should be under the jurisdiction of local school systems rather than under community action direction.

As the adult education effort has been conducted in my State and elsewhere it seems to have fortified and strengthened existing adult education programs and contributed to improving the lot of the undereducated.

More than 10,000 persons have been involved in this program in my State in the past 3 years, and our State department of education reports that the overall average of public education in the State will be increased by as much as two full grade levels as a result of the program.

For example, I have been advised by Mr. James Basil Deck, State supervisor of the adult basic education program for the West Virginia Department of Education, that 4,800 individuals have moved off the welfare rolls during the past 2 years, these individuals having gone through the adult basic education class. Many have just learned to read and write and have upgraded educational skills and have been able to move out and get jobs. Mr. Deck advised me that there are 6,071 AFDCUP participants in the adult basic education classes this year; 846 are in high school equivalency classes; and 451 are in vocational classes, making a total of 7,368.

I am informed that there were over 16,000 students in classes during the past year and that it is expected to be about the same number this year. Mr. Deck stated that many of these individuals take the general adult development tests for high school equivalency. Moreover, he stated that 25 students in classes have enrolled in college this year. So, from the reports I have received, an excellent job is being done in the adult education effort in West Virginia, an effort which improves basic education skills or upgrades skills to prepare for jobs. This is the kind of program that I wholeheartedly support.

I have had some equally good reports concerning the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which OEO farms out to the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, I voted for the original economic opportunity legislation. The eradication of poverty where it is real and where the objective can be accomplished effectively is a worthwhile goal of which I approve and for the achievement of which I supported the original Economic Opportunity Act. I do feel, however, that the war on poverty needs a full-scale, in-depth inquiry and investigation. I am fully cognizant of the work which Senator CLARK's subcommittee has so ably performed in conducting hearings on this bill, and I would say nothing in derogation of this work. But I do not believe that this is sufficient. It is my opinion that a thorough and comprehensive reappraisal of the war on poverty is needed, and I think that the kind of scrutiny required can only be provided by competent and trained persons skilled in investigative and auditing techniques.

I feel strongly that many of the community action programs have not been properly administered, properly directed, properly supervised, or properly audited. I also believe that if such an in-depth study of these programs were to be conducted, many disturbing, and even shocking, facts would be brought to light with regard to how these programs have been mismanaged, with a concomitant wasteful expenditure of Federal funds. Moreover, I am convinced in my own mind that some of the poverty workers have been utilized by misguided persons and even out-and-out revolutionaries, who have sought to achieve ends that have little or nothing to do with the stamping out of poverty. I am deeply disturbed at the many indications that some programs have been utilized to foment social protest, civil rights disturbances, and anti-Vietnam war demonstrations.

I was happy to support the amendment offered by Senator PROUTY on Friday, which would order the General Accounting Office to investigate the Office of Economic Opportunity and its local agencies in the war on poverty. I believe that this type of investigation by the GAO will help to determine the real efficiency of the administration of OEO programs and the extent to which such programs achieve the objectives as intended by Congress. I have a feeling that some of the shortcomings of the antipoverty programs in the District of Columbia may be indicative of what is taking place throughout many areas of the country.

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, of which I am chairman, has information of interest in this regard.

The subcommittee has received information that indicates a grave weakness in the financial management of records and expenses maintained by one of the programs in the District of Columbia. In 1 month the organization responsible to the Washington Welfare Association claimed expenditures for positions which were vacant during that period. Expenditures for group health insurance premiums had also been overstated; bills for merchandise purchased by a former employee after his dismissal in the previous year had also been claimed as an expense reimbursable by the United Planning Organization.

As a further illustration of lack of adequate financial control and laxity in the management of the program there existed in one instance unsupported billings from a local store which had been paid and claimed as an expense, an excessive retroactive salary payment had been made to an employee, expenditures were repeatedly charged to incorrect program components, personnel costs have been overstated by 1 day for all employed positions of another development program, and in several instances commitments incurred during the prior contract period had been paid from current contract funds.

Other reported deficiencies showed reimbursement twice to the activity for expenses that had been incurred during a period in calendar year 1966. Another instance of questionable practice concerned the accountant-office manager and her assistant, in that each received, in addition to her regular salary, one half of the funds available for a part-time accountant position in another activity of the area.

The reported deficiencies also revealed that inventory records for equipment furnished the area have not been maintained as required by agreements with the United Planning Organization.

With further regard to the additional payments to the accountant-office manager and clerk-typist, the two employees receive monthly salaries of $667 and $401 respectively, and each person was reportedly receiving an additional $162 per month for performing the duties of the part-time workers in another development program. Justification of the additional payment to the two individuals related to the fact that each worked 10 hours per week in addition to her regular full-time working hours, and officials recognized the practice was not desirable but said they were not able to find the qualified neighborhood residents to fill the positions.

Another questionable practice concerns the use of poverty funds to pay certain administrative expenses of the credit union in the area rather than using the proceeds of credit union operations to pay those expenses, as is customary. There are over 1,200 members with share accounts totaling over $86,000. It is reported that without the aid of poverty funds, the credit union would be facing financial difficulty. For example, in February 1967, it cost more than $2,000 to make loans of $6,802. Moreover, dividends which are now paid regularly could not be continued if earnings from less than $100,000 of capital were required to pay expenses at the rate of $22,509 for 10 months. Loan delinquencies of the union are said to have been increasing over the period of its operations. For example, on March 31, 1967, delinquent loans totaled $8,612, 11.2 percent of loans outstanding of $76,824, whereas on December 31, 1964, delinquent loans were only 3.9 percent of loans outstanding.

Another reported irregularity related to the child day care and Headstart programs. It was reported that the Office of Economic Opportunity income guidelines were not adhered to. A legal requirement of the 1964 act is that not more than 10 percent of families with children receiving day care who are enrolled in Headstart may have incomes higher than levels to be set under the act by OEO. It was found in this area that the act was not observed in some cases. At one day care program in the area, 16 of the 90 children were from overincome families. It was noted that only eight of the 16 children whose incomes exceeded the OEO guidelines were charged a fee as required by the act.

Of the 30 children enrolled in two Headstart classes in the area in September 1966, it was found that six of the children's families had incomes at the time of enrollment which exceeded eligibility guidelines.

Mr. President, I shall probably have more to say, at a future date, about poverty programs in the District of Colum-

bia area to which I have referred. I have merely alluded to the situation in that particular area of the District of Columbia at this time for the purpose of indicating the need, in my opinion, for a thorough investigation of the poverty program in urban communities and elsewhere.

Mr. President, I have discussed certain aspects of the war on poverty as we have seen it operate since its beginning. I call attention to the fact that the authorization in title I is in excess of the administration bill in the amount of $198 million for fiscal year 1968.

However, the Senate is confronted, in the massive bill before us, with a radically new proposal to spend another $2.5 billion in grants, and $300 million in loans on a crash program which is estimated to create 500,000 new jobs.

Although I respect the sincerity of the distinguished Senator whose name is associated with it, I believe his multi-billion-dollar proposal is the wrong program and comes at the wrong time.

In its haste, the proposal attacks the wrong horn of the manpower dilemma faced by the country.

There is no shortage of jobs in the United States today. The total work force, as of July 1967, was 82.9 million. The number of unemployed persons was 3.2 million, or 4.1 percent. I think it is important to note that the term "unemployed" as used here can be misleading. For example, persons are considered unemployed who, for an entire week, did not work at all, were able to work and available for work and would have looked for work except that: First, they were waiting to return to a job from which they were laid off, or second, waiting to report to a new wage or salary job scheduled to start within the following 30 days—and were not in school during the week, or third, believed no work to be available in their line of work or in the community. Moreover, persons under AFDCUP and working in work experience programs are primarily counted as unemployed.

Agricultural workers and construction workers are counted among the unemployed if they have registered as seeking employment. Others unemployed and not seeking work cannot be counted.

Thousands on thousands of good high-paying jobs are going begging every day in every city in every State simply because there are not enough trained or qualified people to fill them and, in some instances, because there are people who do not want to work.

I am advised that, at the end of July, there were, for example, over 343,000 unfilled job openings listed at over 2,000 State public employment offices across the country. These job openings were in 150 major employment areas.

Now, why do we not concentrate on filling those job openings, before we create another half million?

In fact, the 343,000 job openings tell us only part of the job vacancy story.

The total figure on job vacancies—listed and unlisted—is probably closer to the million mark, because information is not available as to the number of job openings nationwide. But this is only part of the story. In many areas of the country, Federal job training openings are going begging as well. In fact, as of last July 31, there were nearly 50,000 MDTA unfilled openings in these programs in the Nation's 48 largest cities.

Is the Congress seriously supposed to authorize the creation of half a million new jobs when one million jobs have no takers and 50,000 training opportunities are being ignored?

The second major defect in the proposal is that it would certainly result in a number of cities quickly creating jobs—jobs they do not need, jobs they do not want, but jobs which will be produced simply because Uncle Sam is footing the bill with hundreds of millions in ready cash.

The kinds of jobs cities will create, for the most part, will be psuedo-jobs. They will be makework jobs, shadow jobs, deadend jobs. They will be manual or unskilled jobs which require little, if any, training. They will be underskilled jobs with no future, with no possible development, with no real base upon which a human being may build a career.

Such jobs will have the effect of further isolating the poor person from society. He will not only be poor; he will also have a poor man's job. This is exactly the kind of situation which we should all be trying to reverse today. We should try to break the cycle of poverty, not freeze poverty into job categories.

The 1967 Manpower Report of the President stated clearly the kinds of jobs our economy must fill if it is to continue the seven unprecedented years of prosperity the country has enjoyed.

The Manpower Report stated:

> At the end of 1966, the most widespread shortages existed for industrial production workers . . . machinists, machine operators, tool makers, aircraft mechanics, model and pattern makers, assemblers, electricians and welders, and for engineers, draftsmen, mathematicians and health service workers.

I do not care how crashing a crash program is, or how many billions may be poured into it; it is not possible to create skilled, trained, and qualified workers for such jobs overnight. No amount of money will turn an undereducated, unskilled, unmotivated ghetto dweller into a skilled employee by providing him with a 1- or 2-year leaf-raking assignment.

You must train and prepare those who will man and guide the American economic system of tomorrow.

And that leads me to the third major defect in the emergency proposal.

What 3 million unemployed in our country need today is not just a job—but a job with a bright future.

The unemployed need education for a job. They need to be taught how to hold a job; how to perform under varying job conditions; how to shift to a new and perhaps more promising occupation when new opportunity arises.

And if we look at the record of the Congress and the administration these last few years, we will find that there already exists a comprehensive series of opportunity programs which, if they are properly administered, can serve as blueprints for the social and economic rehabilitation of millions of poor people.

The administration's opportunity programs are basically geared and intended to raise people to the level where they can become productive Americans, rather than dependent Americans.

The Manpower Development and Training Act, for example, is a good illustration of the kind of program which invests in human beings by training or retraining people for better jobs. Since it was inaugurated, almost one million men and women have received job training with Federal help. In the past the MDTA program has focused more and more on the disadvantaged, with positive and fruitful results.

This is the type of program we should be improving, rather than setting up parallel or conflicting programs.

Let us not launch new programs until we have corrected the flaws in the old ones, and as I have already stated, there is much work to be done in correcting the existing programs.

My fourth major objection to title II of the bill is that it is clearly inflationary—and that is another thing we do not need in our present state of economic affairs.

Almost $3 billion poured into 500,000 jobs of very slight productivity is either going to give us a solid dose of new inflation or force the President and the Congress to raise taxes even higher than now proposed.

The total national debt at the end of fiscal year 1967 was $326 billion. According to the testimony of the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury before the House Ways and Means Committee, the anticipated deficit for fiscal year 1968 may go as high as $29 billion. I do not believe that it is wise to compound this dangerous deficit with an additional $1.3 billion required, by title II of the bill before us, for fiscal year 1968. This is in excess of the administration's request, and if it stays in the bill, the bill will never reach the President's desk for his signature, considering the temper of the other body.

At a time when the President is requesting the enactment of legislation providing for a surtax on personal and corporation incomes, it would be a serious mistake to launch this new and costly program.

My fifth objection to title II is that it is extraordinarily vague, ambiguous, and unclear. Such a new and costly program as would be envisioned by title II should have the most thorough study and should involve the most careful and detailed analysis before enactment. Exhaustive hearings would be required. Even if we were living in a time when such a crash emergency program were needed, in my judgment, the concepts and outlines of such a program would have to be much more concrete, more carefully evaluated, studied, and delineated than is the case here.

As Senators DOMINICK and FANNIN stated in their supplemental views on the bill:

> Title II was reported to the Floor without hearings.

Senator MURPHY, in his supplemental views stated, with regard to title II:

> Here again we seem to be faced with a lack of planning, a lack of definition, a lack of

guidelines, and an absence of complete preparation. In good conscience, I cannot agree to spending $2.8 billion of taxpayers' dollars on such a program.

Senator GRIFFIN, in his supplemental views, referred to title II as "an unfortunate example of hasty, unsound congressional reaction to the riots." He said:

It is as extravagant in its promise as it is vague in its operation. The committee has had no real opportunity to consider the proposal in depth. The record contains no statement of the administration's views regarding the merits of the program, its effect on the poverty war or on the budget. How such a program would relate to ongoing job creation and training programs has not been explored. . . . Instead of holding hearings, the subcommittee released a booklet entitled "Emergency Employment Act—Background Materials." The booklet is supposed to establish the need for title II. In fact, however, the material also emphasizes that superficial, short-term make-work programs do not solve long-term unemployment problems, and that efforts should be directed toward training and education. As written, the title would constitute a virtual abdication of congressional responsibility; it would delegate almost unlimited authority and discretion to the Secretary of Labor.

Finally, there are some real basic philosophical questions we have got to ask ourselves about such a program as would be inaugurated by title II. Is the country ready to give a permanent job to anyone who cannot or will not find work elsewhere?

Once we get people into a program such as this, how do we get them out into productive employment?

Will we ever get them out?

Would we not create a new public welfare bureaucracy?

We will be paying people, essentially for doing nothing productive. They will become an added, and possibly, permanent public burden.

Title II would authorize an expenditure of $1 billion in grants in fiscal year 1968 and $1.5 billion in fiscal year 1969. If past experience is worth anything, every Senator knows that these programs mushroom like the prophet's gourd overnight. Two years hence we could expect the Congress to be asked for an expanded program—one which would perhaps double that which is envisioned in title II. If this country were in the midst of a depression, a crash program of this kind might be justified. One thing is abundantly clear. The sense of the Congress and the Nation today is that this program is not necessary and not wise.

I urge the Senate to take action to delete this title from the bill.

Mr. President, I have not addressed my remarks to the pending Prouty amendment; but if the Prouty amendment is agreed to, then the motion which I have offered, the effect of which would be to delete title II, would be out of the question, because the question would then recur on my motion as amended by Senator PROUTY's substitute. My motion would no longer be amendable.

Therefore, I hope Senators will support me in voting against the Prouty amendment and against all other amendments to my motion, so that we can have a final, clear-cut vote on my motion to recommit with instructions to delete title II in its entirety.

EXHIBIT A

[From U.S. News & World Report]

IS UNITED STATES REALLY FILLED WITH POVERTY?—A LOOK AT THE FACTS

(NOTE.—How many Americans are really in poverty? Thirty million? Eighty million? Or only a handful? This article, written for "U.S. News & World Report," is based on a study of poverty—and of the "poverty cult" that has developed in this era.)

(By John B. Parrish, professor of economics, University of Illinois)

When future historians write the history of the 1960s, there will be no more extraordinary episode in their accounts than the rise of America's "new poverty" cult. Intellectuals from every social-science discipline, every religious denomination, every political and social institution have climbed aboard the poverty bandwagon.

This article is concerned with a few fundamental questions: How did the new cult get started? What are its claims? Does the economic evidence support the claims? Are we moving toward a new and better social order or toward social chaos?

After a decade of exploring every nook and cranny of the poverty world, the "new poverty" cult has settled on a few basic doctrines which together form a dogma that apparently must be accepted on faith. These claims may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The economic process, which in earlier years brought affluence to a majority of Americans, recently has slowed up and apparently stopped. As a result, a large minority of Americans are "hopelessly" trapped below the poverty line.

2. The size of this poverty population is "massive," and may be increasing. Minimum estimates place the number at 30 million, maximum at nearly 80 million.

3. Despite its great size, the poverty population is hidden away—"invisible," unknown, unwanted, unaided, helpless.

4. The hard core of the "other America" is the Negro. Because of racial discrimination, he has been unable to participate in economic progress. He is frustrated, embittered, forced to live outside the affluent society of the majority.

5. The "new poverty" can only be eradicated by massive, federal social-action programs involving income maintenance, self-help, education and training, in a milieu of racial integration, the latter voluntary if possible, compulsory if necessary.

Does the evidence on diffusion of economic well-being support the "new poverty" cult? Has diffusion mysteriously slowed to a halt, leaving millions "hopelessly trapped"? Are 30 to 80 million suffering acute deprivation in today's America? The plain truth is there is no basis in fact for the "new poverty" thesis. The high priests of the poverty religion have been exchanging each other's misformation. Let's look briefly at some illustrative evidence.

Diet. The diet of U.S. families has continued to improve steadily over time until today at least 95 per cent, perhaps 96 per cent or 97 per cent of all families have an adequate minimum daily intake of nutrients.

Automatic cooking equipment. Are 20 per cent, perhaps 40 per cent of U.S. families without decent equipment with which to prepare this food intake? No. As a matter of fact, 99 per cent of all U.S. households have automatic cooking equipment, including most of those families living in rural and urban "ghettos." The diffusion has been consistent and persistent over the last six decades.

Refrigeration. Could it be that millions of American families are experiencing dull and dreary meals because they have no way to preserve foods and beverages against spoilage? No. About 99 per cent of all U.S. families have purchased electric or gas refrigerators. It is reasonable to assume that they know how to operate them, even in the "ghettos."

Communication. Are millions of America's poor shut off from all contact with the rest of their affluent countrymen—alone, frustrated, in that "other world" of poverty isolation? At last count, the diffusion of TV sets had reached 92 per cent of all U.S. households, providing instant access to entertainment, news, sports, cultural enrichment. Since a small per cent of middle, and upper-income families who can afford TV have chosen not to buy, the per cent of families having TV who want it must be around 96 or 97 per cent—a diffusion achieved in just 15 years.

Medical aid. Have the "new hopeless poor" found the doors to modern medical service "slammed shut," forcing them to rely on quack remedies, superstition, midwives, or to die alone and unattended?

In 1910, only one of every 10 American families had access to hospitals for childbirth. The diffusion since then has been spectacular and persistent for all groups, including nonwhites. By 1960, over 97 per cent of all American women had their babies born in hospitals. Today it is somewhere between 98 per cent and 99 per cent.

The luxury of telephone service. Telephone service is ordinarily not a rock-bottom consumer necessity. It is useful and convenient but not an absolute requirement, as was demonstrated during the Great Depression of the 1930s when the percent of families with telephones declined.

Yet today nearly 90 per cent of all U.S. households have telephones. Since there are still a few pockets of unavailability, it is reasonable to conclude that close to 95 per cent of all U.S. households in availability areas who would like this luxury actually enjoy it.

Some clues to how much poverty in United States

Percentage of families having—	*1920*	*1965*
Minimum adequate diet, or better	50	95
Electric or gas stoves	28	99
Electric refrigerators	1	99
Television sets	0	92
Telephones in home	35	[1] 88
Children born in hospitals	20	98

[1] In metropolitan areas.

Source: Study by Prof. John B. Parrish, University of Illinois.

THREE POVERTY FALLACIES

The foregoing illustrative evidence raises an interesting question: *How can the "massive" group of America's "hopeless poor" buy so much with so little?* Perhaps this basic question can be put another way: How could the poverty intellectuals be so wrong? The answer is actually very simple. The intellectuals have chosen to be wrong. Most members of the "new poverty" cult are quite well-trained in statistics. Some are acknowledged experts. They know better. But, for the sake of the "new poverty" religion, they have chosen to accept three poverty fallacies.

The "new poverty" cult has built much of its case on family-income statistics. Some technical matters aside, there is nothing wrong with these statistics, per se. But there is something wrong, very much wrong, with their use. It is impossible for anyone adequately to interpret them in terms of average family economic well-being.

Poverty fallacy No. 1 got its big push from the 1964 report on "The Problem of Poverty in America" by the Council of Economic Advisers. CEA determined that households with less than $3,000 annual income were in poverty. Using this income yardstick, it was de-

termined that 20 per cent of U.S. households containing 30 million persons were in the poverty class.

This report provided a wonderful takeoff point for poverty statisticians. With 30 million to build on, it was not difficult to find millions of additional families who should be added to the poverty population. The poverty numbers game became quite exciting. Who could count the most? Honors so far have gone to those claiming nearly 80 million. A majority of cult members have settled for a more modest 40 to 50 million.

The truth about poverty-income statistics is this: Under no reasonable assumptions does income below $3,000 indicate poverty status. It may or may not, and to say otherwise is not only erroneous but absurd.

Let's take as an example a young married couple, the Smiths. They are attending college. They constitute a statistical household. Their annual income is $1,500 a year. They are not being "hopelessly" shut out from the good things of life. They are, along with other American youth enjoying a rate of access to higher education greater than the youth of any country, any time, any place. They enjoy electric lighting, refrigeration, adequate if not fancy food, and a second-hand automobile or motorcycle. They would like a new Cadillac, but will manage without one. They aren't "poor" and need no crocodile tears shed in their behalf.

At the other end of the life cycle are the Joneses. Mr. Jones has been a machinist all his life. He and Mrs. Jones had always wanted to visit the country's great national parks after the children had grown up and left. So he has opted to retire at age 60. The retirement income will come to only $2,000 a year. Are they poor? The poverty cult says, "Yes," these people are suffering from deprivation. They have been "hopelessly" cast aside. Yet the truth is they have a small home paid for, a modest automobile paid for. They enjoy refrigeration, automatic cooking equipment, inside plumbing, TV, enough clothes to last for years—the accumulation of a lifetime. And now they propose to enjoy more leisure, in more comfort, for more years than similar working-class families of any country, any time. The Joneses think the Council of Economic Advisers is statistically wacky.

And take the Browns. They are in the middle years. Both Mr. and Mrs. Brown work. Their three children are in school. They have a modest new home, partially paid for, some savings, some insurance, good clothes—yes, and a paid-for refrigerator and TV set. They have a new car and six installments still outstanding. Mr. Brown becomes ill. Mrs. Brown quits work to take care of him. Their income drops to below $3,000 for the year. Are they in trouble? Yes. Are they in desperate consumer poverty? Are they "hopelessly trapped?" By no means. After a tough year they will resume as members of the affluent society even by CEA's definition.

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: "CUMULATIVE"

These illustrations could be multiplied many times. Cross-section household-income statistics are a very inappropriate yardstick with which to measure economic well-being, which is a longitudinal and cumulative process.

Let's return for a moment to the telephone as a luxury—or at least a semiluxury—consumer good. Now take the desperately poor on whom the doors of affluency have presumably been "slammed shut." Now take the "poorest of the poor"—those at the very rock bottom of the income scale, those desperately deprived households earning less than $500 a year. You just can't get much poorer than that.

Now observe that nearly 60 per cent of these poorest of the poor had telephone service in 1965. How could this be? Why would families presumably facing the grim miseries of malnutrition order telephone service? And, if we make allowance for the availability factor and the "can afford but don't want" factor, then it is reasonable to conclude that 70 to 80 per cent of America's poorest poor had telephones in 1965.

If this is the "new poverty," it is apparently not too severe. How to explain this paradox of income poverty, consumer-goods affluence? The answer is quite simple. Income data are a very bad measure of economic well-being. The Smiths, the Joneses, the Browns, all had telephone service even though the CEA's income statistics put them in the "poverty class."

There is a second big fallacy in the "new poverty" claims, and in some respects an inexcusable one. The poverty cult measures the economic well-being of families at all income levels by determining what they can buy with their income at current retail prices. In fact, the poverty cult makes much out of the fact that because of the greed of retail merchants and the gullibility and lack of buying savvy on the part of many poor buyers, the "new poor" actually pay more for the same goods than the affluent classes. This is hogwash.

The truth is, America's low-income classes have access to a low-price consumer-goods market in which prices are a fraction of published retail prices, and in which the purchasing power of "poor" dollars is multiplied many times. This discount market yields levels of consumption far above that indicated by retail prices.

As the poor could explain to CEA and the poverty intellectuals, this market is America's enormously big resale market—the world's largest. Every year, from 25 to 65 per cent of many consumer durable-goods purchases involve second or third-hand goods moving in established trade or in informal, person-to-person channels.

Take as an example a popular consumer durable good, the electric refrigerator. In 1923, this appliance was a new item. In current dollars, it cost around $900. Its capacity was small, averaging less than 6 cubic feet. It averaged only six years of service life, or about $150 a year. There were too few produced, and service was too short for a resale market. Only the rich could afford a refrigerator.

Today a good new refrigerator can be purchased for about $300. Its capacity will average about 10 cubic feet. Service life will be around 18 years. The average replacement year currently is around 10. So the first buyer pays about $30 a year, minus trade-in. Resale value will be about $50. This will permit the second buyer to purchase eight years of the same quality of refrigeration for about $6 a year. The low-income buyer, not particular about the latest style, has expanded his purchasing power 500 per cent over that of the first high-income buyer.

Today's low-income, "new poverty" buyer has purchasing power 25 times greater than that of the rich buyer of 1923. America's consumer durable-goods market is operating under a law of accelerating diffusion. America's low-income families are not being shut out. They are being pulled into affluence at an ever-increasing rate.

There is a big, hidden, tertiary consumer-goods market not measured even by retail or resale price statistics. This is the intergeneration movement of goods accumulated over time and handed down or distributed from one generation to another. In an affluent society this becomes a very large market. Sewing machines, automobiles, electric irons, kitchenware, furniture, silverware, dinnerware, bicycles, etc.—all these provide an enormous source of consumption for all income classes, including the poor.

GROWTH OF NO-COST GOODS, SERVICES

If ignoring the durable-goods resale market is inexcusable, the failure of the poverty cult to take account of the rapid growth in low-cost or no-cost goods and services in America is well-nigh incredible. It is incredible because much of it has been brought about by the very federal agencies whose economists have been among the high priests of the poverty cult. This failure constitutes poverty fallacy No. 3.

To illustrate: Nearly 90 per cent of all Negro births today are in hospitals. Yet the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor in 1964 said half the Negroes in America were suffering from acute poverty, measured by income statistics. How can so many poor afford so much medical service? For two reasons: First, as already noted, the income data are faulty. But more to the point here, almost every urban community has free or very low-cost medical services for low-income families. In fact, surveys show that in some communities the lowest-income families have more medical checkups, vaccinations, chest X rays, eye examinations than some higher-income groups.

The number of low-cost food programs has been growing rapidly. For example, the national school-lunch program provided low-cost noon meals for nearly 20 million children in 1967. The food-stamp plan provided low-cost food for 1 million persons in 1966, and was scheduled to rise to 2 million in 1967. The low-cost milk plan—along with school lunch—accounted for 5 per cent of total U.S. nonfarm fluid-milk consumption in 1966, and would have expanded even more in 1967 had not cutbacks been ordered because of Vietnam.

The total number of low-income persons reached by various food-subsidy programs came to nearly 30 million in 1966, or precisely the number of persons classified as poor in 1964 by the Council of Economic Advisers. Since many of CEA's 30 million didn't belong in the poverty classification in the first place, some questions may well be raised as to who and how many poor have been "forgotten."

If the evidence suggests the "new poverty" intellectuals have grossly exaggerated the extent of poverty in America, can we now sit back comfortably and forget the poverty claims? Unfortunately, we cannot.

SOME DISTURBING TRENDS

There are some very disturbing social trends which have accompanied the spread of affluency. Even more disturbing is the possibility that the federal antipoverty programs may be causally as well as associationally related to these developments. We may be headed not toward a great new society, but toward social chaos. Let's look briefly at six problem areas, all of them interrelated:

1. The various federal-State income-maintenance programs seem to have generated an explosion of illegitimacy in America that will have far-reaching consequences for the future. The illegitimacy rate has doubled in the last few years, until today 1 out of 12 Americans is born illegitimate. At recent rates of growth, every tenth American by the early 1970's will be born out of wedlock.

2. Related to illegitimacy is the long-run growth in households managed only by females, a large proportion subsidized by various federal-State aid programs. Today in America, 1 out of 10 households is fatherless. There is every reason to expect this to rise in the future. Among Negro families the percentage is already 1 out of 4.

3. A particularly disconcerting development over and above trends for the whole population is the upsurge in the number and proportion of unwanted and unguided Negro youth. Today 1 out of 4 Negroes is born illegitimate. In some sections of large urban areas the percentage is very much higher. If the trends of 1950–64 continue, then by 1975 about one third of all Negro youth born in the U.S. will be born outside normal family-life patterns. They will be arriving

at the teen ages not suffering from malnutrition or abject consumer-goods poverty, but from acute social and intellectual poverty. The future consequences for the rest of the urban populations, both white and nonwhite, will be considerable.

4. Related to but not solely derived from problems 1 to 3 is the rise of juvenile delinquency. The rate has doubled in the last decade. How long can society tolerate such a rate of growth? At least in part, the steady climb of delinquency may be due not to poverty, but to an affluent society—more leisure, more spending money, fewer responsibilities, less motivation, failure of rehabilitative programs.

5. The diffusion of affluency has been accompanied not only by rising juvenile delinquency but by a rising rate of general crime. The rate rose by one third, 1960 to 1964. The law-abiding segment of the population has an ever-increasing struggle to avoid the depredations of criminals, the latter experiencing not acute deprivation but the encouragement of easy and profitable pickings of the affluent state.

6. Perhaps no problem illustrates so well the failure of the poverty intellectuals than the upward drift of youth unemployment. Very strenuous and dedicated efforts have been made by the U.S. Congress to do something about youth unemployment. A great diversity of programs has been attempted. Recent conditions of tight, full employment have provided a favorable labor market. Yet the "new poverty" intellectuals have only failure to show for their efforts. Youth unemployment has not retreated. For nearly 20 years it has shown a rise—slight for white youth, sharply upward for nonwhite youth.

Could it be the "new poverty" cult has been fighting the wrong war? Measured by consumer-goods yardsticks, less than 5 per cent of U.S. households are below the poverty line, and the percentage continues to decline.

There is a war to be fought, however. There are disturbing signs of deep social problems around us, and more on the horizon. The most rapidly growing segment of the American population is the illegitimate segment. The largest proportion of this "other America" is Negro.

Who is to discipline, guide, train this growing army of unwanted, unmotivated? The ordinary family influences, so strong among earlier ethnic groups immigrating to U. S. cities, appears to be lacking. In fact, such influences appear to be declining and may well be disintegrating.

The churches, historically an important institution in shaping constructive life patterns, appear to have limited and perhaps declining influence.

The "new social problem" is being dumped onto the public schools and the police. But schools cannot discipline—and without discipline they cannot educate.

The police can discipline—but they cannot educate and motivate. Racial-integration efforts have created new antagonisms to add to the problems of the already overburdened schools and police.

PHONY STATISTICS: HARDLY CONVINCING

The poverty intellectuals say they are building a great new society. Perhaps they are. But phony statistics are hardly convincing proof. Perhaps they should take a second look. They may well be rushing us pell-mell toward social chaos. The dogmas of the poverty cult may not prove as effective as expected.

Efforts to force racial integration may bring about as many disruptive as constructive influences. We may well need some new institutions designed for the problems of an affluent society of the present, not the poverty society of the past.

If this conclusion is even partially correct, then we should be about the task before it is too late. It may be already too late.

EXHIBIT B

IT'S TIME FOR A CHANGE IN NORTHSIDE!!

Are you tired of being stepped on?

Are you satisfied with the prevailing conditions in *Northside?*

Community action can help you!!

Come to the Community action meeting.

Date: Tuesday July 18, 1967.

Time: 7:30 P.M.

Place: Presbyterian Church—North Mercer Street.

PROPOSED AGENDA

Election of officers.

Committee reports.

Recreation center.

Representatives to the Board of Directors.

Fund Raising Projects.

Freedom School . . . and anything else that's on your mind . . .

"United We Stand Divided We Fall."

EXHIBIT C

MORE MONEY—NOW!

All across the nation, more and more welfare recipients are now getting more money for their living needs because they are now members of the welfare/rights movement.

How are you doing? Are you getting more? You can get legal help and a voice that counts in getting more welfare money.

Find out! Write, phone, or come in and see us, at your local Welfare Rights Office.

GOALS FOR A NATIONAL WELFARE RIGHTS MOVEMENT

OUR RIGHTS ARE NOT FOR SALE

We are not willing to sell our rights as *American citizens:* Our rights to *dignity,* our rights to *justice,* our rights to *democracy*—for the food, clothing, and shelter which our *age,* our *disability,* the *absence or death of our family's breadwinner,* our *lack of economic opportunity,* our *society*—have made us unable to provide.

Based on Report of Workshop No. 2, Goals for a National Welfare Rights Movement, First National Welfare Rights Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, August 6 and 7, 1966.

Our goal is: Jobs or income *now!* Decent jobs with adequate wages for those who can work, adequate income for those who cannot work.

Our goals are:

1. Adequate income: A system which guarantees enough money for all Americans to live dignified lives above the level of poverty.

2. Dignity: A system which guarantees recipients the same full freedoms, rights and respect as all American citizens.

3. Justice: A fair and open system which guarantees recipients the full protections of the Constitution.

4. Democracy: A system which guarantees recipients direct participation in the decisions under which they must live.

IMMEDIATE GOALS

Stopping the *illegal* practices of welfare departments:

Midnight raids

Other searches and seizures without search warrants

Giving recipients smaller grants than the law says they should be getting

Not giving recipients "special grants" for heavy clothing, household furnishings, etc., which the law says they should get

Illegally cutting people off welfare

Threatening, scaring, or intimidating recipients

Discriminating against families with illegitimate children

Discriminating against large families

Racial discrimination

Forcing recipients to "accept" other "social services" in order to keep their welfare grants

Not informing recipients of their rights of appeal

Making friends or non-legally responsible relatives pay child support

Forcing mothers with young children to take jobs

Forcing recipients to live in segregated or substandard housing

Illegally rejecting applicants for welfare

Recognition of welfare recipient organizations as representatives of welfare recipients . . . including the rights to pass out information at welfare centers and to be with recipients at interviews and fair hearings.

Full budgets and grants based on *current* cost-of-living . . . in many states grants are based on costs-of-living during the 1950's.

Full budgets and grants for all welfare recipients . . . in many states, recipients receive only a percentage of the state's own grant standards for minimum health and decency.

Getting made *public* . . . to welfare recipients, their organizations, and anyone who want to know. . . .

All the rules, regulations, and policies of welfare departments . . . in many places, although they are "public documents" such information is purposefully kept from welfare recipients and their organizations.

Fair hearings, immediately, with free lawyers, for recipients who believe they have been treated illegally or unfairly by welfare departments . . . most communities do not follow the federal regulations for fair hearings.

Direct representation of welfare recipients' organizations on all welfare policy-making and advisory boards.

Clearer and simplified welfare regulations, policies, and procedures.

OTHER PRESSING GOALS

National (Federal) grant minimums set at or above the Federal poverty line.

Ending "categories" for assistance (such as OAA, AFDC, home relief).

Having only one category for assistance—*need.*

Welfare grants for all people who have incomes below grant levels—including people who are employed.

Property maximums for welfare eligibility set at equal to one year's income at the Federal poverty line.

Getting rid of "man in the house" and "suitable home" regulations and laws, except as they apply to the *whole* public.

Court-ordered child support payments for welfare children paid directly to welfare departments, with welfare families getting full, regular grants.

Application for welfare by affidavit (sworn statement that the person applying is eligible) with *immediate* grants unless or until the person is proved ineligible.

An end to all residency requirements.

Enough money for food, rather than food stamps.

More Federal money for welfare.

Minimum standards for clothing and household furnishings.

Clerical and sub-professional jobs in welfare departments for recipients who are able to and wish to work.

Federal money for "home relief" programs.

Getting rid of "special investigation units" in welfare departments.

Ending "relative responsibility" except for parent-for-child.

Allowing all recipients to earn some money without deducting it from their welfare grants.

Ending all liens by welfare departments on welfare recipients' property.

Making all banks cash welfare checks.

Providing child care for welfare mothers who are able to and wish to work.

Providing real job training and actual jobs for recipients who are able to and wish to work.

Emergency public assistance . . . available 24 hours a day.

Dividing public welfare into two completely separate parts:

(1) One agency handling only welfare grants (income assistance . . . a clerical rather than social-work agency).

(2) Another handling all other social services . . . a social work agency handling counseling, guidance, training, etc.

[From Now! national welfare leaders newsletter, vol. 1, No. 11]

CONGRESS READIES ANTI-WELFARE LAWS—DEMONSTRATION CALLED FOR NATION'S CAPITOL AUGUST 28

WELFARE RIGHTS NEWS

Cleveland welfare rights movement wins furniture

The basic needs campaign in Cleveland has succeeded in getting the Welfare Department to tell workers to meet all basic needs requests for beds, mattresses-blankets, tables, and chairs, stoves, refrigerators and washing machines.

The Welfare Department also admitted that they had not been "uniform" in meeting requests for these basic needs. The fight to prevent the closing of the Hough office (in the ghetto) continues.

We've got rights!

An excellent summary of the growing legal attack on the welfare system is to be found in Richard A. Cloward's and Frances Fox Piven's latest article in the *New Republic's* August 5, 1967 issue. Reprints are available from the Poverty/Rights Action Center for 25¢—all four Cloward/Piven articles for $1.00

Four locals now in Utica

The Utica (New York) Welfare Rights Movement now has 4 chapters. Mrs. Annie Mae Goodson is Coordinating Chairman. Mrs. Goodson, Mrs. Beatrice English, James Hooks, and Diana Compolongo head the locals.

Iowa welfare rights now has two active groups. Mrs. Margaret Rees is chairman of the Mothers for Adequate Welfare in Waterloo, and Mrs. Margaret Beechum is chairman of the Progressive Action Club in Muscatine.

GOALS FOR THE NATIONAL WELFARE RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Enclosed in this issue is the statement of goals for the National Welfare Rights Movement, developed at a workshop at the August 1966 national meeting in Chicago.

It will serve as a basic working document for the convention. What changes are needed?

ACTION

Congress must know that if this bill passes it will directly contribute to the crisis in our cities. We must make our voices heard on this anti-welfare bill.

1. Plan to send a bus from your community to join the national demonstration Monday, August 28, in Washington, D.C. against this bill and for jobs and decent income now. (See next page for details.)

2. Write your Congressman today to protest this anti-welfare, anti-poor people bill ("1967 Social Security amendments").

3. Contact church, social worker, civil rights and other liberal groups and especially all grassroots community groups and get them to protest this bill; write their Congressmen, and to join your delegation to Washington, D.C., on August 28.

Now!

The national welfare rights movement invites ghetto and barrio groups from across the country to join in opposing oppressive anti-welfare legislation and to demand *jobs and decent income now!*

In a Washington, D.C., demonstration, Monday, August 28.

Liberal, labor, church, social work and civil rights groups are also urged to attend.

Groups should plan to arrive in Washington by 10 a.m. and to stay through 5 p.m.

Lobbying visits to Congressmen will be scheduled in the morning as well as meetings with OEO, Labor, HEW, HUD, and other officials. The demonstration and rally will be held in the afternoon.

For additional information contact; Poverty/Rights Action Center, 1713 R Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

More money now!

NATIONAL CONVENTION AUGUST 25 TO 28

These dates are definite—disregard earlier dates:

The First National Welfare Rights Movement Convention will be held in Washington, D.C., August 25 to 28.

See Newsletter #15 for the Convention Call and full details.

Each welfare rights group has received a pre-registration form for its delegates.

Delegates will be based on *paid up* members. Both the money *and* the national record cards for members must be turned in to count toward delegates. Groups should have their membership money and national record cards in to national headquarters as soon as possible. Membership money and national record cards will be accepted at the convention but this may delay seating of some of those delegates.

Delegates will be sent details of registration, maps showing the convention location, and information on how and where to register in Washington. Groups should return the yellow pre-registration form with the names of their delegates as soon as possible.

Any welfare recipients or organizers who wish to attend the convention *as observers* should notify national headquarters immediately as space will be limited.

All group members and supporters are urged to plan to come to Washington on Monday, August 28, for the national demonstration on jobs and decent income.

Call national headquarters *today* if you have questions!

CONGRESS READIES ANTI-WELFARE LAWS

The House Ways and Means Committee this week announced its proposals on welfare. They proposed that:

All states be required to set up Work and Training Programs for welfare recipients.

Every welfare recipient over 16 years of age who is determined able be required to participate in work or training or be cut off welfare. This would *include* mothers.

Instead of providing more money for children in their own homes, more money would be provided for children placed in foster homes, states establish more programs for investigating "neglect and abuse of children" with more "child welfare works" to remove children from their own homes.

States not receive federal money for more children than are presently on the rolls—welfare rolls would be frozen at present levels.

The Committee did *not* include the Administration proposal that all states be required to meet 100% of their own standard of need. It also did *not* require states to aid families with dependent children when a parent is unemployed (AFDC–UP).

These proposals are a direct attack on poor people. This bill would continue to use welfare as a weapon to divide families *and* now try to force mothers to work whether or not this is in the best interest of their children.

Instead of providing for real jobs it proposes more WET training—which a majority of the time does not lead to jobs. And now it seems that once "trained", people will be cut off welfare—whether or not they are able to find work.

WELFARE RIGHTS NEWS

Pittsfield, Mass., PAPAW marches

Mrs. Barbara Bragdon, President of PAPAW (Pittsfield Association of Parents for Adequate Welfare) reports that her group is continuing to press for fair hearings even though some people have been denied hearings.

The PAPAW protest on June 30 was described as the "most militant act ever staged by Pittsfield welfare recipients." PAPAW got friendly support from the Mayor but there has been little action on their 16 demands for changes in welfare department procedures.

Mrs. Bragdon, mother of 7, will lead the PAPAW delegation to the national convention.

Lancaster, Pa.

The Citizens Welfare Group led by Mrs. Charlotte Stewart, Chairman, picketing the County Board of Public Assistance on June 30, got the County Welfare Director to admit publicly "we aren't paying the minimum standards of health and decency. The state doesnt have the money."

Louisville welfare organization elects officers

The Louisville Welfare Organization has elected Mrs. Mae Belle Potter, President. Mrs. Potter, 30, mother of 6 children, says she joined the welfare rights movement "to get the benefits we are entitled to." Her first act as president was to telephone the Kentucky State Welfare Director to press for changes in state policy as demanded by Kentucky Welfare Rights groups on June 30.

The group plans a dance August 15 to raise money to send their delegates to the convention.

Wiley to speak at national Catholic conference

George Wiley will speak on "The Equal Rights of the Poor" at the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice in Kansas City, Aug. 17–20.

EXHIBIT D

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. HULETT SMITH,
Governor of West Virginia,
Charleston, W. Va.

DEAR GOVERNOR SMITH: As you know, OEO, at your request and in cooperation with your offices, has been conducting an investigation of the following charges cited in your letter of August 14, 1967, to Sargent Shriver:

1. Babcock State Park disturbance.
2. Alleged immoral conduct in Wyoming County
3. Misuse of GSA vehicles
4. Nicholas County controversy
5. Effects of sedition arrests in Kentucky

Briefly, our investigation found the following:

1. The Volunteers at Babcock State Park, while not nearly as inconsiderate as first noted, did indeed disturb neighboring cabins on the night of July 22.

The charges of tampering with vehicles and of destroying park property were found to be invalid. However, there seems to be no question the Volunteers who stayed at the park did disturb some people using the park. We feel the Babcock State Park incident might have been avoided with better planning and supervision on the part of the Appalachian Volunteers and with better notification of State Park officials of the exact nature and duration of the conference held there. The fact is that apparently no planning concerning the possibility of rain took place and Volunteers had to make their own arrangements in the midst of the sudden downpour. By copy of this letter, we are relating our concern to Mr. Milton Ogle, Director of the Appalachian Volunteers.

We regret that this incident took place and will work closely with the Appalachian Volunteers and your office to insure that similar incidents do not reoccur in the future.

2. We found no verification for the charges of immoral conduct by VISTAs or Appalachian Volunteers in Wyoming County or any of the other counties in which VISTA and the Appalachian Volunteers worked in West

Virginia. You should know, however, that there are rumors of immorality in Wyoming County and that, while untrue, may continue to disturb the program of the Appalachian Volunteers. This means that the Appalachian Volunteers should make even greater efforts to maintain high standards of conduct in the communities where they are working. A total of 21 people were interviewed in Wyoming County and were unable to provide any concrete evidence for the charges. We feel that increased supervision this summer by Appalachian Volunteer staff has led to more satisfactory behavior by the Volunteers.

3. The charge of misuse of a government vehicle by a VISTA Volunteer was found to be true. A VISTA Volunteer drove the vehicle with a friend to Charleston, West Virginia, for social purposes.

Since this is an inappropriate use of a government vehicle, we have transferred the car from her use and will not make a GSA vehicle available to her in the future. Any Volunteer found to be misusing a government vehicle will have GSA vehicles removed from his use as a minimal action taken by VISTA in the future.

4. The charges of Appalachian Volunteer Summer Associates in Nicholas County calling for the "mass dismissal of a number of the county's elected officials and school personnel" were unfounded. We feel that the Appalachian Volunteer-VISTA group conducted itself well within the bounds required by OEO. The OEO investigation did find that a number of citizens of this county have opposed the policies of the school principal in question for several years, thus predating both CAP and VISTA programs. Because of their interest in tutoring and other education-related matters, VISTA Volunteers did work with people who had doubts about school policy.

5. As you know, a panel of three Federal Judges has recently ruled unconstitutional the sedition law under which an Appalachian Volunteer fieldman was indicted.

Because of the current misunderstanding about the Appalachian Volunteers and the need for closer coordination and administrative tightening, we are increasing our staff in West Virginia. A new staff member, Miss Denise Cavanaugh, will work full time in the state and an additional staff person will be added to work part time in coordinating with the Appalachian Volunteers in West Virginia. Mr. Richard Dodds will continue to have overall responsibility for the state and will continue to work closely with the State OEO Technical Assistance Director, Mr. Jeff Monroe, and his staff.

While the Appalachian Volunteers were found to have violated no major or minor OEO regulations, they can be criticized for incomplete planning. Therefore, we do think it essential that the Appalachian Volunteers show an increased awareness of the need to communicate to the general public the nature of the program, especially since the general public has heard principally the charges and none of the positive aspects of the group's efforts, and of the need to take appropriate steps to insure that the incidents which did occur will not happen again. For example, I think the need for an intensive Volunteer orientation to the area (and this holds true for Volunteers across the country) has been underscored during the events of the past several weeks and we will require that such an orientation is a part of the training for every Volunteer who serves in West Virginia. We are grateful for your offer to provide staff to participate in this aspect of the training and we intend to take immediate advantage of it. For example, this week members of the West Virginia Department of Mental Health are in Kansas training and selecting VISTA Volunteers who will serve in the highly successful West Virginia Mental Health project.

To further implement the training suggestion and others, I have directed our mid-Atlantic Regional Administrator to work with Mr. Monroe and the Appalachian Volunteer staff to set up regular, periodic meetings to review program progress and potential problem areas.

VISTA has held the Appalachian Volunteer program in high regard and will make every effort to insure that the program is maintained at a professional level. We are glad that you have not let a few incidents influence your judgment about the program, and we are grateful for your support, both now and in the past, for overall VISTA efforts in West Virginia.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. CROOK,
Director, VISTA.

INTERIM RESULTS OF THE OEO INVESTIGATION INTO COMPLAINTS MADE AGAINST APPALACHIAN VOLUNTEERS AND VISTA VOLUNTEERS IN WEST VIRGINIA

This is an interim statement containing the results of the OEO investigation into a series of complaints made against the VISTA and Appalachian Volunteers (AVs) program over the past summer. A complete investigation on all significant complaints is in the process of being completed. This statement contains the present status of the investigation with respect to four of the complaints contained in the letter from Governor Hulett Smith of August 14 to the Director of OEO.

Charges and details (The charges are quoted from the governor's letter.)

1. *Charge:* "A group of persons identified as AVs and VISTA personnel staged a riotous all night party on July 22 at Babcock State Park—destroying park property, interfering with the exit and entrance of other park guests, tampering with automobiles and generally disturbing the peace. Several of these persons used Federal government automobiles, raising the possible question of misuse of U.S. Government property (as well as being abominable public relations for the national administration)."

Details: On Saturday, July 22, an AV training program involving 89 people in an overnight camp-out at Babcock State Park was rained out at about 11:00 p.m. The majority of the campers, none of whom had tents, left the park and returned to their communities. About a dozen stayed in the park at one of two park cabins rented for the night by an AFL–CIO training officer. Five others stayed at the second cabin. The cabin where the twelve stayed was located some 40 yards from two occupied cabins. The people in these cabins complained to the Park Superintendent that a wild party was held late into the night. The AV's in the cabin contend that there was much loud discussion, but not a real party.

The purpose of the AV gathering was to hold a mid-summer conference-training-discussion session. This was done with the approval of VISTA. This removes the question of misuse of the GSA cars.

There was little preparation for the event. An AV staffer, went to the park and got general information about a week before, but gave the park no notice of the AV plans. Despite this, the arrival of the almost 90 members of the AV session were assimilated into the camp with a minimum disturbance and the group finally settled in the evening in an overflow camp site across the highway and behind a clump of trees from other campers. The park superintendent says when he made his 10:00 P.M. rounds everything was all right. Then it rained.

The disturbance could not be called riotous although noisy and probably inconsiderate; there was no property damage attributed to the AVs by the park superintendent. One park guest told the superintendent that his distributor wire was cut during the night but the superintendent said he had no basis but guess work to tie this to the AVs—the man's cabin was at a location away from the AV disturbances. The other charges in the letter about tampering with cars were, according to the superintendent, instances where people heard a group near their car and were afraid something might be done to it.

One of the people staying in the two neighboring cabins says she spent a sleepless night and thought the AVs must have had an "unsupervised ball" until about 3:30 A.M. She says there was loud singing with guitars and banging of doors. She thinks there was a lot of drinking, but says she saw no bottles. She says her husband did not ask them to be quiet because they were afraid they might be attacked—this was also the reason they didn't try to go for help in their car. Although the two ends of the loop drive past their cabin were sometimes blocked with about four different cars, she remembers they were not blocked during all of the party.

The family had planned to leave the next morning for home, but delayed their trip until the following day so they could get a good night's rest.

The lady says, "We can go anywhere and get this kind of behavior—we went to the park to get away from it." She adds that the AVs were crummy-looking—she noted particularly that one girl had sores on her legs which she attributed to being dirty. She says that some were all right and that she didn't see them until the morning after the incident when they had been caught in the rain.

One camper left the park in the afternoon because of the AVs who had first attempted to fit into four six-man camp sites (24 total) in the main camping area. His reasons as given by the park superintendent were that his site was a path-way between areas rented by the AVs. One AV staffer says he told them that he objected to their beer drinking. The AV's say they were told by park officials that they could drink the beer. The provisions for the group brought three cases of beer and three cases of soft drink. They were told to move to the over-flow area because of their numbers. They agreed to do so with approval of an unidentified park ranger after dinner so they could use the stoves on the camp sites—none were available on the over-flow site. The superintendent was not asked directly if he gave permission for beer drinking but he knew of the beer drinking in the afternoon and made no effort to restrict it.

With respect to the other charges in the letter from Superintendent, he says cabin guest did not actually have his car tampered with, but said the AVs were "messing around" and was apparently afraid they might tamper with it. Another report from a person described in the letter, "a lodge guest" was from a temporary park employee who was afraid the noise outside might endanger his state truck; this man, however, did not notify the superintendent.

It seems likely that much of the disturbances reported by other guests was a result of AV campers and possibly other campers looking for a place out of the rain—the lodge would be a logical place to look as well as the two cabins rented by the AFL–CIO Training Officer, one of which is in the far corner of the park and probably was not found. This explanation was considered possible by the park superintendent.

2. *Charge:* "Reports from Wyoming County, West Virginia, indicate confidence in, and effectiveness of, the VISTA–AV program has been seriously weakened by immoral conduct on the part of several of these volunteers. While these persons logically argue that their personal lives are their own affair, the fact remains that promiscuity, particularly when it crosses racial lines, is not accepted by the community as a whole and damages public respect and support for the VISTA and AV program."

The key source on AV immorality in Wyoming County, a neighbor of the former office-apartment of the AVs on Broadway Street in Mullens did not articulate much de-

tail about the AV misconduct. He said that he saw some kissing. The only example of this was an incident outside the AV office when he said some guy lined up a whole lot of girls and went down the line kissing them. The often repeated complaint is that a group of boys and girls stayed overnight on occasion sleeping on the floor in sleeping bags. This source says, "They were staying in there together, but I couldn't say if they stayed overnight. I would see them in the morning."

One VISTA who lives in the apartment says that on two occasions groups stayed overnight. The first time was after a big cookout organized at Herndon Heights. About 15 AVs stayed overnight on the floor in sleeping bags of the office rather than drive home later at night. The next time four stayed after getting to Mullens late from Beckley July 23 where they attended a local pageant called "Honey in the Rock." These groups included boys and girls, but no Negroes were included.

A boyfriend of one VISTA girl stayed overnight about twice, but the VISTA Volunteer slept in the bedroom with her roommate and the boyfriend slept in the next room.

She moved out of the apartment on Broadway after she learned that she was in physical danger; the storefront windows on the building were broken by vandals. She moved temporarily to Brenton where two AV girls have a trailer.

The two remaining neighbors of the AV apartment which is the subject of complaint were contacted. One said that his only objection was "just the looks of the outfit—as dirty looking as a damn sewer. I haven't seen anything take place. I could hear them some but they didn't bother me. I was afraid they'd agitate the colored. They went up to a colored restaurant in Goose Hollow to get meals sometimes. The better class of white people didn't mess with them."

A second neighbor says he thought nothing of the AVs as neighbors except they were a little dirty. He said he would be sound asleep by 11:00 p.m. every night.

One of the VISTAs lived in another apartment before moving to the Broadway address. She left before she was asked to leave, but her landlord said he had complaints from neighbors that she was noisy late at night. He would have asked her to leave if she had not done so. A local official who looked into the matter said he found that the VISTA had been loud on occasion (she admits playing her phonograph at night) and at one point had a loud party. The official says such parties happen often in most neighborhoods—he said it was basically innocent, the kind of party he would have enjoyed. The former landlord, however, complains that the VISTA also damaged some property such as removing doors from bookcases, a kitchenette broke down and some chairs were damaged. The landlord also complained that he had to repaint the apartment. He says he observed none of her behavior while the VISTA was his tenant and got no complaints except about noise.

A total of 21 residents of Wyoming County were interviewed concerning AV activities; none had more specific information about immorality than covered above.

3. *Charge:* "On August 6, pickets protesting U.S. participation in the Viet Nam war staged a demonstration on the lawn of the State Capitol. The protest, which was peaceful and orderly, included five VISTA-AV workers from Raleigh County. While I affirm their right to their own views on the Vietnamese situation, the fact that they drove to Charleston in a clearly marked U.S. Government car, which was parked near the Capitol, attracted considerable attention, as the attached State Police report reveals. The use of a Federally-owned car for such purposes certainly is open to question."

Details: A VISTA working with the AVs admitted that she and a summer AV drove to Charleston from Beckley in a GSA car to do some sightseeing. The two workers stopped at the State Capitol and participated in an anti-Viet Nam war rally they found in progress. Later, they accompanied a demonstration leader to his home. After their visit, they went back to Beckley.

The AVs learned of this after Governor Smith's letter became public. They confirmed the incident and suspended the workers from further use of cars for a short period. VISTA has directed the AVs to make the suspension permanent. Short-term suspension was also imposed last winter when the AV staff learned that volunteers assigned to them had taken two GSA cars from Beckley to Bluefield to attend a movie. The summer AV involved left the AVs with the end of the summer program.

The GSA car was one assigned to a volunteer attached to the Beckley County CAA and borrowed for official purposes according to the AV staff.

Attempts to reach the State Department of Public Safety for information concerning the allegation that there were five VISTA-AV workers present from Raleigh County, rather than the two so far identified, have not been completed and will be checked out.

4. *Charge:* "A respected State Senator, Carl E. Gainer, from central West Virginia has protested formally the activities of VISTA and AV workers in Nicholas County. These persons apparently have called for the mass dismissal of a number of the county's elected officials and school personnel. While such social protest might be valid, the absence of constructive alternatives to the problems of the community has led to a general feeling that the VISTA-AV group is composed of 'trouble-makers' who offer only negative solutions to community problems. Charges of teaching 'ideas that are Communistic' have been made."

Details: Most of the controversy in Nicholas County has centered on the CAA education committee efforts to make changes in a Summerville High School. These efforts have included reports calling for the removal of the county school superintendent, the school board and the high school principal unless reforms are made. There have been no general or specific requests for resignations of other public officials. The AVs who worked in the county over the summer under the general direction of the local CAA director have not promoted the school issue, but have attempted to help get people out to meetings where these issues are being discussed. There was no evidence to support the charges of communism against the AVs contained in the letter to Governor Smith. Using leads supplied by the Principal complainant, no one was found in Richwood or Summerville with first-hand knowledge of what the VISTA workers have been doing in the areas where they have worked—none indicated knowledge of VISTAs teaching communism.

EXHIBIT E

SHERIFF AND TREASURER,
RALEIGH COUNTY,
Beckley, W. Va., September 21, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: Attached you will find copy of a small publication which is being put out by some area citizens aided by VISTA workers and the Area Youth Corp.

Bob, the investigators sent into our area are doing and have done one of the best jobs of white-washing that I have ever witnessed. These so-called investigators came into this County after having made up their minds regarding the situation and refused to listen or look into any problems, they simply made as few calls as possible and then came away saying exactly the same things in exactly the same language they had used when they first arrived.

Preconceived ideas and indoctrination of the persons who have been sent in to evaluate the poverty programs have made it impossible to obtain anything but a biased report. Again, Bob, I would like to ask you and our other representatives for some help down here before it is too late.

Very sincerely yours,

OKEY A. MILLS,
Sheriff.

P.S. Bob, I still feel that part of the program is good. The administration of this program could have been planned by Civil Rights Leadership. I still hope we can have constructive changes in our Federal setup. It may be too late already. Bob, send some investigators from your Democratic Caucus to look into this Federal *Stupidity.*

Sincerely,

OKEY.

SHERIFF AND TREASURER,
RALEIGH COUNTY,
Beckley, W. Va., February 17, 1967.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JENNINGS: We are asking your help in trying to solve a problem caused by one of our Democratic Programs that has reached the place where it is to the point of being fantastic. I make direct reference to the Vista Program under the C.A.A.

I will not bother you with numerous details but it is hard for me to believe this program, as it is being administered, is a result of the thinking of any sane department of our U.S. Government. It would seem that it was dreamed up in a mental institution.

This program is making the Democratic Party in our County look ridiculous to the point of absurdity. It is beyond my imagination to think that the results of this program could be due to the direct action of any sub-divisions of our government and the blame thereto laid directly to the Democratic Party. There is one person that I know of that would be pleased with this program and that is Gus Hall.

I would be most pleased if we could get someone to come to Raleigh County and investigate the actions of these people. I would also appreciate someone investigating the feelings of local people as a direct result of this program. We have many Federal Programs under the Democrats which are worth while and should be progressing as far as the Government is concerned and the Democratic Party is concerned. We are sitting on our rear ends and letting two or three parts of the program not only tear down all of the good that the rest of the program is doing but is disgusting our Democratic wage earning citizens to the point that they have resentment toward the Federal Government that is reaching the point of no return. I am making direct reference to people who have been good Democrats all their life and have worked for a living and do not owe anyone a dime and have voted Democratic because they wanted to.

I, personally, am a strong Democrat and intend to remain a loyal Democrat but I am disgusted with this program and if something is not done by the leaders of our party, I fully intend to make a personal call to Drew Pearson and ask him to come down and check into this program. I hope that this is not necessary but if some action is not taken by our leaders, I will not be deterred in my intention to follow through. If you think that the only trouble in this program is in Raleigh County, I would suggest that you check with the other counties that have this program.

In conclusion, let me say, please pay attention to this letter.

Very sincerely yours,

OKEY A. MILLS,
Sheriff.

BRADLEY, W. VA.,
January 10, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: We have discussed the expenditure of funds for Community Action Programs and especially those paid to Vista workers.

Admittedly Vista workers can do good work in certain areas of the world if educated and trained but I do not believe an 18 or 19 year old can come into Raleigh County without training, looking in most cases more in need of assistance than our own people, and accomplish much in the way of a "better life" for those in the rural areas.

I am enclosing two clippings from our local paper which I feel may be of interest to you. I certainly do not know of any training program in Raleigh County which would produce qualified workers for the Vista program.

No doubt this lack of training is considered to be an asset to a Vista worker as Radio advertising for Vista Workers specifies "No Training" required.

I trust something will be done about this reckless spending of our tax money.

Sincerely,

J. A. BLACKBURN.

THE SENATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
August 8, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am enclosing a news release which appeared in the Sunday Gazette August 6, 1967 and a letter from one of my constitutents dated August 5, 1967 which I sincerely believe at this time is the genuine concern of most of the citizens *of Nicholas County.*

It is rather unusual that any group would be wanting to ask the resignation of the School Superintendent, Principal of Summersville High School, the Sheriff and the County Road Supervisor all in the same meeting. It is also unusual that Senator Paul Kaufman and Ralph Murphine would be present for the Friday night meeting along with the Vista Workers and *Appalachia Volunteers.* As far as I can tell there was no announcement made to the general public of this meeting and only these people selected by the Vistas and Volunteers were transported to the meeting in their own cars.

I have watched the Vista Workers from the beginning of the program and I believe that I made the statement to Senator Randolph and Governor Smith at lunch at my home last August before the Cherry River Navy parade that if they were allowed to continue they would defeat the Democratic Party in the 1968 election.

It has certainly become more evident in my district with the increase of these workers coming in the county. No doubt, a *very small* percentage of these workers are sincere and do a good job but by and large the majority are a bunch of improperly misguided misfits who are I believe endangering our concept of law and order in this nation. I do not think these workrs were ever needed in this County and would respectfully ask for their resignation.

Very truly yours,

CARL E. GAINER,
State Senate.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the Allen-Scott Report in *Daily Mail* (Charleston, W. Va.) on July 31, 1967, report was made of charges by Rep. James Gardner (R-NC) implicating government financed anti-poverty workers in inciting riots and directly involved in agitations.

Under ordinary conditions, I would not get too excited about this item, for it did not directly concern our community, but after some unpleasant publicity regarding anti-poverty workers (Better Community Action-OEO) in this county, I feel a protest is in order.

Here in this county, we have good stable citizens who are interested in progress, education and all the better things for our families . . . and until now, we have had no smirching of our schools with dope raids, long-haired, rude and untidy students, moral problems and the like. This has been due to the fine Administrators employed by the Board of Education. However, at the moment, meetings are held by the Community Action Groups with guest speakers from surrounding counties promoting changes and shouting unfair school policies and charging public institutions with "lining their mink-lined pockets".

I am a high school teacher and a mother of two teen-agers. I *resent* the implications that our school people are doing so many things wrong, for I know that is not true. Personally, I like strict rules in the schools for that makes for much better schools and better future citizens. At this very moment the Community Action seek the resignation of our fine Principal and Assistant. Only last week they demanded the resignation of our Superintendent of Schools.

These Administrators are fine, intelligent, and dedicated men who could further their financial status by going to other states, but have not done so. We are most fortunate to have matters in the schools handled so efficiently and there is not need for anti-poverty to advise these experienced and well trained educators.

I deeply resent that my hard earned teacher dollars help to pay these inexperienced, untrained, and hysterical workers. Instead of Better Community they very well might force this community to a much worse one.

You will find enclosed some newspaper clippings which will further explain this matter and will somehow convince you that I am not a hysterical constituent whose sole purpose is to complain and make trouble. These Better Community Workers are a detriment to our school. Can someone do something to help us retain our previous status without OEO interference?

Very truly yours,

_____ _____,
Librarian.

WILLIAMSON PIGGLY WIGGLY, INC.,
Williamson, W. Va., August 2, 1967.

U.S. Senator ROBERT BYRD,
House of Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are a Kentucky firm located in Pike County, Kentucky, bordering a West Virginia county, Mingo, and enjoy a reasonable amount of business from West Virginia.

On Monday, July 31, 1967, a group of VISTA workers entered our store. They arrived at our store in a government car driven by a female. This group was composed of two colored girls and three colored boys. We do not know if they all were VISTA workers. These workers have headquarters in your state in Mingo County.

While the girls shopped as normal one of the boys wandering through different departments of the store entered our produce department. He had a marks-a-lot pencil, which is a pencil used for marking merchandise. He marked 5¢ on a lemon. An employee of ours, Benjamin Beverly, advised him that our Manager would not approve of this. He said "I'm not afraid of your manager or anyone else in the store." Beverly said "I am not the only boy in the store, we have more in the back room." The colored boy walked away from the produce department toward the meat department and our Meat Manager, David Crigger, heard him say "Do you think one of them could shoot this gun I have in my pocket." He then asked Mr. Crigger if he had any Hard Coconuts. Mr. Crigger advised him that he would have to ask our produce clerk. The boy then said "He is just like you, he doesn't know anything either." Mr. Crigger did not reply and the boy walked away.

Several of our customers noticed his rudeness and saw him re-enter the government car with the others. A government car being a carrier of this type of ill will could be projected in the minds of on lookers as an ally of this type of doings.

We do not wish to magnify this incident and we know it is small in comparison with the racial disturbances elsewhere, but if this is an example of the attitudes and actions of any government group it could very well cause some bad situations.

We do not discriminate in our employment and now have, as we have had in the past, colored employees.

We again emphasize that we do not want to ignite a fuse, only hope that this bit of information will help to serve as one of the many corrective measures that are so badly needed in this racial strife.

Yours truly,

WILLIAMSON PIGGLY WIGGLY, INC.
CLAUDE P. VARNEY, *Manager.*

AUGUST 10, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT BYRD,
Washington, D.C.:

We have some V. Vista workers here in Wyo. Co. who is working against the Democrat party and causing a lot of disturbances among people, one here, 20 yr. old from rich family in Chicago. I hear all that is going on in Post Office, let me know what this is all about. They are telling the people here that they aren't getting what is due them. Get a big stir up about the water works and giving the ring in Wyo. Co. thunder

Thanks for an answer or get these people out of here.

Yours truly,

_____ _____.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Huntington, W.Va., July 31, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: For the past several weeks, the City of Huntington has been fraught with rumors of racial strife; i.e., riots, looting, burning, etc. On every occasion we have attempted to get to the source of the rumors and found each of them to be untrue. However, we have found that each time these rumors started one or more of the following people were in the City: Phillip Carter Negro/Male, Pat Austin Negro/Female, Ann Adams White/Female, and Marion Hanley White/Female. From past experience we know these people are trouble makers. Our information now is that each are active in the furtherance of the Black Power Movement. They were each in the City of Huntington over this past weekend attempting to set up Black Power Movement meetings.

Our information is that Carter, Austin, Adams, and possibly Marion Hanley are employees of the Federal Government. Phillip Carter is reported to be employed by OEO in some capacity in Norman, Oklahoma. The three females are reported to be employed by OEO in some capacity in New York City. Carter was formerly assigned to the Job Corps at Lake Vesuvius in Ironton, Ohio; Pat Austin and Ann Adams were employed in some capacity with the Job Corps in the City of Huntington and Marion Hanley was employed by Action in the City of Huntington.

We have the best of relations with the local F.B.I. agents; however, we sometimes feel that information we pass on to them and which they forward to Washington may be filtering back to these same people. We

have no basis of fact for this except our intuition.

It would be greatly appreciated if you could possibly cause a confidential check made of these people through your office to determine if they are employees of the Federal Government. It is felt that the appointment of the Blue Ribbon Commisson by the President to investigate riots will be of no value if the Federal Government in fact is financing, at least in an indirect manner, people of this caliber who are advocating revolution in this country.

Your assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated and any other information we might be able to furnish you on Carter, Austin, Adams, and Hanley, we would be glad to do so.

Sincerely,

G. H. KLEINKNECHT,
Chief of Police.

LAW OFFICES SAYRE & SAYRE,
Beckley, W. Va., May 5, 1967.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: The great "Vista Workers" of the Johnson-Kennedy-Shriver regime made a vicious attack on Presidents Hoover and Eisenhower at their Jacksons Mill training program this week, according to the newspapers, and the Rev. Jack S. Stephenson of Cincinnati, director of the training camp, said the trainees were giving vent to their expression. This damnable practice and procedure should stop and our senators and congressmen should see that it stops. The taxpayers of this country are paying the bill and we have a right to expect better treatment.

This entire program is a farce from beginning to end. Some of these so-called volunteers came into Raleigh County and proceeded to stir up all the trouble they could. We have some surface mining going on in our county and last summer we had a disastrous and unprecedented flood and it caused some damage, and they proceeded to go abroad, hauling people to the site, trying to make a mountain out of a molehill, while the company was doing everything possible to rectify the damages done. They even went to the legislature and made all kinds of untrue statements, and you might say stampeded the Legislature of West Virginia into passing an unworkable surface mining law, and reported that our company had not done anything to alleviate the damage, and I quote with respect to one case from a letter written by an official of the company to a local lawyer in Beckley under date of January 9, 1967, concerning the claim being made by one, Ernest Bonds, concerning a very small parcel of land, and I quote from the letter without mentioning the name of the attorney:

"Sufficient information now has been furnished by our engineers for reply to your letter of December 9, 1966, regarding claims in the vicinity of our mining operations at Drews Creek.

"We must take exception to your statement that in connection with these claims 'to date nothing has been done.' Prior to the date of your letter, property affected by our operations was landscaped by skilled people in a fashion which not only removed all debris, but also provided drainage superior to that which existed prior to our arrival. With respect to landscaping already accomplished, we have agreed to seed the same area at the appropriate time and that agreement will be kept.

"In accomplishing the foregoing, the following expenditures, in addition to our engineers' time, have been made:

"30 hours D-8 bulldozer rental at $20	$600.00
8 hours grader rental at $15	120.00
24 hours truck rental at $10	240.00
Labor	202.84
Total	1,162.84

"Concerning the dwelling which allegedly was damaged by our blasting, our engineers carefully inspected this dwelling and found that the only condition of damage existing is the result of normal depreciation but in no way attributable to our operations.

"It always has been the policy of our companies to meet any responsibility to the public resulting from our operations and we believe you will find from personal inspection that we have more than done so in this instance."

This reputable attorney refused to prosecute their alleged vicious and unfounded claim.

The above states more completely the efforts made by the company I represent as an attorney than I am able to give you concerning the various claims made. The amount of work done to alleviate the damage amounted to more than the value of the land. This is just one instance of their trouble making.

During the last year or so there have been a lot of stories making the rounds concerning the actions and conduct of these people. One man was chosen by the Governor as Director of the Economic Opportunity Program for Raleigh County and he was not vicious enough and the Vista workers had him fired.

A grandson of a very well known Raleigh County citizen, now deceased, former state senator and well known lawyer throughout this section of West Virginia, was a dropout and in some manner got him a job and came into Raleigh County as a Vista worker. He traveled with others of lesser standing. He was dirty, clothes unclean and unkept, rooming in a home of a colored family in East Park, and I understand that they wouldn't keep him because he would go to bed with his shoes on. He never called on his grandmother, so I understand, although he was rooming within ½ mile of her home, and she did not know he was in the county. His grandmother is a very refined lady and not very well, and I expect she would have passed out if she had seen him or had received knowledge of what was going on.

This is just a sample of some of the Vista workers we have had in our county, and some of their actions and conduct would not stand the light of investigation. I don't know of any good they have done. They just cause trouble and raise the hell.

In order to save time I am sending a copy of this letter to Congressman Slack and a copy to Congressman Arch A. Moore.

With kindest personal regards to all three of you, I am

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD M. SAYRE.

HANOVER, W. VA.,
August 15, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have in our neighborhood four young people who say they have been sent here by the Federal Government to help Poverty Stricken people of W. Va.

They call themselves Appalachian Volunteers of America. They seem to be arousing suspicion among some people, whether they are really working for the betterment of the people in Wyoming County, W. Va., or are they going about ensighting riots, are maybe Sedition. Will you please let me hear from you with literature concerning these people, as I'm very interested in helping the poverty programs. I've been working with these people and have seen nothing wrong, but the people won't help us if we don't furnish proof that they are sent out by the Federal Government as they say.

As I have written you before concerning floods in Huff Creek District, and you have always given my letters your immediate attention I'm hoping you will do the same with this one. Dredging Huff Creek, building bridges and better schools is what we hope these people are working for.

Please give this your attention quickly as possible so I can show the people of Huff Creek what to expect of these people.

Very truly yours,

W. W. C.

GLEN DANIEL, W. VA.,
January 12, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Would it be possible for you senators to send a committee to Raleigh County to investigate the programs and methods being sponsored by the VISTA workers? I believe if congressmen can see, first-hand, the class division, the strife, and malice that is being generated right here in Raleigh County, you will want to stop it now.

When the VISTAS speak of the "people", they mean only those on relief and welfare checks. The rest of us aren't "people", we are only taxpayers.

We Raleigh County people aren't so unable to solve our own problems that "volunteers" from all over the United States have to come here and do it for us. The biggest barrier has been financial in the past. Now that funds are available, please give us a chance to work out our own problems and not send an avalanche of "young beatniks" to do it for us.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senators Randolph, Mansfield, and Dirksen.

Please help us in this struggle for self-respect.

Sincerely yours,

V. S.

DELBARTON, W. VA.,
August 5, 1967.

DEAR SIR: I am again writing you concerning the work of the Poverty Program in Mingo County, after two special meetings of the Lee District C.A.G., called by the County organization in an attempt to oust this present group, an effort which failed, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Mingo County E.O.C., Mr. Gerald Chafin, said they were to work with the present group, who is truly interested in trying to help the community.

Our problem is the Appalachia Volunteer's Activities. They are constantly agitating and attempting to cause trouble. They have not succeded with but a very few people but it is enough to cause many of our people to seemingly be afraid to come out to a C.A.O Meeting.

Tonight we had a meeting for the purpose of screening applications for work in the head start center. They came in with a man, who was highly intoxicated and kept interrupting the meeting. These volunteers are scattering hate, propaganda, plus the idea that people who work are against the poor.

It sems to us, since we have discussed this problem with various reliable people in our area that it is very much like a communist idea. Their feeling from all we can gather is overthrow regardless of what law is. Now, I ask you, Is this, what I, and others are paying taxes for?

Frankly, we think we speak for a great number in our area—GET THEM OUT and let our people work here. I am sure we can do a better job of understanding the problems of the poor than can outside agitators.

Do we get any results? or is this to be ignored also? I am very much afraid of what the results will be if they are not removed.

None of us want trouble, but if they keep agitating, I am afraid for what could happen.

Yours very truly,

C. W.

DELBARTON, W. VA.,
August 6, 1976.

DEAR SIR: I attended a Community Action Meeting August 4, 1967 of the Lee District CAG of which I am Vice Chairman. The special meeting had been called to screen applications for employment in the head start center, and selection of two (2) people to serve on an advisory group for the center.

The Appalachian Volunteers came in with a man who was highly intoxicated and kept trying to agitate trouble as were the AV's. We finally succeeded in finishing our meeting, but outside the building one of the Appalachian Volunteers, Susan School, got a group of two or three together and was threatening to take me apart. Now I ask, is this what Government money is to go for? That people life-long residents cannot get together to transact business without threats? I think it's time we re-examine closely what is going on.

Many of the people are afraid to come out to meetings for fear of trouble. There must be something done about preventing agitators from receiving Government money or we'll just let the Communist take over. I am a firm believer in free speech, but peaceable. These people seemingly are not. The only thing they seem to know is force.

Many of the people to whom I have talked feel as I do. Get the Appalachian Volunteers and Vistas out. Let our community alone. Neighbors being neighborly, not at each other's throats. They are stirring up hate in everyone.

Needless to say, I feel that the riots could well have started with agitators such as these.

Respectfully yours,

H. B.

(Mr. BYRD of West Virginia assumed the chair as Presiding Officer at this point.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the hour is late and I shall be as brief as possible under the circumstances; but I should like to make a few comments on what the Senator from West Virginia has just said, and then proceed with a fairly brief argument in support of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967, which is title II of the pending bill.

Preliminarily, may I say that when the subcommittee of which I am chairman began its investigation of the poverty program in February of this year, we made a commitment that we would undertake neither a whitewash or a witch hunt. A good many months and more than 4,000 pages of testimony later, I think I can conscientiously say that we have kept that pledge.

This is not a whitewash. There are many things wrong with the poverty program. We have pointed them out in our report. We have undertaken, in this legislation, to remedy as many of them as could be remedied by tightening up legislation, and by seeking, through our oversight function, to point out to the Office of Economic Opportunity other areas where we believe administrative practices should be strengthened and improved, and, to some extent, drastically changed.

Nor was our investigation a witch hunt. We did not go out to get anybody. We did not ask a lot of loaded questions of witnesses, intended to show them up or make them look bad. We undertook to get at the truth. I believe our report does state the truth, states it objectively, states it fairly, states it clearly, and should be the basis for action by the Senate on the bill we have brought in.

The Senator from West Virginia suggests that there are many misleading statistics about the war on poverty, and complains that it is not a fair test to determine who is poor and who is not on the basis of the family incomes of the families in question.

I would reluctantly have to disagree with that point of view. I suggest that any reasonable person with the background of those of us who have been out and looked at the ghettos and met these people face to face, who have gone into their houses and seen their community facilities, who have discussed their plight not only with representatives of the OEO, but with local welfare workers, mayors, city councilmen, and various municipal and State departments, would come to the reasonable conclusion, as did a majority of the subcommittee—and I have no quarrel with the findings of other members of the subcommittee in the minority reports—that it is a pretty clearly established that there are, at the moment, somewhere in the neighborhood of between 27 million and 30 million American citizens, of all ages, races, creeds, and colors, who are living in penury by the standards set up by the OEO in the legislation to determine who is poor and who is not, by reasonable standards, standards on which we can rely.

I base this not only on the statistics which I have seen, but on the witness of my eyesight as I went around to look at these areas, all the way from the east to the west coast, down south in Mississippi, up to the Canadian border, in Chicago and elsewhere.

So I would respectfully disagree with my friend from West Virginia that the figures are distorted. In my opinion they are not, and there is now one-fifth of the Nation living ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-housed, just as there was, in Franklin Roosevelt's day, one-third of the Nation.

It is quite a bit of progress to go from one-third to one-fifth, and I am proud of what has been done in the intervening years. But as I say, Mr. President, there is a certain callousness in certain areas of the United States, particularly among those who have not been out to look at conditions in the urban and rural ghettos of this country. To me it is almost disgraceful that the richest Nation the world has ever known, has done as little as it has, from a sense of compassion, to bring its poor citizens up to a decent level of civilized living. I assert again—and I regret to have to disagree with the Senator from West Virginia in this regard—that those people live in penury. Many of them are hungry and their children are hungry, and there does exist in America, in various places, starvation. I would take great exception to the report the Senator from West Virginia placed in the RECORD—I did not see it, but I heard his reference to it—to the effect that in excess of 90 percent of the American people are in fact well-fed, well-clad, well-housed, and on an adequate diet. Mr. President, that in my opinion is just not true.

The Senator from West Virginia complained about the Job Corps, and Job Corps data; he said it was conflicting. He said the record of the graduates of the Job Corps was, in many instances, defective.

I shall not undertake to answer that part of my friend's argument, because we discussed that matter this morning in connection with the debate on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, [Mr. CURTIS] to eliminate the Job Corps. By a vote of 49 to 30, the Senate rejected the arguments made by the Senator from Nebraska and, I say in all good humor to my friend from West Virginia, the arguments which he reiterated this afternoon after the vote.

I think the statistics which have been shown as to who kept their jobs after they left the Job Corps and who got new jobs are correct statistics. I would stand by them.

My friend, as his fourth point, complained about the community action programs in many parts of the country and attacks that have been made by community action committees on the power structure and what is called "the establishment."

The Senator is correct, to some extent, in that regard. We did find, throughout the country, that there were instances where, to my way of thinking, irrational people undertook to attack the established elected officials in their particular communities. This I deplore.

On the other hand, we found, generally speaking, that these were very rare exceptions to the general rule. We also found that in a number of instances, in our opinion, the elected public officials deserved to be attacked because they were not giving a fair shake to the community action activities. And in some instances they were speaking against it.

What has happened across the country is that the poor have become articulate. Their voice, stilled by inadequate income and education, has risen to attack the conditions under which they live and under which they have been deprived for the most part of the good things in life which this country is perfectly capable of giving them.

This is a shock to many conservative people. I must say that it was a shock to me when I first saw it. I think that there have been some instances in which there has been inflammatory action.

I remember one witness in Los Angeles, whom I shall not name, whose behavior was entirely deplorable.

I remember an upstate New York city where I cannot believe that commonsense motivated the officials when they acted with such vigor and took such inflammatory action.

I say again that in my opinion these are rare exceptions and should not be translated into the rule. Moreover, generally speaking, the community action program have done vastly more good than they have done harm, and they are getting better every day.

The committee's records, which are on the desks of every Senator, bear strong witness to the soundness of the conclusions I have just stated, as, in fact, does the committee report.

I am not familiar with conditions in West Virginia, and I would not pretend to be. I have no doubt that the complaints which the Senator from West

Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has raised not only with respect to some conditions in his own State but also with respect to what he calls a subsidized version in Kentucky—with outside agitators and the like—may very well have some merit, and I would not want categorically to deny them.

I will say that the very able member of our committee, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] tells me that he has looked pretty carefully into these things and he still feels that it is his pleasure and obligation to support the bill, including emergency employment.

There are many times when I do not agree with my colleague from Pennsylvania. I go to no pains to conceal that fact. So, I can well understand that my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, the present occupant of the Chair, is well within his rights to say "That is true, but I do not agree with my colleague. I am right, and he is wrong." I have no quarrel with that. There are 2 sides to a question even in West Virginia.

The Senator's criticism of the VISTA program, exclusive of the mental health program in West Virginia, I am in no position to answer because I do not know the facts. However, again I feel compelled to say that I do know that wherever the committee went, with the exception of the criticism raised by the Senator from West Virginia, we found enthusiastic encomiums for the action of the VISTA volunteers.

I have attended a number of graduations of VISTA volunteers around the country and have made talks at these ceremonies. In my opinion, they are splendid young people, well worthy of the traditions of the Peace Corps, carried on on a domestic basis.

I do not wish to get into a discussion and argument with my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, in this regard. It may be that the VISTA volunteers in West Virginia are not doing what they should.

I think I can say on the basis of the investigation of the committee, the witnesses we heard, and the consultants whom we sent out to look into these matters that generally speaking across the country the VISTA volunteers are doing an extraordinarily fine job.

I hope that no effort will be made—and none has so far in the course of this debate—to disturb the continuing program which they are presently engaged in carrying out.

My friend, the Senator from West Virginia, said, I believe, that the Headstart program should be transferred to the Office of Education. So did a number of other Senators. However, we voted on that a few days ago, and the majority determined to leave it where it is. I think it is unnecessary for me to comment further on it.

The Senator pointed out that he would like to have a reappraisal by an independent agency. He was kind enough to say that he was not critical of the committee or of the investigation it made. So did other Senators.

I was happy to accept the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and bring the General Accounting Office into the picture.

It may be that they can help us. I hope that they can. They are certainly well qualified in investigative techniques. How much understanding they have of the human elements involved here, we will see when they bring in their report. We now have the amendment in the bill. I suggest that, to that extent, we wait until next year to see what happens.

When it comes to the District of Columbia, the Senator from West Virginia is far more expert in that area than I am. I sat for 2 years on the District of Columbia Committee, but I got off by 1960 and cannot pretend to be an expert and I know that the Senator from West Virginia is. All I can say is that we did have one member of the subcommittee staff make what I thought was an investigation of some depth and inquire at some length concerning the poverty program in the District of Columbia.

He came back with a report speaking of it in glowing terms, admitting, of course, that there are some deficiencies.

I have no doubt that many of the specific instances mentioned by the Senator from West Virginia may very well be true. It is an enormous program. It would be surprising if there were not some defects.

The committee held 2 days of hearings here in Washington, at which leaders of the national planning organization and many others connected with the program testified.

Some of them were pretty critical of the effectiveness and the efficiency of the program.

I came out of that hearing, as one Senator, with an enormously high regard for Mr. Banks, executive director of the program who, unfortunately, in my judgment, has now left, and my friend, Mr. Lee, whom I look upon as a distinguished American.

He has held many high places in the Federal Government. In my opinion, he is also doing an excellent job as the chairman of the board of directors of the Upward Bound group, where he has to do a coordinating job that requires high skill. So I came out of the District of Columbia investigation with the feeling that by and large an excellent job was being done.

I do not know all the details. This is an area where I feel the Senator from West Virginia has superior knowledge and expertise in the field.

Let me speak briefly now about the Emergency Employment Act. The Senator has moved to recommit the entire bill with instructions to delete the Emergency Employment Act, title II.

I have no doubt that the Senator reaches a point of view in this regard which is shared by many of his colleagues, and it may well be that his point of view is shared by a majority—that we will find out tomorrow or a little later. I would not wish to quarrel with the Senator for his—in my judgment—unduly conservative point of view as to the very great need to have an emergency employment program to deal with the problems of the cities of America and the rural ghettos.

We saw a great deal of poverty as we went around the country—in the Delta counties of Mississippi, in the slums of Chicago, among the migrant workers in San Joaquin Valley in California, in Watts, and in a number of other places where I would suspect that the majority of the Senators have not had a real opportunity, as we in the subcommittee of necessity did, to see the conditions of misery and penury and squalor under which so many Americans are living, the end result being that thousands of them are being denied the good things in life and indeed are being deprived of their rights as free citizens of this great Republic.

The end result of the Senator's point of view—and I honor him for his point of view, as I say, because it is shared by many of his colleagues here—is that we will turn our back on the poor insofar as any effective employment program is concerned for the balance of this fiscal year.

We are turning our backs on the poor, if the Senator's views are to prevail—and I hope they will not—largely because the Senator thinks we cannot afford to support both the war in Vietnam and the war on poverty.

I have said enough on this subject on other occasions, so all I will do this evening is to define that issue and to point out that I have felt for a long time that we have a swollen military establishment, a military-industrial-scientific complex, which is taking this country down the road to disaster, and that we are neglecting many a problem which is a real threat to the civilization of which we are so proud when we put so much emphasis on the military and so little emphasis on our sense of compassion in doing what needs to be done for our needy fellow American citizens.

I shall not attempt to reply seriatim to the other arguments—and some of them are persuasive arguments—made by the Senator from West Virginia, but would rather turn away from an answer to his comments toward a positive espousal of the Emergency Employment Act.

In the hearings held by the committee throughout the length and breadth of the continental United States, I believe a clear consensus emerged that jobs are the single most important way to combat poverty. We had some pretty impressive testimony to that effect, which is set forth in the report of the committee. I shall do no more than to point out some of those who felt that jobs were the key answer—not the only answer, but the key answer—to poverty in the urban and rural ghettos.

Erwin D. Canham, editor-in-chief of the Christian Science Monitor and chairman of the Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, told the committee:

> Expert after expert, when consulted by the task force, has emphasized that income and place in the social and economic scheme can best be restored by providing the employable poor with training and job opportunities. These have the effect of bringing them into the mainstream of the economy, rather than merely paying them to remain outside.

Andrew Biemiller, director of legislation, AFL–CIO, recomended:

As a major aspect of the war on want we urge the inauguration of federally supported job-creating programs that would put the hard core unemployed to work providing needed public facilities and services.

Bayard Rustin, civil rights leader and executive secretary of the A. Phillip Randolph Institute, stated:

The great majority of the people who are poor, I am convinced, want work, but that work won't be found until we are prepared to establish a full and fair employment economy. We need public services, which is one means of creating full employment.

John Reading, mayor of Oakland, Calif., reported:

When visiting the neighborhood center, I find that most of all, the people want jobs. I feel very strongly, and the ones around me feel very strongly, that if we can provide jobs that we in turn then, over a period of time, will to a great extent solve the rest of the social evils that apply to a poor city.

These leaders reflect the views of the American people. In a public opinion poll taken August 14, 1967, to determine what the people believe would be an effective way to deal with the urban crisis, Louis H. Harris & Associates, Inc., found that 69 percent of the public favor setting up large-scale Federal work projects to give jobs to the unemployed.

The conclusion that jobs are the central need of the poor is well founded in statistics. In 1966 when the U.S. unemployment rate averaged 3.8 percent, the rate for the disadvantaged was much higher; for all Negroes, 7.3 percent; for all 16- to 19-year-old youths, 12.7 percent but for Negro youth, about 25 percent. The unemployment rate for those with 8 years or less of education tends to run twice the national average for all workers.

A survey of 10 urban slum areas conducted by the Labor Department in November 1966 found 1 out of 10 workers unemployed. Yet these figures do not tell the true story, for they do not reveal the extent of hidden unemployment. To get the whole picture it is necessary also to consider those with part-time jobs who want full-time work, those earning too little to meet their families' minimum subsistence needs, and those who could work but are not looking because they are discouraged at the prospects. Adding these to the traditional unemployment rate yields what the Labor Department calls the "subemployment" rate. In the 10 slum areas, this rate was 34 percent, or three times the usually reported unemployment rate for those areas.

In magnitude, the number of unemployed and looking for work in the United States has averaged nearly 3 million during the first half of 1967. To reduce unemployment to a rate of 3 percent, which used to be the Federal goal, would take 600,000 new jobs. To take care of underemployment and hidden unemployment might take twice that number, and perhaps more.

Nonetheless, projecting the findings from the 10 slum areas to the Nation as a whole, the Labor Department concluded that, as bad as the problem is, it is of manageable proportions. Given more resources, the high rate of unemployment could be drastically reduced in a reasonable period of time. The committee is convinced that this would be true even with the addition of rural areas with severe unemployment, although the types of programs would vary some between urban and rural areas.

While a major part of the problem is the lack of job qualifications of the unemployed, no amount of training will solve the total problem unless the jobs are there. Conversely, if jobs are certain, training can be accelerated. As evidence, recall the illiterates who became production workers with only a few months on-the-job training during World War II.

The committee's amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, particularly to part B of title I, have expanded and strengthened the training programs for the disadvantaged. But this is not enough. The extent of unemployment in our inner city areas and in certain rural areas severely affected by technological change is such that a crisis exists. Emergency measures must be taken immediately. Federal funds should be invested now in creating jobs for the unemployed.

This reiterates what the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty recommended in 1964:

Federal, State, and local governments should undertake a joint program to directly employ the hard-core unemployed in poverty-stricken areas, both rural and urban, in an attack on the deficiencies of their own environments. Financial support should be provided by the Federal Government. Local governments and private groups should provide the proposals, planning, and administration.

Since then, three Federal commissions appointed by the President have affirmed this recommendations. In February 1966, the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress recommended a 5-year program of public service employment with a sum of $2 billion for the first year. In June 1966, the White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights" urged the development of "Government-financed employment programs on public works and services to guarantee the availability of jobs to able workers who cannot be placed in, or promptly, trained for, regular employment." In July 1967, the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber proposed that Federal funds be granted to State and local governments and certain types of nonprofit institutions which would serve as "the residual employer" in rural areas with high unemployment until economic development programs can take hold.

Each of these bodies has identified public service employment as an especially fruitful source of additional, socially useful jobs. The "Automation" Commission, for example, estimated that at least 5.3 million such jobs could be filled: 1.2 million in medical institutions and health services, 1.1 million in educational institutions, 1.3 million in national beautification, 700,000 in welfare and home care, 350,000 in public protection, and 650,000 in urban renewal and sanitation. In a study conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity, Greenleigh Associates, Inc., calculated that it would be practicable to fill more than 400,000 such jobs during the first year of a new employment program.

The evidence is strong and consistent. Jobs are central to solving the crisis of cities and depressed rural areas. Public service employment provides an immediate remedy. Federal resources must be used, but the job creation programs should be locally operated. All that is lacking is the national commitment. To supply this missing link the committee recommends the adoption of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967.

I have already adverted to the statement of the Urban Coalition, which specifically endorsed the Emergency Employment Act, which was jointly submited to the committee by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, and which comes to the floor with the support of a majority of the committee.

Before asking unanimous consent that the statement of the Urban Coalition of September 15 be printed in full in the RECORD, I should like to point out that the members of the Urban Coalition represent a uniquely wide spectrum of respectable opinion in the United States.

We have had some talk—some of it in a lighter vein, some of it not—about the "establishment" in America; but I would say that, across the spectrum, from respected leaders of industry and banking through the chief executives of our principal municipalities, to prominent educators and churchmen, across to noted civil rights leaders and the leaders of the great labor movements in our country, we have in this Urban Coalition about as powerful a group of respected citizens as is possible to bring together.

I will not read the names of all of them, but among them are Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board of Time, Inc., and for many years the publisher of Life magazine; and A. Philip Randolph, the well-known civil rights and labor leader. They include the mayor of Atlanta, the mayor of Philadelphia, the mayor of Pittsburgh, the mayor of Detroit, the mayor of Boston, the mayor of Chicago.

These are the people who have to deal with the problems in the urban ghettos. They include Arnold Aronson, the executive secretary of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. They include some substantial industrialists: Roy Ash, president of Litton Industries; Frederick J. Close, chairman of the board of Aluminum Co. of America; Gilbert W. Fitzhugh, president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank; Theodore Schlesinger, president of Allied Stores; Asa T. Spaulding, president of North Carolina Mutual Insurance Co.; Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Co. Mayor Lindsay, of New York, I should not have skipped.

Prominent, too, are labor leaders George Meany and Walter Reuther. Among the civil rights leaders are Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young, Jr.

This is just a sampling of the strength of this leadership.

I now ask unanimous consent that the

statement of the coalition, issued on September 15, specifically endorsing title II of this bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT OF URBAN COALITION SEPTEMBER 15, 1967

The Urban Coalition endorses the Clark-Javits Emergency Employment Act as a significant step toward an urgently needed national emergency program to provide at least one million jobs. We urge the President to support it and we urge Congress to adopt it as part of the Economic Opportunity Act amendments this year.

With regard to the private sector, we commend Mr. Gilbert Fitzhugh of our National Steering Committee and the Insurance Industry for their recently announced commitment of $1 billion in mortgage and investment funds for the reconstruction of the core areas of our cities. We are encouraged that the program will take advantage of rent supplements and that the federal government has developed an FHA-mortgage insurance program for these areas as well as middle and upper income families in the suburbs.

In support of the job program, the Emergency Convocation, held in Washington on August 24, and attended by 1,000 representatives of business and industry, organized labor, religious groups, local government and civil rights organizations, endorsed a Declaration of Principles, Goals and Commitments which called for legislation consistent with the following principles:

The federal government must enlist the cooperation of government at all levels and of private industry to assure that meaningful, productive work is available to everyone willing and able to work.

To create socially useful jobs, the emergency work program should concentrate on the huge backlog of employment needs in parks, streets, slums, countryside, schools, colleges, libraries, and hospitals. To this end, an emergency work program should be initiated and should have as its first goal putting at least one million of the presently unemployed into productive work at the earliest possible moment.

The program must provide meaningful jobs—not dead-end, make work projects—so that the employment experience gained adds to the capabilities and broadens the opportunities of the employees to become productive members of the permanent work force of our nation.

Basic education, training, and counseling must be an integral part of the program to assure extended opportunities for upward job mobility and to improve employee productivity. Funds for training, education, and counseling should be made available to private industry as well as to public and private nonprofit agencies.

Funds for employment should be made available to local and state governments, nonprofit institutions, and federal agencies able to demonstrate their ability to use labor productively without reducing existing levels of employment or undercutting existing labor standards or wages which prevail for comparable work or services in the area but are not less than the federal minimum wage.

Such a program should seek to qualify new employees to become part of the regular work force and that normal performance standards are met.

The operation of the program should be keyed to specific localized unemployment problems and focused initially on those areas where the need is most apparent.

The Clark-Javits Emergency Employment Act is responsive to these princples. It is also responsive to the conditions of unemployment and despair revealed in the dozens of hearings held over many months by the Senate Subcommittee on Unemployment and is consistent with the findings and recommendtaions of the National Committee on Technology Automation and Economic Progress (Feb. 1966), the White House Conference to Fulfill These Rights (June 1966), and The National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber (July 1967).

In addition, we call upon Congress to expedite action in providing full funding for the poverty program, the rent supplement program and Model Cities. We also urge the adoption of the Equal Opportunity in Housing measure now pending in both houses.

We offer our full support in implementing these objectives.

ANDREW HEISKELL,
Cochairman.
A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
Cochairman.

Mr. CLARK. The statement points out that an emergency convocation was held in Washington on August 24, attended by a thousand representatives of business and industry, organized labor, religious groups, local government, and civil rights organizations; and it endorsed the statement of principles, goals, and commitments which has just been printed in the RECORD.

I should point out that the coalition statement called upon Congress to pass emergency job legislation which would create 1 million jobs. That was a little too rich for the blood of Senator JAVITS and myself. We cut that 1 million down to 200,000, for 2 years, which could grow to 300,000 or perhaps 350,000, depending on how the program would be administered during that 2-year period.

We felt it was not feasible, under present congressional sentiment, to do what these leaders of business, labor, industry, and church groups asked us to do. Their program would have cost a minimum of $5 billion for 1 year, or $10 billion for 2 years. Ours, I point out, is a much more modest program.

Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia did not advert to Senator PROUTY's amendment, nor have I done so in this talk. But Senator PROUTY and I had a colloquy about it earlier today, which interested Senators can read in the RECORD. I must say that, as a pragmatist and, I hope, a realistic Senator and politician, I believe the best hope of doing something for the poor, unemployed Americans who live in our urban and rural ghettos, on this 3d day of October 1967, in the light of congressional sentiment, is for me, as the floor manager of this bill, to accept the Prouty admendment.

I have discussed this matter with my colleagues on the subcommittee which reported the bill. They feel as I do, that if we could get the entire $2.8 billion for a 2-year program, this possibly would be perfection.

They feel it is most dubious that this could be done. They feel it is important, and so do I, that this should be a bipartisan effort to help the poor of America; not a Republican effort or a Democratic effort, but a bipartisan effort to join hands together to do something for these poor fellow citizens of ours who are denied so many of the good things of life.

I shall support the Prouty amendment tomorrow and I hope it will be agreed to. The Senator from Vermont described the measure at some length earlier this afternoon. I asked him a number of questions to bring out the strengths and possibly the weaknesses of his amendment. We will have little time tomorrow to debate the Prouty amendment.

Therefore, I say tonight that I shall support that amendment. I hope that absent Senators who may be interested will read of this support in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow, and perhaps our long-suffering friends of the press—who I am sure want to get home for dinner as much as I do—will report the commitment I have just made.

(At this point Mr. CLARK assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I shall not prolong the discussion, except for a moment. I wish to say that I respect the viewpoint of the distinguished, able, and congenial Senator from Pennsylvania. I admire his compassion for the poor, and what I have said this afternoon was not in any way any personal criticism of his efforts. I know that he has put a great deal of thought and much effort into developing the hearings, taking the testimony therein, and into formulating the bill that is before the Senate.

I congratulate the Senator for his zeal. I share his compassion for the poor. I am sorry we cannot agree with regard to the wisdom of retaining title II in the bill.

I would imagine that, if exhaustive hearings were held on the subject, it might be possible, at some future time and under appropriate circumstances, for his subcommittee to bring some language before the Senate that I and other Senators who oppose title II could accept. However, as I said earlier, I believe it is the wrong time now and the wrong approach. I have made my case against title II and I shall not attempt to repeat it now.

I expect to vote for the bill on final passage, but this would be difficult for me to do if title II were to remain in this bill.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of Senators who will read the RECORD in the morning, perhaps I should recall that, in accordance with the unanimous-consent request propounded by the majority leader today, it was agreed that after the prayer and disposition of the Journal tomorrow morning there will be a live quorum, following which 20 minutes will be allotted to the debate on the Prouty amendment, the time to be equally divided between the proposer thereof, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who opposes the amendment.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in ac-

cordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 4, 1967, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 3 (legislative day of October 2), 1967:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Edna M. Callaway, Orange Beach, Ala., in place of M. L. Brown, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Haakon T. Magnussen, Alpine, Calif., in place of P. G. Hall, retired.

Hugh A. Cassidy, San Rafael, Calif., in place of W. H. Williams, retired.

COLORADO

James A. Barrett, Mancos, Colo., in place of G. R. Noland, retired.

FLORIDA

Horace E. Treadwell, Oak Hill, Fla., in place of D. L. Hilldale, resigned.

GEORGIA

James H. Campbell, Cleveland, Ga., in place of C. E. Head, retired.

IDAHO

Louise K. Gosselink, McCall, Idaho, in place of R. B. Fields, retired.

ILLINOIS

John P. Hanley, Wilmette, Ill., in place of L. J. Orr, retired.

INDIANA

Wayne A. Kern, Bedford, Ind., in place of W. E. Shirley, retired.

IOWA

Wesley T. Ward, Dallas Center, Iowa, in place of R. G. Mann, deceased.

Dale D. Stupp, Hazleton, Iowa, in place of J. J. Snoble, transferred.

Rose M. Gelhaus, Ledyard, Iowa, in place of E. S. McDonald, retired.

Myron W. F. Ihde, Monona, Iowa, in place of M. M. Funk, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Rose K. Durbin, Nazareth, Ky., in place of M. K. Egan, resigned.

Harold G. Rice, Waco, Ky., in place of M. M. Bush, retired.

LOUISIANA

Doris L. Bradley, Sondheimer, La., in place of E. J. Dalfiume, transferred.

Estelle D. Gorman, Tullos, La., in place of C. D. Norsworthy, retired.

MARYLAND

Rachel B. Racine, Childs, Md., in place of F. B. Gallaher, retired.

George B. Hasson, Perryville, Md., in place of J. T. Barrow, retired.

William D. Beall, Stevenson, Md., in place of H. B. Long, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Robert L. Carrington, Granby, Mass., in place of R. T. Ruel, retired.

John G. Duffy, West Springfield, Mass., in place of R. J. Specht, retired.

MICHIGAN

Joseph V. Spreitzer, Allegan, Mich., in place of F. C. McOmber, retired.

John A. Mulligan, Plymouth, Mich., in place of George Timpona, retired.

MINNESOTA

Glenn O. Solomonson, Storden, Minn., in place of W. H. Roemer, retired.

MISSOURI

Robert E. Booth, Cainsville, Mo., in place of C. C. Thompson, retired.

Kenneth W. Bolton, Chaffee, Mo., in place of L. B. Papin, deceased.

Ralph O. Hood, Cosby, Mo., in place of W. C. Mandler, retired.

William E. Jenkins, Kahoka, Mo., in place of F. M. Story, retired.

Maurine Simmons, Malta Bend, Mo., in place of H. C. Taylor, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Betty G. Hoelting, Lawrence, Nebr., in place of W. H. Hoelting, deceased.

Bernadean R. Strufing, Martell, Nebr., in place of M. L. Wunderlich, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Laurent J. Ruell, Ashland, N.H., in place of C. E. Crowley, retired.

Richard P. Piper, Jr., Holderness, N.H., in place of J. M. Cripps, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Richard E. Case, Pennington, N.J., in place of G. C. Koeppel, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Ernest S. Castillo, Belen, N. Mex., in place of Martin Baca, retired.

NEW YORK

Ethel M. Reilly, Esopus, N.Y., in place of A. C. Jones, retired.

Virginia E. Hunt, Greenwood, N.Y., in place of M. H. Burd, retired.

Hilliard R. Crane, Livonia, N.Y., in place of F. B. Densmore, retired.

John F. Fosina, New Rochelle, N.Y., in place of A. J. Rivers, retired.

Jarvis E. Ireland, Panama, N.Y., in place of L. R. Wagner, retired.

Melva J. Sherman, Shelter Island, N.Y., in place of N. B. Dickerson, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Robert F. Corbin, Sr., La Grange, N.C., in place of M. D. Harper, retired.

OHIO

John W. Schromen, Orrville, Ohio, in place of J. W. Evans, deceased.

Elmer R. Klinger, West Farmington, Ohio, in place of W. S. Rice, deceased.

OREGON

Gladys M. Mortimore, Mitchell, Oreg., in place of C. M. Norton, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

David G. Anderson, Enon Valley, Pa., in place of M. A. Simpson, retired.

Elizabeth A. Lis, Everson, Pa., in place of Victor Wolinski, retired.

Liberty R. Catherine, Morrisdale, Pa., in place of T. A. Howe, retired.

Delbert L. Potts, Saint Petersburg, Pa., in place of A. K. Francisco, retired.

Charles S. S. Reppert, Shoemakersville, Pa., in place of M. A. Shappell, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Howard F. Tucker, Jr., Chepachet, R.I., in place of W. H. Seifert, retired.

Peter McLaren, Greenville, R.I., in place of R. L. Battey, retired.

TENNESSEE

Robert T. Jacobs, Beechgrove, Tenn., in place of J. A. Bryant, retired.

Edna E. Courtner, Butler, Tenn., in place of F. P. Curtis, retired.

Joseph W. Satterfield, Dandridge, Tenn., in place of R. M. Sams, transferred.

Harry D. Montgomery, Trenton, Tenn., in place of W. W. Taylor, retired.

TEXAS

Cornelious M. Hatch, Hamilton, Tex., in place of G. H. Boynton, deceased.

Charles E. Clifford, Jr., Hitchcock, Tex., in place of C. L. Woods, deceased.

Wesley E. Coburn, Huntsville, Tex., in place of T. G. Sandel, retired.

Robert E. Ligon, Loving, Tex., in place of M. B. Rowley, deceased.

Mary R. Morris, Mobeetie, Tex., in place of R. J. Tyson, retired.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Rupert R. Abramson, Frederiksted, V.I., in place of Curneall Watson, removed.

WEST VIRGINIA

Russell L. Morrow, Smithers, W. Va., in place of E. D. Burch, retired.

WISCONSIN

Louis S. Skarda, Coleman, Wis., in place of H. A. Martens, retired.

Richard L. Schwartz, Ixonia, Wis., in place of O. F. Huebner, retired.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Paul Masterton, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. Turner F. Caldwell, Jr., U.S. Navy.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Allen, James E.
Alley, Walter L.
Allison, Robert L.
Anzini, Bert J.
Appel, Harry L.
Armstrong, Eldon L.
Atchison, Thomas L.
Aubin, Charles D.
Bahr, Stephen M.
Baier, Joseph E.
Bailey, Kenneth E.
Baird, Walter L.
Baker, Robert W.
Baker, Stanley C.
Bakkala, Eugene J.
Ballinger, Robert W.
Banks, Harold R.
Barrett, James L.
Bean, Richard L.
Becker, James R.
Beckham, Jerry
Bell, Walter A.
Bell, William F.
Bennett, James G.
Benson, James N.
Bonjorni, Edward E.
Bornman, Richard E.
Boston, Glenn J.
Bourdon, Theodore J.
Boyd, Gerald G.
Brashear, James E., Jr.
Breidert, William E.
Brooks, Chapin C.
Brooks, Morris E.
Brown, Carl R.
Brown, Oval D.
Brown, Richard S.
Bruce, James R.
Bryant, Robert W.
Bucholz, Roger C.
Burck, Clarence W.
Burns, Dale M.
Burns, Jerome P., Jr.
Bush, Harold S.
Butler, Frank A.
Butrovich, John, III
Butterfield, John F.
Cameron, John F.
Carlson, Robert W.
Carlyon, Walter E., III
Carver, Marion E.
Cegler, Edmund C.
Chappell, Ralph E.
Christianson, Richard A.
Claassen, Aaron J.
Clapper, Richard F.
Clark, Ray L.
Cobb, Robert M.
Cody, Edward J.
Collins, William V., Jr.
Connor, James V.
Cook, Clifford V.
Cornell, Clifford L.
Cornett, Arthur
Courtney, Marlin A.
Cox, Arthur B.
Craker, Paul W.
Creekmore, Edwin W., Jr.
Crosson, Bobby D.
Cumbie, James B.
Cyr, Robert T.
Dalton, David H.
Dameron, Jack E.
Dassler, Frederick W., Jr.
Davis, James R.
Dawson, Wilbert E., Jr.
Dean, Donald R.
Deemie, William H.
Degange, James J.
Densmore, Dean W.
Dentremont, Albert G.
Dillon, James P.
Disharoon, Donald L.
Dobbs, Wiley G.
Dole, Howard W.
Domanski, Bernard J.
Donnelly, Ambrose T.
Dotson, William T.
Dozier, Loyle B.
Draper, James W.
Duffy, Marvin L.
Duncan, Carl T.
Durazo, Alfred M.
Eastberg, George E.
Eckhoff, Clarence, J., Jr.
Edmison, William J.
Elliott, David F.
Ernst, Eugene E.
Everett, Carl S.
Fee, James W.
Fell, William G.
Ferguson, James T.

Fiske, Eugene G.
Flanagan, Donald S.
Foley, Robert F.
Franklin, Eugene, C., Jr.
Frederick, James S.
Fried, Arthur A.
Friesen, James M.
Fuller, Jerry L.
Gammons, Robert A.
Garza, Jose E.
Gilbert, Proctor J.
Gilbert, Richard B.
Gillie, Earley C.
Gipp, Earl W.
Glass, Robert L.
Gless, Edwin H.
Goddard, Glen L.
Gomes, Benjamin J.
Good, James R.
Goodson, Joe B., Jr.
Gordon, Leonard
Graham, James E.
Graham, Ronald B.
Grantham, Nick H.
Gray, Lawrence S.
Gray, Robert J.
Greathouse, Robert L.
Green, George W.
Greenwell, William M.
Guthrie, Charlie M.
Haacke, Karl M.
Hahn, Gary T.
Haire, Charles R.
Hakes, Vander D.
Hall, Gaylon S.
Hall, John P., Jr.
Hall, John T.
Hansen, Jack C.
Hansen, Norman L., II
Harrelson, James T.
Harris, Hubert V.
Hearn, Ellison J.
Hefty, William A.
Heitzman, Dwayne J.
Helm, Samuel W.
Henderson, Ronald B.
Hendricks, Judson J.
Herrmann, Robert H.
Hess, Walter W.
Hewitt, William H.
Hilsabeck, Clayton N.
Hinds, Glenn W.
Hoglund, Delbert P.
Horne, Don M.
Hotalen, Robert J.
Hubble, Hilbert R.
Huckabone, Theodore W.
Hudson, Charles E.
Humphreys, Kellogg F.
Hunnell, Sherman M.
Hunt, Edmund J., Jr.
Hyneman, Roger T.
Irvine, Pickens W.
Irwin, Fred B., Jr.
Isaksen, Roy E.
Ivie, Gayland C.
Jackman, Richard M.
Jackson, Donald L.
Jackson, Roy B.
James, Leonard D.
Janes, James B.
Jeffords, John M.
Jensen, Robert J.
Johnson, Charles H.
Johnson, Douglas J.
Johnson, Golden H.
Jones, George R.
Jones, James R.
Kaufman, Jack J.
Kautz, John F.
Kear, Billie G.
Kegley, Ben L.
Keidel, Lawrence F.
Kimmel, Ronald C.
Kinard, Edgar C., Jr.
King, Francis L.
Kiser, Paul F.
Koch, Melvin A.
Kochenower, Bobby D.
Kramer, Larry E.
Kunz, Gerald W.
Lakin, John B., Jr.
Landis, Robert S.
Lanier, Bobby R.
Lassley, Arthur R.
Laurick, George
Lavelle, Donald L.
Lepore, Daniel J.
Lindley, James R.
Listol, Lavern D.
Lloyd, William E.
Long, Gerald E.
Longstreth, William A.
Looney, Robert L.
Lopez, Ambler B. M.
Loveless, Sheldon L.
Ludwig, Harvey E.
Lyons, Leonard S.
Madsen, George G.
Mallett, Charles A.
Maroney, Derrell
Martin, Michael L.
Mason, Roger W.
Matthews, John E.
Maze, Robert A.
McCrea, Charles M.
McCreary, James D.
McCullough, Robert I.
McDonald, John L.
McFearin, Allen L., Jr.
McGauley, Gilbert E.
McKean, Robert W.
McKnight, Jimmie D.
McLaughlin, John W.
McMahon, Thomas W.
McMeekin, Richard L.
McNab, John D.
McNett, Donald D.
Meek, Phillip D.
Mellendorf, Wayne H.
Michael, Robert E.
Migliorini, Ernest B.
Miller, Francis L.
Miller, William P.
Miller, William W.
Minnick, Steve A., Jr.
Mohler, Marvin L.
Moore, Frederick S.
Morell, Ronald W.
Morgan, Benny M.
Morgan, Robert E.
Morrison, Virgil E.
Morse, Gilbert M.
Murdock, Glenn E.
Murphy, Jeremiah J.
Nelson, Walter O.
Newbern, Thomas N.
Newton, William J.
Nilsson, Kenneth M.
Oakes, Floyd M.
O'Brien, John L.
Older, Clinton D.
Outcault, Frank W.
Overson, Claude L.
Owens, Compton C., Jr.
Parker, Kenneth W.
Parker, Thomas F.
Patin, Carl A.
Patridge, Delmar E.
Patten, Freddie J.
Paulson, Glen T.
Peak, Jack R.
Pemberton, Colin C.
Perez, Richard
Pfister, Raymond
Polinsky, John W.
Polk, Raymond F., Jr.
Pollock, Clifford, E.
Powers, Ralph V.
Pritchard, Richard D.
Pritchett, Roland H.
Radford, David A.
Ralston, Gene D.
Randolph, Richard L.
Reynolds, Claude D.
Rhodes, James L.
Richardson, Dix
Ridley, William D.
Ritz, Richard W.
Robbins, Shirley A.
Roberts, George H.
Roberts, John R.
Roberts, William A.
Robinson, Albert E.
Robinson, Keith D.
Roffey, Robert C.
Roman, Joseph N.
Rucker, Joseph T.
Ruhland, Ralph F.
Russell, James L., Jr.
Sadler, Jack R.
Sage, Ralph J.
Sandusky, Howard E.
Savage, Eugene M.
Schrader, Richard H.
Schwartz, Louie A.
Schwendinger, Ronald G.
Scobee, Mitchell O.
Scott, Jerry L.
Scott, Larry J.
Sears, Frederick D.
Seebeck, George
Seeler, Carl L.
Shaw, Earl D.
Shaw, Laroyce
Short, Mark S.
Shuford, Earl D.
Shustack, Edmund J.
Simmons, James R.
Simmons, Samuel M.
Smith, George H.
Smith, Guy A., Jr.
Smith, William F.
Snead, Thomas S.
Snodgrass, Carl E.
Soderberg, James L.
Spooner, Robert J.
Stanfield, James W.
Staton, Bobby P.
Stevenson, George A.
Stone, "S" "J"
Storaasli, Leroy O.
Strangeway, Leon E.
Stratton, Phil Z.
Suthowski, George E.
Swann, Jack T.
Swearingen, Gerald B.
Sweet, Jack H.
Taylor, Richard L.
Templin, Charles L.
Thieme, Glenn A.
Thompson, Henry M.
Thompson, Vernon R.
Thorn, Paul E.
Thurman, Ronald J.
Tosspon, Maurice C.
Tow, James D.
Trahan, Ronald G.
Trance, Roland G.
Tucker, Roger W.
Turner, James F.
Turner, William A.
Tyson, Paul D.
Valentine, Darrell L.
Vanderveen, Paul E.
Vipavetz, George F.
Wagner, Fernley R., Jr.
Wagner, Robert J.
Walker, William E.
Walls, Hulet G., Jr.
Walt, Charles E., III
Watford, Franky G.
Watkinson, William H., Jr.
Watson, Alva D., Jr.
Watson, William E.
Webb, Jay S.
Webb, Reginald C.
Weller, Jac S.
West, Edward E.
Whitehead, Robert C.
Williams, Donald F.
Williams, Paul V., Jr.
Williams, William
Windom, Bobby G.
Winterberg, Franklyn E.
Winthrope, Jeff G.
Wright, George G.
Wright, Willis T.
Yates, Robert E.
Yates, Robert H.
Yeager, John L.
Young, Martin P.

SUPPLY CORPS

Andrea, William R.
Archibald, Robert L.
Bartlett, Terry M.
Bennett, Herbert D.
Birmingham, Joseph F.
Black, John F., Jr.
Brigden, Jack A.
Collins, Jesse, Jr.
Craig, James B.
Dougherty, Daley D.
Driscoll, Eugene J.
Elich, Mitchell
Emde, Arthur B.
Fisher, Richard C.
Frank, Daniel S.
Gonzales, Virgilio G.
Gutman, Philip W.
Hall, Robert L.
Harris, Allen W.
Humphrey, Carl L.
Johnson, Creighton E.
Latorra, Donald J.
Lilley, Edward H.
Lord, Clifford C.
McMillen, Kenneth V.
Newson, Richard W.
Norton, William F.
Pettigrew, Daniel
Pica, Joseph N.
Romero, Severiano L.
Rucka, Edward T.
Schumann, Frederick W.
Smith, Jerry W.
Swing, John P., Jr.
Vroman, Henry A.
Waldrop, Charles G.
Wilmes, Donald J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Grover, William B.
Gunn, Alexander C.
Hartman, Franklin J.
Jarvis, Jimmie E.
Jobe, Eugene G.
King, Jerry W.
Malla, Joseph J.
Miller, Huey W.
Payne, Purcell C., Jr.
Schrader, Terry C.
Steffens, Eugene H.
Swinford, Harold D.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Antonopoulos, Adam T.
Aringdale, Gordon L.
Ayers, Samuel H., Jr.
Boyle, Richard L.
Butts, Charles, M.
Carter, Franklin W.
Chomiak, Donald E.
Clem, Nicholas J.
Combs, Wesley B.
Cook, Jimmie C.
Corley, Richard A.
Cota, Richard J.
Dekrey, Charles R.
Dotson, Robert M.
Felt, Water R.
Fisher, Frank D. R.
Galbreath, Jerry D.
Gregory, George H.
Hilling, Levi N.
Holcomb, Howard E.
Lashley, Kenneth L.
Lewis, Jack T.
McNamara, John E., III
Mullins, William F.
Oglesby, Norman G.
Pepera, Leroy J.
Piatt, Austin E.
Pilkington, Richard H.
Renfro, Gene F.
Robinson, Richard A.
Sammons, John H.
Skinner, Howard L.
Slipsager, Frederick A.
Smith, Lloyd D.
Spillman, Graham B., Jr.
Windholz, Francis L.
Wortendyke, John
Zink, George A.

Lieutenant Robert Crafts, Junior, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lieutenant (junior grade) Clyde W. Rogers, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lieutenant (junior grade) Ronald H. Thompson, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Supply Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bromley, Jack E.
Corman, William C.
Heckbert, Donald F.
Johnson, Benjamin M.
Sessions, William M
Smith, George D.
Smith, George R.

The following-named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Reustle, Charles H.
Wheeler, Eugene D.

The following-named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Brockley, John P.
Burgess, Larry L.
Craig, Norman L.
Crane, Stephen H.
Elliott, Thomas J.
Grieve, James E.
Gullickson, Lamoine K.
Long, Michael D.
Mellin, William F., Jr.
Morgan, William T.
West, Franklin G., Jr.
Withey, Thomas A.
Wixom, Robert F.
Young, Terrence J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Anderson, Edward J., Jr.
Claflin, Neville H.
Ketcham, Richard D.

Edward S. Hartford, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

James A. Haugen
Joseph J. Rudy, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Daniel W. Aljoe
George T. Allen
Ronald D. Alley
Edward L. Anderson
William A. Angus III
Russel L. Appleyard
Fredric G. Arnow
Lawrence J. Asmus
Bert L. Atwater
Albert M. Bacco
Robert T. Bailes
Stephen A. Banks
Anthony J. Baratta Jr.
Terrell W. Barlow
Gerard J. Barrett
Gerard F. Becker
Donald W. Blackwood
Gerhard H. Bonas, Jr.
John J. Born
Carleton B. Brink
Mark S. Brothers
James W. Brown
Jack A. Burgess, Jr.
Charles A. Burns
Phillip T. Buss
Mark L. Byars
Richard B. Carter
James F. Casey, Jr.
Howard M. Chatham
Cecil A. Clabaugh
Jerry A. Clements
Melvin A. Coble
William R. Cooper
Philip G. Corrigan
Anthony E. Cristina
Daniel H. Dennison, Jr.

Henry N. Didier
William R. Diwgosh
Anthony W. Dougherty
Robert E. Douglas
Jesse C. Drain III
Robert F. Duminiak
Robert W. Erikson
William S. Fellner
Richard M. Fessenden
Michael B. Flaherty
Jimmy M. Forbes
Floyd E. Freeman
Kevin P. Gallen
Anthony J. Gardella
Jeffrey W. Gartner
James E. Glading
Stephen W. Glidden
Eric R. Goepfert
Charles M. Goodsell
Gerald L. Green
William G. Groepper
Marshall V. Hall
James P. Hampson
Timothy M. Harisook
Charles R. Harley, Jr.
George S. Harris
Ralph R. Heffernan
James F. Higgins, Jr.
Thomas A. Hoffner
Bruce M. Holzapfel
Harwood Hoover, Jr.
Harry J. Hopcroft, Jr.
Alan L. Inglis
Clinton W. Inouye
Oleg Jankovic
Bernard Janov
John A. Jedrlinic
Robert K. Johann
Michael A. Judge
Thomas J. Keagy
Walter F. Keane, Jr.
James A. Kilpatrick
Albert Lew
Eric D. Lindstrom
John S. Locke
Frederick C. Louder, Jr.
Michael C. McConnell
Clemie McKinney
William T. McLaughlin
Dwight W. McNeace
William T. Magee, III
John M. Malone
William D. Marshall
Richard L. Martin
Martin C. Meade
Robert P. Meadows
Gordan C. Menzies, Jr.
William G. Mock
Julian L. Moon III
Vincent S. Morgan
Tim T. Morris
Hugh R. Muir
Raymond D. Munkres
Raymond S. Nichols
Jeremy J. Nittle
William J. Norris
Thomas C. O'Connor, Jr.
Raymond J. Palmer
Martin E. Plante
Joel A. Porter
Kenneth W. Prater
James E. Pruske
Orville G. Ramer
John N. Raudabaugh
John G. Reedy
William L. Rogers
Carl W. Rosengrant
Frederick G. Ruben
Paul A. Schaeffer
Roger L. Schenkel
Robert C. Schucker
Robert E. Schunter
Paul B. Shaffer
Tommy L. Shanyfelt
Porter R. Shults, Jr.
Stephen R. Smith
Robert M. Souter, Jr.
Wayne P. Starke
Victor J. Starks
David H. Starr, III
Thomas J. Stewart
John W. Strassberger, Jr.
Jonathan W. Strom
Theron S. Taber, III
Kennith W. Tapscott
Thomas W. Teneyck, Jr.
Kenneth R. Thompson
Willard S. Titus, III
James P. Virtue
Edwin J. Voss, II
David S. Watson
Ervin R. Way, Jr.
Richard D. Webb
Morris A. Weseloh
William R. Williams
William T. Williams
John H. Wilson
Carl J. Withee
Richard H. Woodrich
William W. Wright
Larry P. Yarham
Steven C. York

James W. Whatley (Navy enlisted scientific education program candidate) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

William D. Shepard
Bruce A. Thompson

Stanley B. Young (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Emile G. Abbott III
Homer A. Anderson, Jr.
Ernest L. Bade
Dean J. Beasley
Roger A. Bell
Joseph J. Bellanca
Victor J. Bilotta
Eugene L. Brown, Jr.
Joseph B. E. Brown, Jr.
Ronald K. Burke
James M. Carter
George V. Cestaro
David P. Colley
Robert T. Crosby
Douglas C. Dechairo
Jay S. DeVore
Albert J. DiVittorio, Jr.
John B. Dorsey
Larry R. Evertson
Ira L. Fox
Macea E. Fussell
Robert S. Gold
William R. Grandolfo
Joseph P. Green
Donovan D. Hanson
Garry C. Harris
William O. Harrison
Henry D. Haynes
Frank E. Isabelle
David G. Johnson
Harvey M. Jones
James K. Jones
Dennis M. Jurczak
Donald J. Kearney
John E. Kelleher, Jr.
Patrick J. Kelly
Donald W. Klopp
James A. Lambert, Jr.
Michael J. Levine
Robert B. Lewis
Thomas H. Loecker
Michael J. Lynch
Martin L. McRoberts
Ross E. McRonald
Robert B. Mallon
Calvin Marantz
Richard H. Mathews
Richard F. Meese
Norman D. Nelson
Craig R. Nolte
Phillip M. Park
William H. Peloquin
Albert B. Pleet
Joel A. Reisman
Richard F. Romfh
Jay F. Rowe
Robert H. Rozendal
William A. Schueller
Paul L. Schell
John A. Shea
John H. Senechal
Milton B. Shields
Nolan D. Shipman
Harold E. Sleight II
Philip R. Somers, Jr.
Dean E. Sorensen
Joseph A. Testa
Robert W. Tom
Donald R. Tredway
Edward S. Tucker
James W. Tyson
Gary F. Velat
John C. Vidoloff
Eugene J. Voltolina
Robert E. Walley III
James A. Waltermire
James L. Wolfsen
David B. Zurschmeide

Jack V. Lowman (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles M. Kawahara
Harry C. Mullins

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert W. Hinman
John F. Sadler
John R. Lohr

Warrant Officer (W-1) Stuart R. Heath to be a warrant officer (W-2) in the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Peter E. Benet
Thomas C. Cox
George M. Edmondson
Charles W. Gobat
Robert L. Gray
John I. Hudson
Robert H. Nelson
Middleton P. Ray
Richard D. Revie
Richard T. Trundy
John R. Waterstreet

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

George V. Best
Edward M. Condra, III
Louis P. Etcheverry

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Edward T. Barfield
Raymond C. Kinkead
Robert O. Tilley

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

Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr.
Laverne B. Arndt
Michael F. Barber
Patrick L. Barry
Lawrence J. Bolger
Walter R. Burroughs
Larry E. Campbell
Duane B. Capps
James M. Chapin
Clayton C. Christensen
Patrick J. Connor
Ralph E. Crafts
Rowland D. Creitz, Jr.
Thomas R. Delux
Wilbur C. Dishman
Richard D. Duff
Robert J. Eisenlohr
Martin J. Forrest III
James E. French
Barton J. Friebolin
Joseph L. Gerry, Jr.
Perry H. Gesell
Thomas L. Hall
Charles H. Hawkins, III
Donald R. Head
George R. Hofmann
Richard F. Hoogerwerf
Laurens J. Jansen
Joseph D. Joiner
Lee D. Kane
John N. Kennedy, Jr.
Frederick L. Kingery
Robert A. Kisch
Norman E. Lane, Jr.
Fred C. Lash
Michael R. Layman
Stephen I. Leonard
Frank Libutti
Gary N. Long
James J. Marshall
Dennis E. McCloskey
James J. McKnight
Eugene G. Meiners
John T. Mero
Russell E. Moke
Joseph H. Murphy
Clyde W. Muter, Jr.
Thomas E. Nadolski
Denver L. Newman, Jr.
Robert J. Peterman
James R. Petty
Sam Pisacreta
Robert S. Plaisance
Patrick D. Polk
Geoffrey K. Rasmussen
William A. Rawson
Richard D. Rodriguez
Robert T. Rohweller
Zebedee L. Rush
Roger L. Sanders II
Klaus D. Schreiber
Thomas A. Schwindt
Donald C. Scott
Millard M. Shell
Charles W. Shobe
Larry E. Smith
Michael Z. Smith
David A. Snyder
Terry W. Stone
William D. Turnbull
Allen E. Weh
John K. Wetter
Joseph H. Williams

Captain James A. Addison, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy (Retired), to be a permanent captain in the Medical Corps of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, 1211.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Howard J. Samuels, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Alexander George, St. John's Eastern Orthodox Church, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bow before You and acknowledge that we have failed to lift our eyes to the vision of peace among men which You have revealed to us. Teach each of us to be dissatisfied with fine words, to work constantly for the brotherhood of man and justice for all men. Make us one under You in quest of the precious things of the spirit. Bestow upon us truth and liberty, human rights, the dignity of the human person, equality of large and small, and peace's blessings.

Let us rededicate ourselves to the work for which this House of Representatives was elected—to save our own and generations from the scourge of war, to construct a world which guarantees the freedoms, justice, and peace which are Your endowment to all Your children.

We ask this in the name of one who never won a committee vote nor who was ever found among the majority opinion of His day, Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SUPPORT OF CEASE-FIRE AND NEGOTIATIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I recently experienced considerable surprise when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] came out of an executive session of his Senate Preparedness Subcommittee and said that if what Secretary McNamara had just told committee members were true, "the United States should get out of Vietnam at the earliest possible time and on the best possible basis."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this came from a man of great ability and stature who heretofore had been in favor of our bombing policy on North Vietnam. However, today, he has, with the firsthand knowledge of our national policy, altered his views with respect to Vietnam.

Since his days as Secretary of the Air Force, I have had a high regard for Senator SYMINGTON, and during his service to the Senate he has impressed me as extremely knowledgeable in matters having to do with national defense. On this account, I have awaited a report on his recent visit to South Vietnam, for, as I said, he had previously fully supported an all-out effort in Southeast Asia.

Earlier today, Mr. Speaker, the Senator reported to his colleagues in the other body, and I am sure the Senator's view will be of great interest to Members of the House. Senator SYMINGTON called today for the Government to announce, "as of a certain date, the cessation of all military action in South Vietnam, as well as over North Vietnam, also announce that there will be no reinforcements into the theater."

The Senator said the Government should announce that these policies were being undertaken in the earnest hope that their adoption would result in prompt and meaningful negotiations in the interest of a just peace.

However, Mr. Speaker, he added that if the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong continued hostilities, then the United States, of course, must feel free to pursue this war in any manner of its own choosing.

As a Member of the House who has been supporting reconsideration of Southeast Asia policy, I think we must ask ourselves the cost and consequences of permitting the costly military stalemate in Vietnam to continue along present lines for another 5 years or longer.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, may I express the hope that action to stop all fighting and bombing be announced and that we try this cease-fire that the Senator and many others have called for.

Let us proclaim that free elections having been achieved, we want to negotiate and order a cease-fire.

THE GREAT FALL CLASSIC

Mr. WIDNALL. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, we have had much discussion recently of the need to expedite the business of the House by scheduling legislation on Mondays, Fridays, and even Saturdays.

Starting tomorrow afternoon, however, the most important business confronting our Nation will be conducted in Fenway Park rather than here under the Capitol dome. Those of us who are not privileged to be from Boston—or for that matter, from anywhere in New England—will have to be tolerant of those who are. With the stirring finish of the Red Sox leading to their participation in this year's great fall classic, starting with tomorrow afternoon's opening game, we will have to display a high degree of understanding to those who will not be here to answer the rollcall. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I suspect many members of the Massachusetts delegation would risk political suicide were they flagrantly to display their absence from Fenway Park by responding to the rollcall tomorrow. In short, the so-called Tuesday to Thursday Club will be put to a severe strain during the next few days.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that I do not think there would be a single eyebrow raised in surprise, if, when the House meets tomorrow afternoon, we find that the Speaker's gavel itself has been passed to the unfriendly hands of a Cardinal rooter.

TRIBUTE TO GOOD SPORTSMANSHIP

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed very much the remarks made by my colleague on the outstanding achievement of the Boston Red Sox.

I also want to express my congratulations to the other three teams who fought so hard to the last game. I also want to express my congratulations to the other teams that were out of the race for the championship of the American League for their competitive spirit right up to the last game.

While I am very happy at the Red Sox winning, there is a deeper lesson that we can learn from the competitive spirit in baseball.

Boston had to win the two final games, and yet, on the other hand, if Detroit had won the doubleheader, Boston and Detroit would have been tied for first place and would have had to engage in a runoff. And yet the Angels were fighting hard with competitive spirit to win that second game, which they did.

I am not gloating over the fact that they won the second game, but I point out the fine exhibition of clean sportsmanship, the players fighting under highly competitive conditions to win.

In congratulating the Red Sox, I think we can learn a lesson, all of us—the people of America—from the fine spirit of the men who play in the big leagues and other leagues. But the spirit of the American League, going down to the last gun, not only the teams who had a chance to win but the teams who had no chance of winning the championship, carrying on in a highly competitive spirit to win until the last ball was pitched by the pitcher and the last batter swung his bat, was clear to all.

So I am very happy that the Red Sox were victorious, but I pay tribute to all the players of both major leagues.

SUPPORT FOR MILITARY POLICY IN VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I have supported the President's military policy in Vietnam and I do so today. I believe that the President wants to end this miserable war as soon as possible, but not at any price. As the Commander in Chief of our Nation's military might, he alone is privy to all information and facts that guide him in the conduct of this military action.

To pull out of Vietnam would be abandoning that country and all of Southeast Asia to communism and a complete renunciation of this country's treaty obligations. If we abandon Vietnam, where do we put up our next defense against communism? Cambodia? the Philippines? or San Francisco?

If we have to stay, we have to win.

For 6 long years we have been mired in the mud of Vietnam in a battle which has taken the lives of thousands of America's finest young men and cost countless billions of dollars.

Our allies have been disappointing and frustrating. Without exception they are calling on us to halt the bombing as a show of good faith. We have done this several times before with absolutely no results. In fact, they used those respites to further build up their military effort so that they could kill more American boys. And, still our allies say "Stop the bombing."

I would like to make this suggestion to our President. Go ahead and agree to a bombing pause of 2 or 3 weeks as a further evidence of our sincere hopes to negotiate peace. But tell North Vietnam and the rest of the world that, if at the end of this bombing halt, there has been no meaningful effort by the enemy to come to the bargaining table, or if they violate the respite in obvious bad faith, then we intend to close up this war once and for all by doing what we have the military capability of doing. By that, I mean a total, all-out effort to win, using every weapon that is necessary to obliterate every target that can possibly support the enemy. This would include closing the Port of Haiphong as well as any other area of supply.

If we have a no-win policy in Vietnam—it should now be abandoned. The American people want this war over.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand the motives of those who would halt the bombing of North Vietnam.

U.S. bombing of North Vietnam is aimed at strictly military targets and those targets directly contributing to North Vietnamese terror and aggression. No bombing in the history of the world has been conducted in such a humane manner. We carefully avoid casualties among civilians, even to the point of endangering the lives of our pilots.

Many of those demanding that we cease bombing North Vietnam cheered the loudest when our airpower destroyed the cities of Germany and brought an earlier end to the war. Many advocating that we now quit bombing and leave our men in South Vietnam to the mercy of the North Vietnamese war lords offered no objection to the bombing of the Nagasaki, Hiroshima, and Tokyo and which thus ended that greatest of all Pacific wars.

The American people at the grassroots cannot understand this strange behavior of an increasing number of our national leaders. Would these people restrict our men to bows and arrows because some of the enemy west of Pleiku use outmoded weapons? The only military advantage the United States has over the Red enemy hordes of Southeast Asia is our science and technology—our airpower, our naval power, and our missiles. We do not have the men to match, man for man, the aggressors in Asia.

We must support and protect our men who are engaged in the fighting by using our superior firepower and our air supremacy. The greatest deterrent to Chinese intervention is our superior airpower and our bombing of North Vietnam. Should we become so foolish as to create a sanctuary in North Vietnam by a permanent halt in the bombing, the Red Chinese millions could pour into the protected areas of North Vietnam and nearby neutral countries.

To halt the bombing would be the surest way to escalate the war—giving Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung the green light to further aggression and conquest. Rather than halt the bombing, the time has come for the United States to consider, after due warning, the full application of our air and sea power. Mr. Speaker, this would be far more humane and moral than the murder, terror, and torture daily conducted by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese against South Vietnam civilian officials, women, and children.

Further, Mr. Speaker, we should declare a national emergency in order to deal with those here in the United States who are aiding the enemy and undermining our fighting men in South Vietnam and those standing guard for peace and freedom the world over.

HELP FOR POOR AND UNEMPLOYED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the question: "Why can't the Great Society help the poor without bringing hanky-panky into the game?"

I note that the President has suggested the laudable idea of job training for the unemployed in our cities. He proposes that private industry be invited to do the job—a position we Republicans have been advancing against overwhelming indifference in this Congress and downtown for the past 4 years. But, instead of doing the job plainly and above board, the President has suggested that business firms who participate can get "special advantages in bidding on Government contracts."

This, of course, is downright bribery. It is use of the taxpayers' dollars to coerce business to earn favors at the Pentagon by participation in the President's program: It is an open invitation to corruption and clandestine deals. It is discriminatory against firms that might be extremely capable in the field of defense production, but financially not able to go into the social welfare field. They would lose defense contracts to firms who might not be able to produce as well or cheaply but who "played ball" with L. B. J.

I contrast with this process the Republican Human Investment Act which proposes to supply job training, by the simple and practical process of providing tax incentives to reimburse business firms for the expenses of buying machinery, hiring technicians and providing job-training facilities. This is a straightforward approach. It would do the job without undue cost to the taxpayer and without the taint of privilege or favor.

I regret that the worthwhile objectives of the President's program have been entwined with the questionable policy of special favors in return for helping the poor and unemployed. Again I ask: "Why can't the Great Society help the poor without playing a game of hanky-panky?"

THE TRUTH ABOUT BUDGET CUTTING

Mr. EILBERG. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for some straight talk about the budget.

In 1966, if the President had decided to ignore the appropriations bills passed by the Congress and spent the money as he saw fit, the cries of objection would be echoing still.

Yet today, in 1967, that is exactly what the Republican Party is demanding of the President.

The Republicans are demanding that the President—by himself—cut $5 billion from the budget.

This vote seeks to confer on the President awesome power—in my opinion more power than any President should have. It would give the President discretion to pick and choose among programs without any advice from Congress which has studied these programs for 8 months.

Mr. Speaker, any action by Congress which says in effect, "We cannot do the job we were elected to do; here, Mr. President, you do it," is government in reverse.

Is this what the Republicans want? I thought they were the party that is always warning about an all-powerful centralized government. Now they say, "Let's give the executive branch the powers that rightly belong to the Congress."

By the same token, the President cannot cut from any appropriations bills which have not passed the Congress. There are now nine civilian appropriations on which we have not yet acted.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must face its responsibilities honestly and courageously. This is the way we must operate if we are to steer the Nation on a sound and prudent fiscal course.

RECISION OF APPROPRIATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to another one of these speeches by our Democratic friends in respect to the fiscal situation.

I think it ought to be quite clear that the House is under control of the Democratic Party and, of course, the Congress should assume its responsibilities in cutting back expenditures. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee has said that his committee is going to meet to consider recision bills. This certainly should be done. But that action does not alter the fact that the President also ought to be doing his job in cutting back on the fiscal year 1968 expenditure level.

I can assure the gentleman who just spoke in the well and other Democrats who have been talking about the responsibilities of Congress that they will get full cooperation from the Republican side in getting recision bills, so that the Congress will be able to undertake its primary responsibility of cutting back expenditures. It is because the Congress has defaulted under the leadership of the gentleman's party that we find ourselves in such a fiscal situation that we must ask the President, or tell the President to cut back. I suggest that we in the Congress move forward on our own front.

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE WASHINGTON SENATORS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, since this seems to be "Baseball Day," I think it would be fitting to say a kind word about the Washington Senators—and I do not mean the other body. After all, Washington was figured by all the experts to wind up in the cellar. Last year Baltimore won the World Series championship in four games. In case any of you failed to notice, this year we ended the season tying Baltimore in the final standing.

I think our team, the Senators, deserves our commendation and full support.

GREAT BALLPLAYERS COME FROM NEW YORK

Mr. CAREY. 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 New York ?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, just to get in the ball game, may I suggest by way of requiem that we do not have baseball any more in Brooklyn, but since reference was made to the Boston Red Sox and the Washington Senators, I do note in passing that the manager of the Washington Senators still resides in Brooklyn, N.Y., and that is where he gets his good baseball ideas. And the Boston Red Sox would not be the Boston Red Sox except that on the great day we in New York mark the nationality of the Polish people, we saw fit to let Yastrzemski leave the place where he resides in New York and go to win the pennant for Boston. So we in New York take credit for our sons' winning on the diamonds all over the country.

WHITE SOX WILL WIN IN ELECTION YEAR

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the White Sox of Chicago, I hasten to explain that this was all planned. The pennant was safely in the grasp of the White Sox, when on an early autumn day somebody whose mind was not on baseball questioned in the hearing of the conquering White Sox the reelection of President Johnson. So the White Sox decided to postpone their pennant for 1 year that 1968 would be a year of double celebration, in October of 1968 the White Sox winning the pennant and in November of 1968 President Johnson being reelected to another term as President of the United States.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

E. F. FORT, CORA LEE FORT CORBETT, AND W. R. FORT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2661) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. INGE HEMMERSBACH HILTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6096) for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6096

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Inge Hemmersbach Hilton shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on page 1, line 7, after the words "visa fee.", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MAURITZ A. STERNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3865) for the relief of Mauritz A. Sterner.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8091) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SETSUKO WILSON (NEE HIRANAKA)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 534) for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 534

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka) may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

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

MARIA KOLOMETROUTSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7427) for the relief of Maria Kolometroutsis.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

HUBERT ASHE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4404) for the relief of Hubert Ashe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL and Mr. GROSS objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COL. GILMOUR C. MACDONALD, U.S. AIR FORCE (RETIRED)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10932) for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10932

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations, lapse of time, or bars of laches, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any legal claim filed by Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, United States Air Force (retired), Shalimar, Florida, for compensation for the usage by the United States during World War II and the Korean conflict of a tubular caltrop tire puncturing device allegedly invented by the said Gilmour C. MacDonald.

SEC. 2. Suit upon any such claim may be

instituted at any time within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. Except as otherwise provided herein, proceedings for the determination of such claim, and review and payment of any judgment thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference or admission of liability on the part of the United States.

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

ELPIDIO AND NATIVIDAD DAMAZO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3727) for the relief of Elpidio and Natividad Damazo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3727

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elpidio and Natividad Damazo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 27, 1958, and June 16, 1959, respectively.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the names "Elpidio and Natividad Damazo" and substitute in lieu thereof the names "Elpidio Dimacali Damazo and Natividad Simsuangco Damazo".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FEIGHAN

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: On page 1, strike out the date "June 16, 1959" and substitute in lieu thereof the date "July 11, 1959".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Elpidio Dimacali Damazo and Natividad Simsuangco Damazo."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTHA BLANKENSHIP

The Clerk called the bill (S. 117) for the relief of Martha Blankenship.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 117

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Martha Blankenship of Meador, West Virginia, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,887.86, representing the amount of survivor benefit payments which were erroneously paid to the said Martha Blankenship under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 incident to the death of her brother, Hasten Daniels, such payments having been used by the said Martha Blankenship to pay the funeral expenses and debts of her deceased brother prior to a determination by the Railroad Retirement Board that such payments should have been made to the surviving children of the said Hasten Daniels. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Martha Blankenship, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from her on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

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

VIRGILE POSFAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1884) for the relief of Virgile Posfay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1884

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Virgile Posfay, former Royal Hungarian Minister Plenipoteniary and Envoy Extraordinary, residing in Naples, Italy, the sum of $3,700 in recognition of the services performed by him, including personal expenses incurred by him in performing such services, for and on behalf of the United States, as an Austro-Hungarian consul at Monastir, Albania, in charge of handling the interests of the United States of America, in the years 1906, 1907, and 1908.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

SECOND LIEUTENANT ALLAN L. SCHOOLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6325) for the relief of 2d Lt. Allan L. Schooler.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DR. ABRAHAM RUCHWARGER

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 493) to refer the bill (H.R. 9326) entitled "A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Ruchwarger" to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 493

Resolved, That the bill (H.R. 9326) entitled "A bill for the relief of Doctor Abraham Ruchwarger", together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, for further proceedings in accordance with applicable law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. RAY F. McMILLAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2283) for the relief of Dr. Ray F. McMillan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2283

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, Doctor Ray F. McMillan, Kensington, California, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any amounts of excess compensation paid to him in the period from July 1, 1957, to September 10, 1966, as a civilian employee of the United States Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, which was subsequently ruled to have been erroneous due to a continuing error in fixing the amount of compensation covering attendance at the United States Naval Air Station in accordance with applicable regulations.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, after line 11, add the following: "In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the respective amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act."

After section 1, add the following:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Doctor Ray F. McMillan, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him with respect to the indebtedness of the United States specified in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 292]

Aspinall	Gray	Pool
Barrett	Green, Oreg.	Rarick
Blackburn	Gubser	Taft
Brock	Hanna	Teague, Tex.
Broomfield	Hays	Utt
de la Garza	Holland	Vander Jagt
Derwinski	Kee	Watkins
Diggs	McClory	Williams, Miss.
Edwards, La.	Martin	Wilson, Bob
Esch	O'Konski	
Fountain	Ottinger	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 400 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 10196, APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 10196 making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

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

There was no objection.

RICHARD K. JONES—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 454) for the relief of Richard K. Jones, with the House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASHMORE, HUNGATE, and SMITH of New York.

FOR THE RELIEF OF GILMOUR C. MACDONALD, COLONEL, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings of the House whereby the bill (H.R. 10932) for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force, retired, was passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 179, the bill (H.R. 10932) for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force, retired.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10932

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations, lapse of time, or bars of laches, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any legal claim filed by Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, United States Air Force (retired), Shalimar, Florida, for compensation for the usage by the United States during World War II and the Korean conflict of a tubular caltrop tire puncturing device allegedly invented by the said Gilmour C. MacDonald.

SEC. 2. Suit upon any such claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Except as otherwise provided herein, proceedings for the determination of such claim, and review and payment of any judgment thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference or admission of liability on the part of the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHMORE

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: On page 2, following line 10, add a new section 3 as follows:

"SEC. 3. No attorney shall charge, demand, receive, or collect for services rendered, fees in excess of 10 per centum of any judgment rendered pursuant to this Act. Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with such claim any amount in excess of that allowed under this section, if recovery be had, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1160, TO AMEND THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none; and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, MACDONALD of Massachusetts, KORNEGAY, SPRINGER, and BROYHILL of North Carolina.

GOP TACTICS TO CUT OFF ALL GOVERNMENT FUNDS IS NOTHING MORE THAN AN ATTEMPT TO EMBARRASS THE PRESIDENT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the world may soon be witnessing a rare spectacle indeed: The U.S. Government—the richest and most powerful on earth—may not be able to pay its bills.

The reason, of course, is that our Republican colleagues have irresponsibly voted for recommital of the resolution for a continuing appropriation.

Their purpose, Mr. Speaker, is either to admit their failure to deal with the complexities of the budget or to embarrass the President of the United States. Apparently our Republican colleagues are blind to every consideration, except election year 1968. Anything they can do now—including paralyzing the U.S. Government—to bolster their chances next year seems to be fair game.

I doubt whether Congress has ever witnessed more irresponsible and reckless conduct by the total membership of one side of the aisle. These Republicans know full well that President Johnson is not the only one responsible for trimming the budget. Only the Congress can repeal or amend the laws which set these expenditures.

But our Republican colleagues want to pretend this is not so. They want President Johnson to wield the cutting knife. They want him to take the heat and cut back on such programs as aid to our schools, housing funds for our cities, protection for our commercial airways, aid to our veterans' hospitals, and loans to bring electricity to our farmers.

In their actions, they are completely allocating their responsibilities as Members of Congress to judge on the budget items submitted to Congress by the President.

The Republicans want $5 billion cut from the budget. Let them tell us where to start cutting, Mr. Speaker. Let them give us the specifics—what programs and in whose district.

Let them stop playing such blatant and hypocritical politics with such a vital matter as the Nation's fiscal welfare.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 938 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 938

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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution 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 Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], representing the minority in the consideration of this resolution, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to say in the beginning that I am troubled enough about the problem that is presented here, and I hope my colleagues will bear with me and not add to my troubled mind.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said here last week, in the well of this House, that no problem I have been called upon to deal with in recent years has caused me more trouble of mind than the problem presented here about the mechanics of reaching the desired objective of cutting expenditures. I am not going to take any time here to tell the House, "I told you so." All I want to say in that connection is that for the past couple of decades, in an ever-escalating degree, we have been spending the taxpayers' money like it was water.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed further I think it might be advisable to again put this whole matter in its proper prospective as to what has brought this House, rather belatedly I think, to realize the necessity for reduction in expenditures in the first place and secondly to present and analyze the problem of how it is to be done.

Of course, we all must realize that the hassle over expenditures is brought about by the fact that the Congress must face the President's request for additional taxes and the realization by the Congress that new and burdensome taxes are not popular with the already burdened taxpayers.

It is apparent now, therefore, that the majority of this House, if not the Senate, realizes that if there is to be a tax bill there must also be a drastic cut in expenditures; otherwise the projected possible deficit for the current fiscal year, $30 billion, could well exceed that awesome figure. This being true, the machinery by which it is to be accomplished is the real problem.

Under the parliamentary situation we must take one of two alternatives. Either we adopt the continuing appropriations resolution, largely sponsored by the Democratic majority and thereby give the Appropriations Committee a further opportunity in an orderly legislative manner to do the job; or the other alternative is the so-called Bow amendment, sponsored by our Republican friends, which would delegate to the President, in the form of a mandate from the Congress the authority to make the necessary cuts.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons which I shall develop as I go along, I shall support the committee resolution largely because I am opposed to giving the President this additional power.

We have been reminded from time to time, as these programs for new ventures into social welfare and the socialistic state have come up, that this very hour was going to arrive. It was just a question of time.

Now the hour for decision has again arrived, for you as well as for me.

When this matter was up before, I wrestled with it, considering what I should do and how I should cast my lone vote for the best interests of my country and for the objective sought. At the last moment I decided, in the dilemma in which I found myself at that moment, to vote for the Bow motion to recommit, just as I had voted for all of the Bow amendments to cut back on the several bills already passed, which the gentleman had offered.

May I again compliment my friend from Ohio by saying that he has made a very valuable contribution in the past, and he is making one now, because he is calling to the attention of this House in a very forcible manner that we have reached the hour of decision.

As I say, I voted for the motion to recommit. I was troubled. I am not without trouble now in my mind.

I went home over the weekend and got away from the trees here and began to examine the forest, in the brief time I had, to come to what I thought would be the proper conclusion.

I would vote today as I did the other day, except for two reasons.

One is that I tried to get my chairman of the Appropriations Committee and my leadership to permit me to offer an amendment, when this matter was before us last week, which would have done exactly what they propose to do today; namely, pass an extension for 10 days rather than 30 days. But they did not see fit to do that.

Who am I to criticize them for it? I do not.

What I had in mind then was to give the Appropriations Committee an opportunity, both the majority and minority members, to get in the committee, behind closed doors and to forget partisanship, if any existed, and try to come to a correct and agreeable conclusion on the mechanics by which to make the necessary expenditure cuts which everybody now appears to be agreed upon should be made.

Who is responsible for this situation we find ourselves in? Is it the President of the United States? Yes, to a substantial degree. But who else is responsible for it? It is the people who honor me by giving me their attention here now, the majority of the Members of this body.

We are the ones who are responsible for this crisis, if crisis is how you want to designate it. I say that because again I remind you the President of the United States could not spend one thin dime unless this Congress authorized it and appropriated it, and that is what we have been doing. Yes, the President of the United States, just to spell it out, made a grave mistake, in my judgment—and as a citizen I am entitled to be critical of him if I so see fit—when he said that we could have the Great Society and carry on an all-out war at the same time. I disagreed with him then and I disagree with him now. I think time has shown that he was in error. How long has it been—search your memory for a moment—how long has it been since we were talking about the fact that if we did not cut down on these appropriations and expenditures we were going to have a $100 billion budget here? Well, we arrived at it in 1965, to the tune of $110.2 billion. In 1966 we went up to $121 billion. In 1967 it was $144.8 billion. And the escalation is still on. What are we going to do about it? That is the thing we are faced with here today. I will tell you what I want to do with it. I would like, as some of you would, to lay this thing on the President's doorstep, but I hasten also to point out that I have been traditionally opposed, as you have been traditionally opposed, to giving the Chief Executive the item veto power. Every President in my time has sought that power. We can do that here today by resolution, but if we do we set a dangerous precedent. It is argued he already has that power, but I do not admit it. I do not know where the Constitution of the United States or the Congress of the United States has given him that power. He may use it by usurpation, but once you set out on this type of a program, then you are setting the precedent and the President will get it and use it just as previous Presidents have desired and asked for it. I emphasize again the danger of this step.

Now, I do not like to talk politics. I do not think my record here—and I am sure the administration would bear me out on this—has been a very partisan one. But if we want to talk politics I would urge a word of caution. If I were in the minority, speaking of the minority in the broad sense—and sometimes I think I am in the minority in a rather limited sense—I think I would be very cautious about giving the President the item veto power here. I imagine that the President, being human, could be vindictive. I am not charging that he would be. He might want to take it out on the minority. I imagine he wants to see a Democratic Congress back here after next year's election.

But, I would be awfully cautious about giving him that power. I am cautious

about it now as a matter of principle, primarily, because I do not want to let the President of the United States permit these doubtful, Great Society programs, go unscathed, and cut other well established and successful programs.

So, Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that I am not sure my Republican friends over here—many, many of whom are my close friends—are really taking the proper approach to this problem—you have today the political advantage in the move you are making—the temporary advantage. But I doubt its wisdom in the long run.

But, again, I would suggest caution about setting this dangerous precedent.

Now, finally, because I cannot take all of the time, I am going to vote for this 10-day extension resolution, hoping for the accomplishment of the objective which I tried to get the other day. I am going to do it with the knowledge or at least the thought that you are not going to be able to do much in 10 days. In fact, I apprehend that there will be an extension later on. But within the period of 10 days the able gentlemen on both sides of the aisle who constitute that great Committee on Appropriations, can sit down and work out some kind of a formula to cut these expenditures back $5 billion, or more.

But, suppose you do not? You can always come back to the so-called Bow amendment.

And, Mr. Speaker, as one Member of this House I pledge my vote and effort to support some other resolution to accomplish the objective we seek.

Mr. Speaker, I have definitely come to the conclusion that that is the course that I should follow. I shall certainly find no fault with anybody who votes differently because I know that they too have wrestled with this problem, as I have.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to attempt to explain the parliamentary situation before us today as best I see it.

The resolution before us from the Committee on Rules, House Resolution 938, will make in order House Joint Resolution 853, with 1 hour of debate.

House Joint Resolution 853 simply changes the date by striking "September 30, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 10, 1967" on the continuing resolution, which would be to and including midnight a week from today.

It is what we refer to as an open rule, for the purpose of amendment, but such amendments would necessarily have to be germane.

You will remember last week we had the Bow amendment before us, and eventually the matter was recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations. The Bow amendment as we handled it last week, and as I will mention to you later, would not be in order in my opinion as an amendment offered to House Joint Resolution 853. We all know that this cannot be done by next Tuesday night, because the appropriation bills will not be through. It is my thought that last week, when the two sections, 105 and 106, and the language of the Bow amendment were sent back, the resolution was sent back to the Committee on Appropriations by the vote of the House of Representatives, it was my interpretation that that was somewhat of a mandate for the said committee to bring out a resolution for a 31-day extension until October 31, 1967, coupled with the Bow language. But that is not what happened. We simply have a resolution to continue it until next Tuesday night, 10 days into October.

So, following up on the procedure as I understand it, in an effort to get the Bow amendments back before the body, which would not be germane as an amendment to House Joint Resolution 853, it is my intention to object to the vote on the previous question and attempt to have the previous question voted down.

If the previous question is voted down, then there will be 1 hour of debate for that discussion, and a vote thereon. If it is voted down I intend to submit the following language: The resolution before us that we are considering is House Resolution 938, now, that is from the Committee on Rules. On line 11, after the period, insert the following:

> It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the text of joint resolution H.J. Res. 846 as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the provisions contained in H.J. Res. 853.

You will recall, as I mentioned, House Joint Resolution 853 is the resolution by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to extend this until October 10, next Tuesday. The resolution that I am referring to, House Joint Resolution 846, is a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] on September 26, 1967, and that resolution reads that the date, September 30, will be stricken and insert in lieu thereof October 31, 1967.

In other words, it is not for 10 days. It is for 31 days.

Then following that, the part of the resolution which we considered last week, are the two sections. There is section 105:

> SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, net aggregate administrative budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall not exceed $131,500,000,000; except by those Department of Defense expenditures beyond $72,300,000,000 for military purposes that the President may determine are necessary.

And then there is section 106:

> SEC. 106. Not later than ten days after the last day of the first session of the Ninetieth Congress, estimated administrative budget expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall be reduced, through the apportionment process, by $5,000,000,000 (the difference between currently anticipated administrative budget expenditures for fiscal year 1968 of $136,500,000,000 and $131,500,000,000). Obligational authority in an amount equal to the $5,000,000,000 reduction in expenditures shall no longer remain available, and such sum shall be covered into the Treasury.

I wanted to read this resolution because many of the Members may not have seen it. The language here is identical with the amendments that we considered and which were debated at considerable length last week on the floor of the House.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have tried to follow the exact wording of the gentleman from the outset. I have been asked by quite a number of Members on our side as to whether I would offer a substitute or an amendment to the gentleman's motion in the event we should reach the place where the Bow amendment could be offered.

The gentleman is calling the attention of the House to the amendment to the rule that he anticipates. I am asking the gentleman if his proposed amendment to the rule would enable those of use on this side to offer a substitute for or an amendment to the Bow amendment?

Mr. SMITH of California. As I attempted to state, my language that I have prepared here is in the nature of a substitute to make the Bow amendment, House Joint Resolution 846 in order for consideration.

Mr. WHITTEN. Quite definitely; if the gentleman has his way, he will make the Bow amendment in order.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. Would a substitute for the Bow amendment be in order under the proposed language?

Mr. SMITH of California. What does the gentleman mean? What does the gentleman have in mind when he speaks of a substitute? Let me say this—if the previous question is voted down and if my amendment is then adopted, and then we would go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union with 1 hour of debate with 30 minutes on the right and 30 minutes on the left for the consideration of the Bow amendment, House Joint Resolution 846. At that time any amendments can be offered to that. An amendment could be offered to strike out section 105 and section 106. An amendment could be offered to change the time.

I realize in the original resolution before us for consideration, it is only for 10 days. I am asking for 31 days. The reason I am willing to ask and agree on 31 days is because of the Bow language in there and with the requirements of sections 105 and 106.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to make plain what I have in mind. My thought is that under the Bow amendment we were inviting the executive department to make these cuts where the President may see fit. If I have read the press accounts correctly, the President in turn has announced that he expects to make cuts on his own initiative in the absence of the Bow amendment.

I think the House needs to discharge its responsibility and not surrender to the President or the executive department either under the Bow amendment, which invites the President to eliminate such items and programs as he may wish or by nonaction, cause the President to do the same thing, without invitation.

The purpose of the amendment which

I shall offer in the Appropriations Committee, if the previous question is approved would call for a deferral in expenditures across the board, retaining in Congress the choice of projects and programs.

Having asked these questions, I thought the gentleman is entitled to know the point of my questions.

Mr. SMITH of California. If I understand the gentleman correctly, if my language is substituted and House Joint Resolution 846 is then before the House, it would be open for amendment in any way and be a completely open rule—and, of course, it would have to be germane. That is what I am trying to do to make it in order and have it before the House so we can have a vote on it.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand the situation, the crucial vote will come on the vote to order the previous question; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of California. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Those who vote against the previous question will in effect be voting for a $5 billion limitation on or reductions in expenditures and a date for the continuing resolution of October 31 rather than October 10.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think it is important that all of us understand that the vote on the previous question will be construed, whether the language is in the RECORD or not, that by voting "nay" on the previous question, you will be voting for a limitation on expenditures of $5 billion, and a "yea" vote is again an indication of no ceiling on expenditures for this current fiscal year. A "yea" vote is to support President Johnson's inflationary budget with $141 billion spending from the Federal Treasury in 12 months.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is correct. I think the easiest way for us to have been able to present this to you would be simply to send down an open rule from the Rules Committee making in order House Joint Resolution 846, the Bow resolution, which was introduced on September 26, which would extend the appropriations until October 31, and would place that language in. Then the resolution would have been open for all germane amendments. But we did not have the votes in the committee to do that. So the other method of continuing for 10 days was agreed upon, and we would be faced with a point of order. That is the only way that we could get it before the House for a vote.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think the gentleman from California has just answered the question I intended to propound, and that is simply this: Is it not true that the only way under the parliamentary situation that this House can have a vote "yea" or "nay" on the Bow resolution is to vote down the previous question, and then amend the rule to make it in order for us to consider whether we want to adopt the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of California. That is correct. If the previous question is voted down and my language is offered to substitute the Bow resolution, that will be open to any amendment, such as continuing the appropriations until October 31 or passing the joint resolution as it is.

If we simply let it go 10 days we know very well there are no restrictions on it, and 10 days would not help. We are going to take Thursday and Friday off because of religious holidays, and the 10 days will be completed next week. The joint resolution would go over to the other body. They would simply add "October 31" or some other date. The joint resolution would come back, go to conference, and then we will come back later on to have another vote to vote the conference report down. We would then send it back to conference and instruct the conferees to change the date or include the Bow language in the joint resolution.

In my opinion, the only way to get at the question is to vote down the previous question, get the joint resolution before the House, and let every Member vote his will, voting the joint resolution with the Bow amendment, then up or down, and we would have the question resolved.

So far as continuing resolutions are concerned, after that is done, if we do it that way, I doubt there will be much more difficulty during the rest of the year on continuing resolutions, and if the Appropriations Committee carries on the real work they are doing.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think it was the impression of most of us that last week the House worked its will and gave a firm mandate to the Committee on Appropriations. Of course, the Committee on Appropriations did not accept that mandate—in fact, went in the face of it. Those who voted last week to give the mandate to the Committee on Appropriations certainly ought to be consistent and say again that we as a body want a spending limitation, and that vote will come on the previous question. Those who voted last week to issue that mandate to the Committee on Appropriations, to be consistent, ought to vote the same way, which is "nay," on the previous question today.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The minority leader, as is his right, said that a vote of "nay" on the previous question will be a vote to impose the Bow amendment. But I think it could be argued just as logically that a vote of "nay" on the previous question, when it comes before us here today, will be a vote of no confidence in this House of Representatives and in its Appropriations Committee. I think that will be just as much an issue and just as much a correct statement of what is at issue when we vote on the previous question.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of repeating myself, I will say briefly once again the resolution before us, if adopted, provides for consideration of a simple joint resolution for a 10-day extension.

I am going to ask that the previous question be voted down, and, if it is voted down, that the language of House Joint Resolution 846 be made in order—that is the Bow amendment of last week, which we voted on last week—which extends the date to October 31, and it will be open for any type amendment all the way down the line.

This is the only way it can be brought to the House—the best way to my knowledge—and I urge those who feel as I do to vote down the previous question, to see if we can have an opportunity once again to discuss this matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday—September 27, 1967—this House, by a vote of 202 to 182, made it crystal clear that it favored the Bow resolution over the one introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

So here was a clear mandate by the House, on a rollcall vote, to have the Bow resolution brought back to the floor so that it could be decided on its merits.

I regret that the Committee on Appropriations declined to follow the will of the House as expressed in that motion to recommit last Wednesday, and I also regret that the Committee on Rules did not grant a rule which would make the Bow resolution in order for consideration today. But since both of these committees have seen fit to ignore the expressed wishes of a majority of the Members who voted last Wednesday, our only recourse is to ask Members to vote down the previous question and thus give themselves an opportunity to vote on the Bow resolution. This can be accomplished only by amending the rule after the previous question has been voted down. In all fairness to the majority who voted in effect for the Bow resolution last Wednesday, I think the previous question should be voted down today because that is the only way the House can be given an opportunity to work its will on the Bow resolution.

A vote against the previous question is not a vote for the Bow resolution but is a vote to give the Members an opportunity to consider that resolution on its merits. I respectfully urge that Members are entitled to that opportunity and I ask that the previous question be voted down.

I cannot agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma that a vote against the previous question would be a vote of no confidence in the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee deals with new obligational authority requested by the President, but the Bow resolution deals with the level of spending proposed by the President in fiscal

year 1968. These are different animals and this difference is often forgotten or perhaps not really understood by some Members who do not deal with the subject on a day-to-day basis.

In order to understand what we are talking about, it is necessary to point out that the President in his current budget asked for new obligational authority in the amount of $144 billion, and this is the budget figure with which the Appropriations Committee has been dealing all year. But the administrative spending program for next year is fixed in the budget at $136.5 billion, and it is this sum that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] seeks to reduce by use of his resolution. This is not the budget proposal with which the Appropriations Committee deals, as I have already pointed out.

The request for new obligational authority is exclusively under the control of Congress and its Appropriations Committees. And up to this point in the session the House has reduced these requests by approximately $4 billion. In my opinion the House will achieve the goal which I for one announced, when the budget was originally transmitted, of cutting requested new obligational authority by $5 billion. We made that $4 billion cut and will make the future ones on a line-item basis. I am willing to accept my part of the responsibility for the cuts already made and which will be made in the future. No member of the Appropriations Committee is seeking to pass that responsibility over to the President.

But the expenditure budget, that is the level of spending proposed by the President next year, is largely outside the control of Congress and its Appropriations Committees. The only way Congress could control that level of spending is by rescinding billions of dollars of previously appropriated funds. This is because the President has on hand, in previously appropriated but unspent funds, $125.6 billion and he proposes to dip into that pool for $39.3 billion of his spending program in 1968. Of the $144 billion in new obligational authority requested this year, the President does not even propose to spend $48.3 billion of that amount in fiscal year 1968, but plans to carry it forward for expenditure in future years.

There is another very practical reason why the Bow resolution offers Congress the only real opportunity it has to exercise any restraint on the level of spending in fiscal 1968. And that practical reason is because one-fourth of the new fiscal year has already passed and we are in what we all hope are the closing days of this congressional session. It would be quite impractical to expect the Committee on Appropriations to redo all of the work that it has required 9 months to accomplish so far this year. Four appropriation bills have already been signed into law; 12 out of 15 have already cleared the House of Representatives; seven have cleared the other body; and three are still to be acted on in either body. But most of the spadework has been completed or is in process of being completed right now. All hearings have been completed, hundreds of witnesses have been examined, and thousands upon thousands of pages of testimony have been taken. All but three appropriation bills have been marked up; and now after all of this work has been completed it is proposed, as an alternative to the Bow resolution, that the committees redo all of this work. I am willing to do it all right and am willing to begin tomorrow. I believe a rescission bill is in order and I will fully cooperate in the effort to bring one to the floor. But I respectfully point out that the most effective way to accomplish the desired objective is to pass the Bow resolution.

In 1957 a somewhat similar procedure was undertaken. On May 12, 1957, the House adopted a resolution calling upon President Eisenhower to send up a revised budget. I voted for that resolution and I would vote for a similar one today. It should not make any difference who is President. This is not politics so far as I am concerned. But there are several substantial differences in the situation which obtained in 1957 and that of today. In the first place, the fiscal situation is substantially different.

The Government ended fiscal year 1956 with a surplus of $1.6 billion, and it ended fiscal year 1957 with a surplus of $1.5 billion. These were Eisenhower years. But in fiscal year 1967, which has just ended, the Government wound up with a deficit in excess of $9 billion and faces a deficit of $29 billion in the current fiscal year. These are Johnson years.

And in 1957 we were considering a proposed administrative budget expenditure of $71.3 billion for fiscal year 1958. Today we are considering expenditures of $136.5 billion—an increase in proposed administrative expenditures of $65.2 billion in one decade. What a record.

And another difference in the situation is that when the previous resolution was before the House it was being considered on March 12, with all of the rest of the year before us. This was 3½ months before the end of the fiscal year. Appropriation hearings were still in progress. Today we are considering the current resolution on October 3, after one-fourth of the fiscal year has already passed, and there is less than 3 months of the current session to run.

For these and other reasons I repeat that this proposal of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to inaugurate new hearings and studies, made as a resort to defeat the Bow proposal, is simply impractical at this late day in the session. But I assure him that I shall certainly cooperate and will support his every effort to find places where the proposed spending level can be reduced.

In conclusion, let me remind Members that this is not a grant of new power to the President. He has exercised this power in the past without any challenge from Congress or from its appropriations committees. It is in my judgment a responsible way for Congress to act, in view of the circumstances heretofore related. It is in my judgment the only practical way Congress can exercise any control over the spending level in 1968. The President has made it clear that he intends to make cuts in the level of spending, but he does not propose to tell us where those cuts will occur or ask for the approval of Congress. He proposes to make them unilaterally and they may be more or less than the $5 billion cut proposed in the Bow resolution. This Bow resolution is in my judgment the only way that Congress can exercise any real and meaningful control over Government spending in 1968.

I therefore urge my colleagues to vote down the previous question so that we can then have a debate on the merits of the Bow resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman can get me a minute or two, I shall be glad to yield to my friend from New York or to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Mississippi, Hon. BILL COLMER, chairman of the Rules Committee.

When this matter was up last week I had this to say—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 27, 1967, pages 26,966–26967—I quote:

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in general agreement with the various statements that have been made as to the seriousness of the situation. My record for voting against programs and policies which has brought our situation about will compare favorably with anyone in Congress.

The question before us is, What shall we do about it?

As I understand the situation, there is pending a continuing resolution to let the Government operate until all appropriation bills are passed and signed. I know we must, in view of the situation, reduce these appropriations in an orderly, judicious, and effective manner.

We all agree that the situation is serious, perhaps as much as my friends on the left have said, and certainly as much as my friends on the right have said. But let us review briefly the fact that we all know we have the separation of powers provided by the Constitution.

Among the tragic things I have seen in recent years, first, is that the Supreme Court has taken unto itself, apparently in many instances, the right to be the supreme department—or so the members act.

Another thing I have seen that I deplore is the fact that the Congress has, in my opinion, abdicated to the executive department more and more power. We give them the right to take actions unless we veto them.

I want to say that this morning the Appropriations Committee took an unprecedented action, to my knowledge for the only time in history. This morning not only did the committee do as said here, but more.

Let us see what my friends on the Republican side asked, and particularly my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [JOHN BYRNES], notwithstanding the fact that we know in times past the executive department froze money for veterans' hospitals and recommended drastic cuts in school lunch and school milk programs, which the Congress had to restore.

The gentleman quotes the Secretary of the Treasury as desiring the right to give this power to the executive department, to tell the Congress where programs will be reduced or eliminated, instead of Congress meeting its responsibility of making such cuts and eliminations.

Yes, the amendment offered by my friend from Ohio would place a ceiling on expenditures and leave it up to the executive department to apply the entire reduction to the school milk and school lunch programs, to veterans' hospitals, or veterans' benefits, if he saw fit to do so. I trust he would not do that, but I do know in times past his Bureau of the Budget has recommended drastic cuts in many of these areas.

Not only that, but the gentleman from Ohio excepts all expenditures of the Defense Department, or up to the amount of $72.3 billion.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Bow. Just a word. I do not except the funds of the Defense Department. I except the funds of the military. There is a difference.

Mr. WHITTEN. For military purposes. The language speaks for itself, and I appreciate the gentleman's calling my attention to it. Certainly I want to be fair. There is no finer man in Congress than FRANK BOW.

But the amendment does except an area where there are many things identified as military which certainly have no connection with our present war in Southeast Asia.

There are many, many things in the name of defense, Mr. Speaker—and I serve on that subcommittee—that should certainly be reviewed. In fact, I think you could cut $5 billion without stopping the flow of a single weapon of war or affecting the war. I speak for myself only on that. But here is what I come to. The measure before us is the adoption of this resolution permitting the running of the Government for 30 days as presently operating. Prior to its adoption, as I understand it, the gentleman from Ohio or someone will offer a motion to recommit the resolution to the committee.

The committee took another action this morning, and that is what I want to talk to you about briefly. You heard the discussions of the first part of this action taken by the committee, as I say, for the first time since 1943, since I have been on the committee, and I think for the first time in history, the committee, by a rollcall vote, provided as follows:

"The committee will carefully review the appropriation action of the session and determine whether or not, prior to adjournment, to recommend recisions of appropriations previously made, giving consideration to the latest revenue outlook and other economic factors at that time."

What it means is that the committee has gone on record as going over these items, item by item, as determined by the Congress, and to tell the Congress what to do in the exercise of its responsibility and in the discharge or the carrying out of its jurisdiction. I have been assured that reductions will be made.

I say to you a motion to recommit, if carried, would undo this specific action that your committee has had the nerve to do by a united vote on my side of the aisle, that is, commit itself to action.

Do not be caught sending it back there. You are undoing that resolution adopted by a rollcall vote.

The other side of the matter is, if you accept the motion to recommit, you are doing so at the instance of Members who voted against that commitment. You are doing so at the instance of Members who said, "Let us turn over to President Johnson the right to withhold funds from any program that he may see fit," instead of the Congress reducing funds.

Now, I have nothing to say to make the problems any heavier on any President, but it is a responsibility that few Presidents would want even though the Secretary or the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury seems to have advocated it, according to Mr. BYRNES. I say to you politically you can understand that some of our friends might like a President of the opposite party to have to lay his finger as to where the cuts would be. That is understandable. I would welcome such recommendations to the Congress, but I cannot understand a Congress abdicating to the President the right to cut where he wanted to. I tell you that in recent years when the executive department and the judiciary have been usurping the rights of the Congress and when on occasion my own committee, may I say, in my judgment, has not always lived up as much as I thought they should to their responsibility, I felt perhaps such action should be taken, but here, where we have taken action and acted in good faith and have ourselves adopted a resolution and announced to the world that we are going to meet and consider these items with the intention to make cuts as the Congress determines as provided by the Constitution, I say do not send this resolution back and undo the most forward step that has been taken by the Committee on Appropriations since I have been in Congress.

I agree with how serious the matter is. We have taken a step toward correcting it in the proper way. Let us hold onto it. I assure you that whether you let conditions continue for the 30-day period as provided by the committee resolution or send it back to the committee, I expect within the committee to move that the House reduce appropriations in line with the fiscal situation with which we are faced. * * *

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a request that the business of the Government be permitted to operate for 10 more days while we work out a solution.

May I say I have not been idle since last week. I have here a proposal which I have made to the Appropriations Committee and to the Democratic caucus which would provide that Federal spending by each department and agency of Government, except for military expenditures of the Department of Defense directly related to our involvement in Southeast Asia, including pay of all military personnel, the payment of interest on the national debt, social security, veterans, medicare and old-age assistance payments, as well as payment of officials and other personnel, the exact number of which is fixed by law, for the fiscal year 1968, shall not exceed 95 percent of the amount expended during fiscal year 1967, and further that, insofar as practical, each department and agency shall absorb such reduction by not filling vacancies. Efforts to meet such reduction of expenditures by stretching out the time schedule on performance and payment on contracts should be made so as not to eliminate new construction starts.

In the event this 10-day resolution is adopted, I shall press for such a course of action.

As the debate has shown here today, if the Bow resolution were to be adopted, the Congress would be inviting, in fact requiring, the President to cut appropriations where he pleases, and it is to be anticipated that his cuts will be in line with his recommendations to the Congress last year when the President recommended drastic cuts in funds for school lunch, school milk, soil conservation, flood control, water and sewage loans, and many other necessary programs, funds which we had to restore, and, if the Bow amendment is not adopted and Congress itself does not act, but retains appropriations as already provided by both Senate and House, either individually or jointly, the President has announced that he will withhold appropriations from such programs as he sees fit, on his own initiative.

In such case, doubtless he would cut these same programs which mean so much to our people and to the preservation of our country. There is every reason to believe he will not cut foreign aid or other programs in which he believes, in other words his "butter" programs.

Thus, it is imperative that the Congress act to retain its jurisdiction and responsibility under the Constitution, and by requiring a little belt tightening on everybody's part, retain the projects and programs provided by the Congress.

We need this 10 days' time to bring this about.

Again I subscribe to the remarks of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, BILL COLMER, and shall vote for this 10-day extension and assure you of my efforts at getting congressional action in view of our serious financial situation.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let us make no mistake about it. We are approaching what may be the most important single vote of the 90th Congress. The Nation faces a fiscal crisis. This vote will separate the men from the boys. It will separate those who are willing to do something about facing up to that crisis and those who want to continue to drift. Let me point out that every day we drift the situation becomes more acute. A quarter of the fiscal year is already history. It cannot be retrieved, and we are still facing the potential of a $29 billion deficit.

I know Members like to talk about economy in Government and the dangers of Federal deficits and scream about high interest rates, tight money, the increasing cost of living. Yes, Members like to make speeches about the problems of the poor, those on fixed incomes, those living on social security, and about the need for housing and jobs.

Well, the vote this afternoon will separate those who want to do something about these problems and those who just want to make speeches about them. Those who want to make matters worse, yes, to drift and continue to drift and who just want to continue to make speeches will vote for the previous question on the resolution before us. A vote for the previous question is a vote to prevent this House from working its will on establishing a spending ceiling. It is a vote to do nothing about the deficit except to hope and pray that maybe it will go away. It is just that simple. The question before us, the issue, is are we going to seize this opportunity to do something about the deficit that faces us and the consequences of such a deficit in terms of increasing cost of living, tight money, high interest rates, and a worsening balance of payments.

Let me point out to my friends on the Democrat side that these dire conse-

quences are not ghosts under the bed; they are not some figment of my imagination. They are consequences that were outlined to you; yes, and to me and to the country. The most recent detailed outline was by the Secretary of the Treasury on September 21 when he spoke before the National Press Club. I referred to the consequences outlined by the Secretary when I spoke on this matter last week. The consequences have been outlined by the President and by the Council of Economic Advisers and the Federal Reserve Board and by eminent business leaders, economists, industrialists, bankers, and financial leaders.

I am not very impressed, frankly, and I do not think that the American people will be impressed by the excuses being offered today by the Democrat members who oppose this effort to cut back and put a lid on Government expenditures. They are offered, interestingly enough, by those who talk the loudest about increasing costs of living and constantly express concern about the poor and about tight money and about high interest rates. But when the time for action comes, they are opposed to putting a lid on Government expenditures and halting the rise in interest rates and living costs that fall heaviest on the poor.

The thing that disturbs me more than anything is that this seems to be becoming a partisan issue as we now try to do something about the fiscal crisis facing the Nation. It was not a partisan issue in the Committee on Ways and Means during the last several weeks when we have had appearing before us these financial experts who told us about the problem of this deficit.

Mr. Speaker, it was not a partisan issue when the chairman of the committee, and others, were telling the administration that they should come up to us with some table of cuts; that they should establish some cuts; and oh, yes, where they were going to do it.

Well, if it is going to become partisan, well and good.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 2 minutes on this side to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let us take it to the American people. The American people want a cut in expenditures. The American people want the expenditure explosion brought under control. They want the deficit cut. They are not going to be very concerned about who does it—about whether it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States or the President of the United States. They want it down and those who vote in opposition to establishing an expenditure ceiling are turning down one opportunity to do it.

Democrat spokesmen can argue all they want that it is the Congress that should do the cutting. Let it be remembered that it is the Democrats who have control of this Congress. They had control in 1965 and 1966 when the groundwork was laid for the expenditure explosion and the current crisis. They have not only failed to bring the explosion under control, they are responsible for letting the expenditures get out of control. They are still doing nothing about it. Their only response to the crisis which they have created is to oppose efforts to put a lid on spending.

This crisis is not something that has come upon us by surprise. Some of us raised the caution signal over a year ago. I pointed out in remarks yesterday that the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee predicted the approach of the fiscal crisis in reports filed in September 1966 on the tax adjustment act, in June 1966 on the debt ceiling, in September 1966 on legislation to suspend the investment credit, in February 1967 and in June 1967 on the debt ceiling.

Those who now talk about making a review of appropriation bills should have known of the crisis and the need for a greater control over expenditures. As early as this spring when it was perfectly clear that rather than the $8 billion deficit projected by the President in January, we were facing a potential $29 billion deficit. These people heard the President's tax message of August 3 but they still did nothing about it. Now at this late date they oppose a spending ceiling and they tell us, "Don't make the President do it: let us do it."

Let me say to you who have control over the Congress and who now oppose our efforts to bring spending under control, "You have already failed. You are already too late."

Why should not the President of the United States be called upon to put a ceiling upon his spending plans, bringing the total down from the $136 billion set in the budget to $131 billion? Let me ask you gentlemen: Who established this $136 billion figure? Was it the Congress of the United States? No, it was the President of the United States who established that figure, and the Congress of the United States is calling upon the President of the United States to cut it back.

We hear the argument that this would represent an item veto, that we are giving the President of the United States authority that should be reserved to the Congress. Let me point out to you the fact that today the President of the United States has the item veto authority in terms of whether he spends money or not, and everyone of you gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations knows it. You send to him an appropriation bill or obligational authority and he determines whether he is going to spend all the money, part of the money, or none at all, and for what. He can make the determination as to whether to expend some of it or to expend none of it. You know that is the case. You know that he already has discretionary authority. In fact he has told us he is going to cut the sum of $2 billion. He will cut it where he wants to cut it and, further, he has all of the authority in the world to do so, authority which we provided in the past.

The Bow amendment will take away some of this authority. It would say to the President of the United States, "You can only expend $131 billion and not $136 billion." In fact, unless we impose a ceiling he can spend more than $136 billion, he can spend more than the $144 billion.

Yes, this may well be the most important vote of this session of Congress. To be decided by this vote is whether or not the House of Representatives will face up to the opportunity to do something about the dangerous deficit facing us. I would warn that you turn it down at your peril.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we are at a crucial moment in the House of Representatives today.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has deplored politics and said that this is not a partisan issue. But, last week, 100 percent of the minority Members present voted for the motion to recommit the continuing resolution. It seems strange, unless partisanship was a motivating factor, that there was such unanimity. This should not be a partisan issue but the minority has made it a partisan issue. The minority is trying to build an image.

Mr. Speaker, the best hope of this Nation is the Congress of the United States. And, he who would destroy the Congress, its prerogatives and its powers, is working contrary to the best interests of this country and contrary to the finest traditions of our land.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is seeking to abdicate authority of the Congress. Countries have gone down the drain in years past when eloquent speeches were being made, and legislative bodies were weakened and destroyed. And the speakers were being cheered, as was the gentleman from Wisconsin today. But I say this is a moment to determine that we shall retain the power of the purse in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the House, it seems clear, will cut appropriation requests for fiscal year 1968 at this session by $5 billion or more—$5 billion or more. We have already cut $3.8 billion, a very substantial sum. We can do more. I propose that we set as our goal a cut of $6 billion.

I have already arranged, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for the subcommittees to conduct hearings, and they have begun seeking further ways to reduce appropriations and expenditures in the four appropriation bills which have already become the law. They are Legislative, Treasury-Post Office, Interior, and Defense.

It is my hope that a recision bill can be brought to the House next week in one or more of these appropriations, and Congress can work its will and retain its power over the purse.

Just today, in a conference between the House and the Senate, at long last we have agreed on the $13 billion Labor-HEW appropriations bill, and the conference report will be filed tonight. If the House feels that the amounts agreed to are excessive, the conference report is subject to recommittal. Even when it is enacted into law, efforts to rescind moneys made available can be considered.

Members of subcommittees handling other bills than those which have already passed are confronted with conferences or plans for conferences with the Senate on the remaining eight bills, such as independent offices, public works, and so forth, which have gone to the Senate. We will conduct, however, while we await a settlement in conference, ex-

ploratory hearings to seek further reductions in these eight bills. Of course, nothing final can be done until the principal appropriation bills have been settled and enacted into law. As I stated earlier, one for $13 billion should be settled this week and several others should be settled during the month of October.

Three bills have not been considered by the Congress because of lack of required annual authorization. We can and will make sharp cuts in these bills when they come before us. The cuts will be sharp if the Members will sustain us.

In seeking to achieve further reductions in appropriations and expenditures, we are considering—and we began considering last week:

First, the recision approach which I have just discussed, to some extent.

Second, a more generalized approach such as an across-the-board cut in personnel, a limitation on each agency on funds available for appropriations, and/or funds available for expenditures.

The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As chairman of the committee, I am determined to press—and I am pressing for further reductions in appropriations and spending above the $5 billion appropriation cuts already anticipated. And I shall do, along with those who share these views, everything in my power toward the attainment of these ends.

Of course, I must work through the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Appropriations must work through the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I propose that this Congress wage a sustained, unrelenting, and determined effort extending to the final adjournment of this session of the Congress to cut appropriations and spending and authorizations.

If you believe in that philosophy, vote with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] on this continuing resolution.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because it has been my impression, talking to several of the subcommittee chairmen on appropriations, that they intended to look not only at the current appropriation bills but also at the carryover, obligational authority which was estimated a little bit ago by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] at $125 billion.

The gentleman from North Carolina said it was his view that there was no power whatsoever in the Congress to do anything about this whole carryover obligational authority. Is that the understanding of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MAHON. To the extent that trust funds are involved, we have some limitations. But funds generally will be subject to recision if the Congress desires to take such action. Carryover funds will be considered in our study of reductions that can be made through the recision or limiting process. That is correct.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Do I understand then that the chairman of the committee will bring to the floor next week at least one recision bill so that Members will have an opportunity to put up or shut up?

Mr. MAHON. This is the plan I have proposed. I shall undertake to follow through on it.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to clear up a misunderstanding in the mind of my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, who understands that we had no power at all over these unexpended funds, except our control of that limited and specifically mentioned, we do have recision power on part of those funds.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I should like to say to the very distinguished chairman of the committee, I am delighted to hear the statement he has made here today as to what the Committee on Appropriations will do in the next few days. I doubt very much that the gentleman would have made that statement had it not been for the amendment which was offered last week. It has now gotten to the point where the committee chairmen and the committee realize that something must be done. So I think we have made some real progress by offering the amendment. In view of what the gentleman has said, I cannot see why he should oppose the right of the House to pass on the Bow amendment.

Mr. MAHON. The Bow amendment would assign to the President complete authority as to where to make reductions in spending and shifts in spending and, therefore, of course I could not vote for the Bow amendment.

I think the Congress ought to discharge its responsibility, as difficult as it may be at times.

RIGHT OF THE PRESIDENT TO WITHHOLD APPROPRIATED FUNDS FROM EXPENDITURE

Mr. Speaker, last week, and again today, there has been some debate about the matter of appropriated funds being withheld by the President from expenditure. This is at all times an important question and we should keep before us the law on the matter. Thus I think it would be useful to reprint at this point from my remarks at page 26960, of the RECORD of last Wednesday when we first debated the October continuing resolution:

RIGHT OF THE PRESIDENT TO WITHHOLD APPROPRIATED FUNDS FROM EXPENDITURE

A further matter which may be troublesome and which should be considered is that of the right of the President to withhold the spending of funds which have been made available by the Congress.

As a general proposition, there has been and there is in my opinion the attitude on the part of the Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, that when Congress appropriates money for Federal programs of one kind or another, it is the responsibility and duty of the Executive, generally speaking, to carry out the will of the Congress and proceed with the programs and expenditures which have been approved by the Congress.

However, the gentleman from Ohio has stated that the President has complete authority to withhold funds which are appropriated and made available to the various agencies of the Government.

And he cites the fact that the President has in many instances—and all Presidents have in some instances—failed to expend, for the programs appropriated for, funds made available by the Congress.

Now, wherein does the President have the authority not to expend funds for the programs which Congress authorizes and appropriates for? I would like to turn to an act which was approved by the Congress in 1950. It is the antideficiency law, and it gives the President some authority to withhold expenditures, but it does not give the President the item veto. We have always taken the position that no President has the right to exercise the item veto, this would give the President authority over the Congress which would be intolerable, and utterly unacceptable. So what did the Congress do under the leadership of the late John Taber, former chairman of the committee, and others? The committee and the Congress improved the antideficiency bill by tightening it up; by putting some teeth in it; by generally improving it. I will read from the antideficiency law the following—31 U.S.C. 665:

"In apportioning any appropriations, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements—"

In other words, the law says that the President can withhold expenditures and effect savings—and we certainly do not oppose savings—whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements. And there are at times changes in requirements—

"greater efficiency of operation."

If he can make savings by a greater efficiency of operations—

"or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available."

Now, that is the law, but that does not give the President item veto or indiscriminate authority to withhold the expenditure of funds for programs which have been authorized and funded by the Congress.

The trouble with the so-called Bow amendment which was offered earlier is that it provides complete and total authority for the President to eliminate any and all programs regardless of the provision in the antideficiency law which * * *.

UNEXPENDED CARRYOVERS

Mr. Speaker, reference has been made to the unexpended carryover balances of previously appropriated funds that are available to the executive branch. Large amounts are involved, but there are explanations.

The budget for 1968 shows an estimated total of $125.6 billion carried forward into fiscal year 1968 on July 1, 1967, from prior years funds. That was the estimate in the January budget.

But of this amount, $75.3 billion represents obligated funds not yet paid out. Generally speaking, this means that legally binding documents exist calling for an ultimate cash payment. For example, some $33.4 billion of this is in defense and represents such things as ships, air-

craft, and missile contruction for which we fully fund when the appropriation is first made, knowing that deliveries may not occur for 2, 3, or even 5 years.

Unobligated funds totalled an estimated $50.3 billion as of July 1, 1967. These represent funds made available for authorized programs, in many cases committed but not yet at the point of obligation in the technical legal sense. For example, $14.1 billion is for defense, again representing largely ship, aircraft, and missile programs; $9.4 billion represents callable capital and standby arrangements for various international banks and the Monetary Fund; about $5.0 billion represents funds available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for mortgage market functions; some $5.3 billion represents funds available for housing, urban renewal, and open space programs and the flood indemnity insurance fund. And so on.

Unexpended carryovers have been growing in size over the years, but carryovers are nothing new to Federal budgets. We have always had them. The $125.6 billion estimated carryover on July 1, 1967, to which I referred is equivalent to about 92 percent of the $135 billion administrative budget expenditures estimated for fiscal 1968 in the original budget last January. Looking back 10 years ago to the fiscal 1958 budget, that budget estimated the unexpended carryover balances on July 1, 1957, at $69.9 billion, of which $40.2 billion was obligated and $29.7 was unobligated, a total equivalent to some 98 percent of the $71.8 billion administrative budget estimate of expenditures for that year.

A special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations back in 1957—House Report 216, March 21, 1957—had occasion to study the matter of carryover balances and had this to say:

It is interesting to note that while the President in his recent budget message urged the Congress to give further consideration to pending legislation to place appropriations on the accrued expenditure basis, the booklet entitled, "The Federal Budget (1958) in Brief," recently issued by the Executive Office of the President, contains the following significant statement:

"Because obligational authority foreruns expenditures, it is necessary to exercise control over the amount of new authority voted for Government agencies in order to keep expenditures within receipts. If in any year the Government obligates itself to pay more money than it is receiving, it is courting future deficits."

Carryover balances are pocketed in hundreds of separate appropriation and other accounts on the books of the departments. They are shown in detail throughout the budget. They vary in size from relatively insignificant amounts to billions of dollars. Regardless of size, determination of amounts of new obligating requests to be allowed requires concurrent consideration of the carryover in those programs where advance financing is necessary. That is the general procedure now followed by the Committee on Appropriations. In some instances only the unobligated portion is a pertinent factor, while in others the obligated portion is of equal importance in the determination. Such balances should be held to the absolute minimum, consistent with the varied needs of the individual program to which applicable. But so long as the scale of Federal programs remains of the present general magnitude carryover balances will continue to exist in terms of billions and billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, it might be illuminating to insert a breakout showing the main items comprising the $50.3 billion of unobligated balances estimated at July 1, 1967, especially since the figure has been alluded to a number of times in recent debate. I include such a table:

Principal areas of estimated unobligated balances of obligational authority, start of fiscal year 1968 (page 51, budget for 1968)

Funds appropriated to the President	$9,379,000,000
Inter-American Development Bank (callable capital)	611,760,000
International Monetary Fund (standby arrangement)	2,000,000,000
World Bank (callable capital)	5,715,000,000
Asian Development Bank (callable capital)	$100,000,000
Department of Defense—Military	14,073,000,000
Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	1,277,766,000
Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy	941,756,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	2,571,408,000
Aircraft procurement, Air Force	2,501,237,000
Other procurement, Air Force	500,503,000
RDT&E, Army	229,665,000
RDT&E, Navy	333,185,000
RDT&E, Air Force	447,135,000
Military construction, Army	413,832,000
Military construction, Navy	293,328,000
Military construction, Air Force	270,448,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development	10,340,000,000
Urban renewal programs	1,987,000,000
Low-rent public housing	309,457,000
College housing	787,365,000
Open space	161,113,000
Public facility loans	293,922,000
Federal National Mortgage Association (special market ops.)	2,426,000,000
Special assistance functions	2,561,581,000
Flood indemnity insurance fund	500,000,000
FHA	973,000,000
Other independent agencies	9,335,000,000
Export-Import Bank	879,925,000
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3,000,000,000
Federal S & L Insurance Corporation	2,446,246,000
Small Business Administration—loan fund	560,223,000
Small Business Administration—Disaster loan fund	181,683,000
TVA	1,050,694,000
Total, these 4 groups	[1] 43,127,000,000

[1] Out of a total of $50,368,000,000 shown in the budget table on page 51.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Mr. Speaker, reference has been made today to the large increase in the number of Federal employees during the past year. It has been intimated that this is a fertile area for reduction in Government expenditures.

Certainly Federal payroll costs for civilian employment add up to a large portion of the budget—some $20.5 billion in fiscal year 1967. It will be more in fiscal year 1968 especially if the Congress agrees to or even increases the pay raise provisions in the President's budget proposals still under consideration.

The following figures indicate the areas of growth in Federal civilian employment in fiscal year 1967. They indicate which Departments and agencies have expanded to handle new and enlarged Federal responsibilities.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH AGENCIES, FISCAL YEAR 1967

	June 1966	June 1967	Increase or decrease
Total	2,738,047	2,980,159	+242,112
Department of Defense	1,138,191	1,302,665	+164,474
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,599,856	1,677,494	+77,638
Executive departments (except Defense):			
Agriculture	118,585	121,871	+3,286
Commerce [1]	39,873	38,193	−1,680
Health, Education, and Welfare	99,810	105,600	+5,790
Housing and Urban Development	14,465	14,757	+292
Interior [1]	74,985	76,770	+1,785
Justice	33,733	34,052	+319
Labor	10,045	10,295	+250
Post Office	675,423	716,603	+41,180
State	42,649	47,415	+4,766
Transportation [1]	.....	58,325	+58,325
Treasury [1]	91,365	89,496	−1,869
Major independent agencies:			
Federal Aviation Agency [1]	43,514	.....	−43,514
General Services Administration	38,175	39,891	+1,716
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	35,708	35,860	+152
Veterans' Administration	170,228	173,474	+3,246
All other agencies [2]	111,298	114,892	+3,594

[1] Agencies involved in new Department of Transportation transfers.

[2] Including General Accounting Office and Government Printing Office.

Source: Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

These employees are engaged in carrying out the many functions of Government, including of course the many new programs created by Congress in recent years.

Between June 1966 and June 1967, there was a total increase of 242,112 Federal civilian employees in the executive branch. A total of 164,474 of the increase was in the Department of Defense. The Bow amendment exempts virtually all of the Defense Department from its provisions.

Further, 41,180 of these employees have been added to handle the ever increasing mail volume of the Post Office Department.

Nearly 5,800 of this increase is related to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As a result of broad public demand, the Congress has authorized many new health programs and Congress has continued to increase funds for research and many other programs. It takes people to administer and operate programs.

Some 3,200 people were added to handle veterans benefits and services last year. In addition, 3,286 employees were added to handle various programs of the

Department of Agriculture, such as meat and produce inspection, school lunch and milk programs, and other programs essential to the health of our growing population.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I do this also to try to clarify the record, because if I understood my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader [Mr. FORD], and my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], they say that a vote for the previous question would be considered as a vote against economy. That may not be the exact words, but in substance that was it—and I see my friend, the gentleman from Michigan nodding in assent.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to say as one humble Member of this House that I differ with my friends on that interpretation. I think a more accurate statement is that since it appears that we are all now in favor of some curtailment and retrenchment, that the real situation is a choice on which approach we are to take, whether we give the committee an opportunity to do something about it first; or whether we adopt the Bow amendment now.

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

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I think I have a minute and I feel under some compulsion to yield to my friend so I will yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I appreciate the gentleman's viewpoint. It seems to me that 202 of us last week voted to impose a $5 billion ceiling on expenditures; 182 voted for President Johnson's $141 billion expenditure level in the current fiscal year. All we want to do is to give the House as a whole an opportunity actually to impose this $5 billion saving and prevent President Johnson from spending $141 billion. And that is what the issue is and how the vote will be interpreted.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, the gentleman is entitled to his interpretation, with which I sharply differ.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the previous question is rejected, then the rule will be open to amendment and there will be debate on any amendments to the rule. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman's question answers itself. But the answer, specifically and directly, is "Yes."

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the Speaker.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 213, nays 205, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—213

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Ashley
Bennett
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Colmer
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Rees
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Watts
White
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—205

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Findley
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Horton
Hosmer
Hunt
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
Pelly
Pettis
Pirnie
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Vander Jagt
Wampler
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—14

Aspinall
Barrett
Broomfield
Button
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Fountain
Gray
Hanna
Martin
O'Konski
Rarick
Utt
Watkins

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Martin against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Watkins against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Utt against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. 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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) with Mr. VANIK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the issue now before the Committee of the Whole is so well delineated and has been so thoroughly debated today and last week that I see little need for further discussion of the matter. I have no immediate requests for time on this side. I ask that the gentleman from Ohio take time.

Mr. BOW. You have no requests for time?

Mr. MAHON. Not at this time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, first, I should say that I think the actions of the House last week and this week displayed the House of Representatives in one of its better moments. I feel the debate on both sides of the aisle has been on a very high level. Members have spoken out on their beliefs, ideologies, and positions. I hope we can continue this throughout the debate today.

I have taken this time to answer some of the critics, some who have made 1-minute speeches and other statements that have been made.

But I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the last vote, to vote down the motion to order the previous question, was close. I wish the vote might have been reversed so that the people's Representatives could have an opportunity to vote on a clearcut question. Because of the parliamentary procedures, the Representatives of the people have not had an opportunity to vote on whether or not they want to put a ceiling on expenditures. The Reprsentatives of the people have not had an opportunity actually to vote on the question as to whether there should be a spending limitation and a recision of $5 billion in expenditures. It seems to me that last week this House spoke on that question. This House, by its vote on the motion to recommit, asked the Committee on Appropriations to report back to them a bill which had in it an amendment which would do just that.

But unfortunately the Appropriations Committee did not heed the will of the House. The Appropriations Committee did not even vote on the Bow amendment in committee. They simply took up the resolution which you have just made in order, and which we are now debating, and even the committee was not given an opportunity to vote on the Bow amendment. Although a motion was made to make it in order, to take it up, the motion was ignored and the other committee resolution put through.

So there we also had the show of not permitting a vote on the question. Now the House itself has been denied the right to vote on this important issue.

There have been a number of times in this debate when we were talking about the great Congress abdicating its authority to the President. This is pure fiction. There is nothing in the Bow amendment that would change the powers of the President one iota. I am speaking about this because I anticipate that next week we will face the same question again.

Along that line I would like to put a question to my distinguished chairman. If this House passes this joint resolution today providing for this 10-day continuance, do I understand that the House conferees will stand firm with the Senate and insist upon its being a 10-day continuation of appropriations?

Mr. MAHON. We will do our best to maintain the House position. It would seem rather likely that the other body, in its wisdom, may choose to have a resolution providing a greater length of time than 10 days. As the gentleman knows, part of the 10 days has already expired. But we will adhere to our position as best we can.

Mr. BOW. I hope that we stand fast on the House position.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman realizes, of course, that very dramatic action cannot be taken in 10 days. It is going to take some time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, in 9 months there has been no dramatic action taken by the Appropriations Committee in cutting the expenses. No, I agree with the gentleman, we cannot do in 10 days what we have not done in 9 months.

Mr. MAHON. I do not know how dramatic the saving of $3.8 billion is, and the prospect of saving $5 billion. Whether that is dramatic or not, it is good news to the taxpayers when the news gets to them, in my opinion.

Mr. BOW. I hope what gets through to the taxpayers is that it is the minority who wants to cut and the majority who uses parliamentary procedures to deny the House the right to make cuts.

There have been questions raised about what the Republicans have done in these 9 months, and what they have tried to do. Have they tried to cut these budgets? I can tell the gentleman exactly what we did. I have a list of the Republican efforts, and I will include them in the RECORD. I have them by vote and by page and amount.

The material referred to follows:

REPUBLICAN EFFORTS TO CUT AND SUSTAIN CUTS IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, 1ST SESS., 90TH CONG.

	Adopted	Rejected
RECORD VOTES		
Treasury-Post Office (Jonas): Cut $185,000, Office of Secretary of Treasury, salaries	$185,000	
Independant offices (Davis of Wisconsin): Strike out $10,000,000 new contract authority, rent supplement program	10,000,000	
Independent offices (Michel): Recommit, strike out $150,000,000 for model cities grants and $75,000,000 for urban renewal, but retain $12,000,000 for planning		$225,000,000
Public works-AEC (Giaimo, Democrat; record vote demanded by Ford, Republican): $1,676,000 cut delete funds for Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric plant in Maine	1,676,000	
State-Justice (Jonas): SBA participation sales insufficiencies, change permanent indefinite appropriation to stated amount "Not to exceed $1,350,000"	X	
OTHER AMENDMENTS		
Agriculture (Pelly): Point of order sustained against $180,000,000 for food stamp program as not authorized	180,000,000	
Agriculture (Jonas): Strike out $800,000,000 participation sales authorization, Farmers Home Administration and $13,268,000 for payment of sales insufficiencies		813,268,000
Agriculture (McDade): Amendment to limit price support and land diversion payments to $1,471,000,000; point of order sustained against McDade amendment		X
Agriculture (Findley): Amendment limiting certain payments under price support or commodity programs to $25,000		X
Agriculture (Riegle): Amendment limiting personnel of Agricultural Research Service, Soil Conservation Service, Consumer and Marketing Service (except special milk, school lunch, and food stamp programs), Commodity Exchange Authority, Office of Information, and Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to level authorized for fiscal year 1967		X
Defense (Byrnes): Add proviso "That none of the funds herein provided shall be used in the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards"	X	
Independent offices (Jonas): Participation sales authorization, VA cut $550,000,000	550,000,000	
Independent offices (Cramer): Add words "or for the administration or implementation of sec. 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-754)" so that HUD will not have the money to administer sec. 204	X	
Independent offices (Jonas): Payment of participation sales insufficiencies cut from $946,000 to $333,882	612,118	
Independent offices (Jonas): Cut $1,804,000,000 participation sales certificates in HUD (from $2,385,000,000 to $581,000,000)	1,804,000,000	
OTHER AMENDMENTS—Continued		
Independent offices (Jonas): Cut payment of participation sales insufficiencies from $42,115,000 to $23,000,000	$19,115,000	
Interior (Riegle): Amendment to cut salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary, from $6,776,500 to $5,498,000		$1,277,600
Interior (Riegle): Amendment to cut salaries and expenses, Commission of Fine Arts, from $115,000 to $50,000		65,000
Interior (Jonas): Amendment to fund 98 percent of the jobs programed in the bill		X
Interior (Thompson of Georgia): Add new section "No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for any purpose relating to the charging of entrance fees to any recreational sites owned by the United States"		X
Interior (Hall): Cut National Foundation on Arts and Humanities $2,700,000		2,700,000
Interior (Riegle): Cut Smithsonian $182,000 from salaries and expenses; do away with increase in museum programs and related research, $684,000; and delete $803,000 of constructions funds for the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden		1,669,000
Labor-HEW (Broyhill of Virginia): Amendment, sec. 907: No part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used to provide payments, assistance, or services in any form with respect to any individual who— (1) Incites, promotes, encourages, or carries on, or facilitates the incitement, promotion, encouragement, or carrying on of, a riot or other civil disturbance in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to preserve the peace of the community concerned or to protect the persons or property of residents of such community; or (2) Assists, encourages, or instructs any person to commit or perform any act specified in par. (1)	X	
NASA (Langen): Motion to recommit		X
Public works (Betts): Amendment to prohibit funds for planning, land acquisition, or construction of Alum Creek project in Ohio		X
Public works: (Davis of Wisconsin): Amendment, "None of the funds appropriated herein shall be allocated for general investigation of projects for which the justifications are 60 percent or more for recreational purposes"		X
Public works (Stanton): Amendment to prohibit planning Grand River Reservoir project		X
State-Justice (Thompson of Georgia): Series of amendments making those appropriations available until "expended" and make them available until July 1, 1972		X
State-Justice: Offered Bow expenditures limitation, excluding FBI, as an amendment		X

REPUBLICAN EFFORTS TO CUT AND SUSTAIN CUTS IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, 1ST SESS., 90TH CONG.—Continued

	Adopted	Rejected
OTHER AMENDMENTS—Continued		
Transportation (MacGregor): Strike $143,000,000 for SST		$143,000,000
Transportation (Gross): Cut $10,000,000 from State and community highway safety program		10,000,000
Transportation (Gross): Strike out $5,000,000, Inter-American Highway		5,000,000
Transportation (Gross): Cut from $4,000,000 to $2,000,000, Chamizal Road		2,000,000
Transportation (Gross): Delete $4,000,000 for highway maintenance in Alaska		4,000,000
Treasury-Post Office (Gross): Cut from $90,700,000 to $90,400,000, Customs Bureau eliminate authority to hire 50 customs agents in addition to the 177 requested in the budget		300,000
Treasury-Post Office (Jonas): Cut Post Office administration and regional operations from $102,700,000 to $100,450,000 and add proviso "none of these funds shall be used for the payment of salaries and expenses of more than 3,000 employees assigned or detailed to regional operations"	$2,250,000	
OTHER AMENDMENTS—Continued		
Treasury-Post Office (Jonas): Add to postal public buildings appropriation proviso: "Provided further, That none of the funds provided in the appropriation shall be available to reimburse the site acquisition fund in the appropriation for 'Building occupancy and postal supplies.'"		X
2d supplemental, 1967 (Hall): Point of order sustained striking out appropriation of $5,500,000 for military construction, family housing, homeowners assistance fund, defense, authorizing legislation not yet enacted	$5,500,000	
2d supplemental, 1967 (Findley): Amendment: "No funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to pay salaries or expenses in connection with consummation of a treaty on nuclear proliferation"		X

Those are amendments which were offered by Republicans during consideration of these bills.

I must admit I have noticed that somebody put the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] down. We welcome him, but this was Mr. GIAIMO's amendment for $1,676,000, on the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric plant in Maine. That amendment was adopted and Republicans buttressed the amendment by demanding a record vote on it.

What happened? On the Democrat side, during consideration of the appropriation bills, again I say that Mr. GIAIMO, over the opposition of some of his colleagues, did cut $1,676,000. Most of the amendments offered on the majority side of the aisle were to increase appropriations. Fortunately, they were rejected. But what happened with the amendments of the Democrats? If they had carried all the amendments they offered, instead of having a decrease, the Democrats would have increased it by $92,872,000. I will put that in the RECORD so we can see where and what was offered.

The material referred to follows:

DEMOCRAT ACTION ON APPROPRIATION BILLS, 90TH CONGRESS

	Adopted	Rejected
Public works-AEC (Giaimo, Democrat, Connecticut), cut $1,676,000 for Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project in Maine	−$1,676,000	
Defense (McCarthy, Democrat, New Jersey), strike $428,000 for National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice		−$428,000
Defense (Bingham, New York), eliminate $106,700,000 for EA-6A aircraft from procurement of Navy aircraft and missiles		−106,700,000
Independent offices (Brown, Democrat, California), add $1,000,000 for low-income housing demonstrations		+1,000,000
NASA (Ryan, Democrat, New York), cut research and development by $100,000,000		−100,000,000
NASA (Ryan, Democrat, New York), cut administrative operations by $37,000,000		−37,000,000
Public works (Gallagher, Democrat, New Jersey), add $1,000,000 for Newark Bay-Hackensack River project		+1,000,000
Public works (Howard, Democrat, New Jersey), amendment to raise construction grants for waste treatment works from $203,000,000 to $450,000,000		+247,000,000
Transportation (Hechler, Democrat, West Virginia), amendment to add $10,000,000 for grants-in-aid for airports		+10,000,000
2d Supplemental, 1967 (St Germain, Democrat, Rhode Island), 2 amendments for school impact areas operation and maintenance, $20,000,000 and construction, $48,000,000		+68,000,000
2d Supplemental, 1967 (Ryan, Democrat, New York), amendment, Adult Education Act of 1966, $10,000,000		+10,000,000
2d Supplemental, 1967 (Rooney, New York), amendment to cut USIA salaries and expenses from $3,700,000 to $3,420,000	−280,000	
Total decreases	−1,956,000	−244,128,000
Total increases		+337,000,000
Total, net	−1,956,000	+92,872,000
Net change if all Democrat amendments were adopted	+90,916,000	

So when we talk about what was done and have we tried, of course we have.

If you had accepted the Bow amendment on the separate bills where it was turned down, you would have saved another $778 million. So do not say we have not tried.

Of course, we have no record of what took place within the subcommittees. In the subcommittees time and time again efforts were made to make further reductions, which were turned down.

We happen to be in the minority, which was demonstrated here just a few minutes ago. When the majority decides to work its will, it is worked.

So I say to you, do not ask what we have done or whether we have cooperated or tried.

What has happened? Where are some of the increases that we could take care of? There are a number of them.

Of course, I believe it is the responsibility of the President to give us some of this information about where we can make cuts. He has asked the leadership of this House to finish the appropriation bills, to "get them down to me, so I can make the cuts." But he has not told us where he can make these cuts. He has indicated substantial cuts can be made.

The gentleman acting as the majority leader the other night informed the House, in session, that the President was going to cut $7 billion. But we have not seen where.

I believe he should do it. I believe he should tell us where it can be cut. I believe he should have told it to us months ago.

In this sort of situation I find myself in agreement with the distinguished and great Speaker of this House, our distinguished friend who is very proud of the Red Sox today. Let me read what he had to say on March 12, 1957. This is Speaker McCORMACK. I am quoting him. He said:

> Only a few days ago President Eisenhower himself said that there are many projects in his budget message that can be deferred.
>
> If that is so, does he not have the constitutional responsibility of letting the other coordinate branch of our Government, the Legislative Branch, know about it? If we are going to appropriate money and then, after appropriating it, he is going to freeze it—and that is what that statement intimates, and he knows what those projects are—do you not think he has the constitutional responsibility of letting the Congress of the United States know what they are?

I wonder whether the great Speaker of this House, who felt the President had a constitutional responsibility to advise the House, when the President of the United States said to the leadership a week or so ago, "Get those appropriation bills through so I can make some cuts on them," said then, "Mr. President, it is your constitutional responsibility to advise the House where you are going to make the cuts."

If it was good in 1957, it is just as good in 1967.

We cannot find out yet where that $7 billion cut is going to be made, although we have been told by the majority that a cut of $7 billion would be made.

Where are some of the other items that can be cut down?

What is the increase in employment in the last year? There is an increase in permanent civilian employment in the executive branch of Government of 189,000 employees.

You ask me where some cuts can be made. I will tell you a few of them—189,000 employees in a year. What does that amount to? We can take an average salary of $7,900. I believe that is about the average now. There are related costs for a new employee, to put him on, of $1,600. That is $9,500 each.

Actually, the annual cost is $1.8 billion, for new employees in the last year. $1.8 billion over what you had in 1967.

You think we cannot make cuts? You want us to point out to you where cuts can be made? There they are. Cut down the new employees. Quit loading up this bureaucracy that you have. I have told

you other places where cuts could be made, and we have told you with our amendments where you could make cuts.

Let me say this further to you, those of you who like to chide about where you can make cuts: You give me for 6 weeks the 674 employees you have in the Bureau of the Budget and give me the 81 employees that the majority has on the Committee on Appropriations—give me a staff of that kind and I will find you some further cuts you can make in this budget.

Now, do not say it cannot be done, because the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations just today on the floor has made commitments to this Congress that substantial cuts will be made; that he will bring bills in for recision and substantial reductions of appropriations.

I would just like to make this one further observation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that question of employees?

Mr. BOW. No, I will not. When I have completed my statement I will be glad to yield.

I should like to make just this observation: If we had not had this amendment, if we Republicans had not done what we did last week and had the vote we had then, I doubt very much that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropirations would have been on this floor today making these promises to the Congress and to the American people. The feet have finally been put to the fire. If he does what he says he is going to do—and I have never doubted his word—and brings in those bills and brings in those reductions, I will suport him and I can promise him a lot of support over here. I am sure, though, it never would have happened if that debate of last week and the vote of last week had not taken place.

I doubt that we might do it in 9 days. If the Bow amendment, if a provision for a limitation of spending, is not the proper way to fight this big $30 billion deficit and if there is a better way to do it, then let us have it. I will support it. I will urge others to support it. But let somebody bring it in and show us how we can save the American people from the inflation they are faced with with a $30 billion deficit. You cannot do it all with taxes. You have to find some way.

Let me say to you, my friends—and I think the votes here both of these days have shown it—the American people want us to do something about spending. They are concerned and so am I. I had hoped that this would be a bipartisan or a nonpartisan position that we take on this question of spending. The gentleman laughs. Let me say to you—and I am sure that my distinguished chairman will agree—before I took a step on this I went to the distinguished chairman with the idea of his joining with me in some kind of an action to do this very thing. There are some of us who try to be Americans first and members of our party second. That is a quote, I think, from Lyndon Johnson. I hope I can be counted as one of those who is interested actually in the good of my country more than I am in votes. Many people over there are saying, "Oh, I wish you would win this, because you would rue the day you ever did." That is politics. Well, if in the protection of the fiscal situation of this country we have to accept that responsibility, I am willing to do it. If you want to come in and find in my district some places to make cuts, come in and do it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall be delighted to yield to my distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to what the gentleman from Texas said last week, it is of official record that he said then that we would seek, through recisions in appropriation bills, as well as otherwise, to make whatever reductions we could.

Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] agree that I have stated today, perhaps in different language, approximately what was stated last week? As of today, we have had a little more time during which to consider these matters and our plans are further developed.

Mr. BOW. However, it sort of soaked in just a little bit.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we have had a little time to have meetings of the various subcommittees as well as the full Committee on Appropriations, and to have held conference during the last week on these matters. Permit me to read to the gentleman from Ohio these statements made in the report of the Committee which I submitted last week:

> The committee will continue its efforts to recommend further reductions in the three remaining bills—

And I say that again today, and I say it will be over $1.2 billion, and probably more—

> Opportunities exist for further significant reductions that will very probably bring the total reductions in the House for fiscal 1968 to $5 billion or more. The committee will carefully review the appropriation actions of the session and determine whether or not it may, prior to adjournment, recommend recision of appropriations previously made, giving consideration to the latest revenue outlook and other economic factors at that time.

Today I can say that we have begun some hearings and we have hopes that some recisions can be undertaken next week. I could not have said this last week. Last week, I said that we could not rescind funds in the eight appropriation bills that are now pending in the other body until those bills are enacted. I repeated that today and added that we would have exploratory hearings on these bills to seek specific ways to achieve the results desired and that we would consider the recision approach, and the generalized approach, such as across-the-board cuts in personnel.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt my distinguished chairman to say that I have just been advised that my time is about to expire, and that the statements of the gentleman from Texas already appear in the RECORD. I recognize this. However, it is my opinion that the gentleman from Texas will also agree with me that this came up after we got into the question of the consideration of the Bow amendment. In other words, all of this is brandnew, because we were beginning to bring it to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. MAHON. All of these things have been taken into consideration.

Mr. BOW. But after the Bow amendment was offered.

Mr. MAHON. The Appropriations Committee has been seeking reductions throughout the session, and I have repeatedly said that we ought to make reductions wherever we safely can as the gentleman from Ohio knows.

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

Mr. BOW. Although my time is very short, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Would all recisions considered by the Committee on Appropriations not require new legislation?

Mr. BOW. I believe we can offer a recision bill on the appropriations.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the second question, very briefly, is this: Is the savings claim of some $5 billion, claimed by the majority of the Committee on Appropriations, not inclusive of all the amendments, or of the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Ohio this week?

Mr. BOW. Let me say that I hope that within the period of 10 days, when we determine whether they mean what they say, and whether we actually have these reductions, and when this question is up again for consideration, I hope then we shall not only maintain the votes we had today, but that we will recognize the necessity of doing something about expenditure limitations.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], earlier today pointed with pride to various amendments offered on the floor by Republican Members to appropriation bills that have been considered earlier in the House to make a showing on the record for economy.

I would respond by inviting the attention of the gentleman from Ohio and others to the far greater and more substantial cuts and reductions we have made in the Committee on Appropriations which total some $4 billion in bills reported by the committee and passed in the House up to Labor Day.

In the three remaining bills yet to be reported we expect additional reductions of more than $1 billion. Thus we have made cuts and reductions of more than $5 billion. This is something major, substantial, and solid in which the majority can take justifiable satisfaction. This is not an exercise in semantics. This is a fact. These far-greater and more sub-

stantial cuts have been made in committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], while the gentleman from Ohio points to a few cuts made by members of the minority on the floor which while worthy of note were not substantial in comparison with these major billion dollar reductions which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the majority party have achieved.

In my own Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development we have made cuts thus far that total more than $1.3 billion alone. In the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill we have made reductions of over $771 million—over three-quarters of a billion dollars, and in another bill we reported separately providing funds for the national space program—NASA—we have made additional cuts of over $516 million—more than one-half billion dollars alone. This is not an exercise in sematics—this is a fact—an exercise in prudent economy.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I make this statement to keep the record straight.

This record speaks for itself.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I will begin to believe there is a serious intent to cut the budget when I find people are really willing to look at and to consider and to cut that $91 billion defense bill. Believe me, there is as much water in that bill as there is in anything else in this Congress. And if the Members do not really believe this, and if they are so afraid of this sacred cow that they cannot cut it, then they underestimate the intelligence of the American people.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, you could buy everything you are buying in that budget and buy it for billions of dollars less if there were any purchasers within the Federal Government, either in the Defense Department or in GSA. A purchaser is rarely promoted for doing a good job, and they are not paid more, and they are not fired when they do a bad job. Why do we not look at the purchasing operation where the purchases are made? The thing that bothers me about this is that every time you start to talk about cuts I see a little gleam come into everybody's eyes when we begin to talk about things that go into the American cities.

I come from a great American city. We have been paying the bill for years, but when it comes to getting back something, that is different.

The next bill up in this Congress is the conference report on military construction. I would like to point out that the conferees have agreed that the cost of military housing under section 602 can go up from $17,500 to $19,000, and under 602(b), which I presume is officers' housing, it can go up to $35,000. The limitation on public housing in this country is $14,000 per unit, therefore you cannot put public housing in a big city.

I do not intend to say that I believe that the military housing is good. I have never seen any good military housing. Much of it looks as if you could push a hole through it with your thumb, but that is because we do not have good people doing the buying.

If the Members really want to cut the budget down, then let them look at where we are spending the money—Defense—and cut it at that point.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I subscribe very substantially to what the gentlewoman from Michigan has said, but I want to point out that the House in the first instance and the Congress in the second, in the Defense Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968 did make reductions. The appropriations were below the President's budget. But what worries me is that last Friday night, or Saturday, or Sunday—I am not sure which—after the Congress had done what the gentlewoman has recommended, the President in a press conference denounced the Congress for the reductions in appropriations and expenditures. I am glad the gentlewoman from Michigan agrees with the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. As I understood the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio, it did not touch defense.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. In reply to the gentlewoman, yes, it does. It does not exclude defense, it excludes the military, but defense is covered, which would mean the areas of defense which are not military. And that is to protect the possibility——

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. If the gentleman will pardon my interruption, let me point out to the gentleman that on the very next bill up, in the conference report on military there is no reduction from last year there, and a very substantial increase.

Mr. BOW. I can assure the gentlewoman, even with the great consternation that I get about this resolution that it says the expenditures beyond the amount for military purposes. This means that it is just the military, and the rest of the Defense Department, and I would suggest that we now have in research and development in the Defense Department $7 billion would be a place that does not affect the military a great deal, and there are other areas that do not particularly mean much to defense.

I believe we can cut that bill 10 percent, so there is another $700 million.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. It seems to me the time has come when not only the Committee on Appropriations but all the rest of us should look seriously at the purchasing that is done by our Government, and correct the practices that are involved in that purchasing.

Some of these people who are contractors with the Government are sole contractors to the Government and they get no money from anyplace else.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. They are just as much employees of the Government as anyone employed in the civil service and not only should you be looking at the prices that are paid to them, but you should look into the salaries that their officials are drawing.

The remarkable belief that the military defends us, and that defense is the prime problem in this country is wrong. The domestic problems of our country are just as important. If we do not do something about these problems, instead of standing here to protect our country, we are not going to have a country left to protect from the outside forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, several references to Defense appropriations have been made in debate last week, yesterday, and today which I did not undertake to discuss in detail at the time. Under leave to revise and extend, I would now like to more or less set the record straight.

COST OF THE WAR

First, as to the cost of the war in Vietnam—the real cost is said to be much higher than the $21.9 billion shown in the budget. On page 77 of the budget this statement appears:

> Although our ability to conduct military operations in Southeast Asia is underpinned by the entire defense budget, the data shown in the table represent the *costs which are clearly attributable to special efforts in that area and in excess of what might have been the defense budgets for the years shown in the absence of the Vietnam conflict.*

Because of the underpinning by the entire Defense budget, and because we cannot send a cost accountant on each patrol, a precise cost of the war in Vietnam will probably never be known. Everyone is at liberty to make his own assumption as to what defense costs are reasonably attributable to the war. In its report on the Defense appropriation bill this year, the committee said:

> The tempo and cost of the war in Southeast Asia are on an upward trend. The costs of wars can never be projected precisely. The actions of the opponent weigh heavily on such matters.

The President's budget, which was submitted in January, contained no funds for the purpose of increasing our military force in Vietnam by an additional 45,000 men who are or will be deployed in Southeast Asia. Huge additional costs will result from the deployment of this additional force in Vietnam, funds for which are not included in the budget and must be made available from some source.

For the purpose of meeting the cost of the deployment of additional forces in Vietnam, it is hoped that a reallocation of funds within the Defense budget will provide enough money to meet a considerable portion of the cost.

STATEMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

Second, some comments have been made with respect to the statement issued by the President last week when the Defense Appropriation Act, 1968, was signed. I make special reference to the following statement by the President in regard to the $1.6 billion cut made in the bill by Congress:

I must emphasize, too, that the costs of conflict can never be precisely estimated nor fully foreseen. This fact, coupled with the Congressional cut of $1.6 billion, might well create an unavoidable requirement for additional Defense funds.

I am not familiar with all the press reports, but I have understood that there has been an implication that the $1.6 reduction made in the Defense budget was assignable to the cost of the war in Vietnam and that in view of the escalating cost of the war, it might be necessary for Congress to restore the $1.6 reduction.

This needs a bit of clarification. Insofar as I know, no one has said that the $1.6 reduction made by Congress might need to be restored to meet the requirements for which the funds were originally requested. My point is that Congress did not cut funds required for the war in Vietnam. The $1.6 billion applies to reductions which are disassociated from the cost of the war and the foregoing statement by the President does not contravene this conclusion.

It may be true that the President will find it necessary to request a restoration of $1.6 billion at a later date, but he will not request it for the same purpose for which the funds were requested in his January budget.

REDUCTION OF WASTE IN MILITARY SPENDING

Third, question has been raised as to whether or not further cuts could be made in Defense. I recognize that Defense is the largest segment of the budget, but let me remind you that in the appropriation process, we deal with Defense in three parts. By far the larger part is the regular annual Defense Appropriation Act, which, as I said, we cut by $1.6 billion. We have yet to act on the bill covering military construction and military family housing. Very probably substantial cuts will be made in the $2.9 billion of estimates for these purposes.

Let me also remind you that the budget expenditure figure of $72.3 billion for "Department of Defense—military" also includes civil defense, which Congress considers as a part of the independent offices-HUD appropriation bill. Action on that bill is not complete, but the House cut the civil defense appropriation estimates by nearly $25 million.

When final action is completed, I would say that cuts made in the total estimates for "Department of Defense—military" will probably aggregate in excess of $2.1 billion, which should result in expenditure reductions of between $650 and $700 million in fiscal year 1968. Of course, we recognize that there is some degree of waste and mismanagement in an organization the size of the Department of Defense. We have held hearings and conducted investigations over the years, both general and specific, into many areas of Defense procurement, the area mentioned by the gentlewoman from Michigan. We have made recommendations resulting in savings of hundreds of millions of dollars in this area. We have exposed wasteful practices and our findings have been widely publicized. We have conducted a continuous and unrelenting campaign against waste and mismanagement and in behalf of economy and efficiency, seeking at all times to promote the military strength and security of the United States.

I have called the Defense Subcommittee to meet for the purpose of reviewing the functions provided for in the regular annual bill with a view to determining what further savings can be made and whether recision action is feasible.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio made reference to reductions that have been made at the instance of the minority—and some reductions have been made at the instance of the minority. I would like to point out that the largest item mentioned involves the participation certificates. Knocking out the participation certificates at the instance of the minority has not saved any $2 billion as might be deduced from the statement of the gentleman from Ohio. I am sure he would not claim that it has, but the RECORD would be misleading to those who are not fully familiar with this situation.

With further regard to the minority, which speaks approvingly of its record of cuts, I would ask the gentleman from Michigan if he will get together with key minority Members and present to the Committee on Appropriations at the appropriate time a listing of further reductions, in the opinion of the minority, that can be made by way of recision or otherwise.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Michigan is not here at the moment, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. Will the gentleman from North Carolina prevail on the minority leader to present us with a list of suggested cuts at a committee meeting? We will be happy to have him appear.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I am patiently waiting for these suggested cuts that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says his committee will make, and we will consider those along with our own.

Mr. MAHON. We will undertake to make as many cuts as we can, and we will be happy to have the cooperation of the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would just like to say to the gentleman from Texas that we on the minority side of the Committee on Appropriations stand ready to make recisions and reductions in appropriations, and we always have. I think we have given better support on reductions in appropriations than has his own party. I think he will have to admit that is so on votes that have taken place in the committees, in the subcommittees, and in the full committee all year long.

The point I would like to make to the gentleman from Texas is that we are talking about the President of the United States and the obligational authority which he has. When we close shop this year, he will have $192 billion worth of obligational authority. He says he is going to expend $136 billion. But in the last 24 months, he has been off $14.8 billion in underestimating the expenditures for Defense and $9.7 billion in underestimating expenditures for nondefense items. It is a sorry situation that we cannot rely upon the estimate of expenditures made by this administration.

The gentleman from Texas knows full well that the Congress of the United States cannot insure an expenditure rate through control of appropriations. You know that well.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further at the moment. I realize that the gentleman from Wisconsin has repeatedly pointed out that in his opinion the war was being underfinanced. He has indicated repeatedly that additional funds would be necessary for defense—not recisions or reductions, but additional funds for the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is correct that additional funds for the war will be required because the budget did not include funds for an additional 45,000 men who are to be sent to Vietnam in connection with the war. So, Mr. Chairman, my point is that to this date the Democratic Members are responsible, along with Members of the minority, for cuts of about $3.8 billion.

Before we have finished with the three remaining appropriation bills, the cuts, in my judgment, will be over $5 billion.

The majority Members know that every reduction in appropriations means a dollar saved for every dollar cut. It does not mean a dollar saved during the current fiscal year, but it means a dollar saved during this year or during succeeding fiscal years.

We have tried to act responsibly. We have made reductions in appropriations. We will make further reductions. In my judgment, we will make some recisions and further adjustments. The House can work its will with respect to recisions or reductions.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about recisions here. In its wisdom the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives did not put any money in for a national park in my district, which everyone who was here then knows that I opposed. When the bill came back from conference there was $1.5 million in the bill for that park. I do not know what they are going to do with that item, but as far as I am personally concerned, you can take it out.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to say that the other body, led by some of the minority Members of the other body, insisted upon placing, I believe, about $9 million in that bill for a series of projects, including $2 million for the Indiana Dunes. I do not remember the exact details. We compromised at the lowest figure we could

in order to get a conference agreement, and this compromise included $1,500,000 for the Indiana Dunes item.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman from Ohio, my good friend over here, made reference a little while ago to the additional employees that have been added to the Government payroll. I think one area in which we have added employees on the two committees on which I serve has been in connection with the minority staff. Employees have been added at the request of the minority, as a result of their repeated policy declarations that they had to have more minority staff employees.

Now, look at your legislative appropriations bill, and I think you will find that most of the increases that have come in that bill have resulted because of the addition of minority employees that must be added in the view of the minority of this House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment very briefly on the question of additional Federal employees. My good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, knows that I regard him most highly. He and I have worked together very closely on a nummber of items.

I happen to disagree with him on his approach to this subject. The distinguished gentleman pointed out that there is a very substantial increase in the number of proposed Federal employees during the current fiscal year, fiscal 1968, and that the cost would be $1,800,000,000.

I could point out that I have made a particular effort, especially in the defense bill, to reduce that proposed increase in the number of Federal employees, and those efforts have been attended with some success. I am convinced we can reconsider and reduce further the number of Federal employees who are proposed. But may I point out that under the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], there would be nothing to assure there would be any reduction in the number of employees—and with control left in the hands of the administration, there very probably would not be.

But Congress does have within its own control the power to reduce the number of proposed additions to the Federal payroll. If we are given an opportunity to do so in the Appropriations Committee, I am convinced that we will reduce that number. That is a point which I think might well be considered at this time.

Now if I may proceed further: It was made very clear during the weekend that the President will not specify the cuts in spending which will be made by the agencies of Government in advance of action by Congress on this subject. This means approval of the Bow resolution is a blank check for the administration to use in any way that it sees fit for the remainder of fiscal 1968. It constitutes approval for line item veto, something the Congress has never been willing to grant to an executive.

From the date of approval of the Bow amendment until June 30, 1968, or until the fiscal 1969 appropriation bills are passed, which may be considerably later than June 30, Congress would have abdicated its authority on spending very largely to the President and to his advisers. Now if you will look at past history, it should be readily apparent that the reductions which would be made are not the reductions which Congress would want made.

Very probably we would lose most of the impacted area school programs. We could lose most of the school lunchroom programs. We could lose most of the soil conservation program. We could lose other important aspects of the agricultural progress. We could lose most of the river and harbor improvement programs which mean a great deal to most of the congressional districts of the Nation.

In their stead, we would get a stepped up poverty program, a stepped up rent supplement program, a stepped up model cities program, a stepped up highway beautification program, and more foreign aid.

I am extremely reluctant to see the Congress in this way throw away the results of a year of hard work. There is no point whatever in spending all year trying to make selective cuts in those areas which are most vulnerable to cuts, then at the last minute to throw in the sponge and march back downhill, saying to the President, "We are not qualified to deal with spending programs. You take it and do what you and your advisers want to do."

I am amazed that such an idea ever could have become so firmly implanted in the minds of my friends in the minority and some of those on my own side. I am more than a little puzzled on how they will explain it to their constituents back home. The Congress has responsibilities, and particularly in fiscal matters is our responsibility clear. Congress is now in the process of living up to those responsibilities.

The Committee on Appropriations, ably headed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, has given assurance that there will be reductions made and they will be made in those areas which are least damaging to the structure of American progress. This is the only way in which Congress can work its will and that of our constituents on the spending programs of the Government.

Remember it has been made clear that the Appropriations Committee will seek to make actual and specific cuts greater than those proposed by the Bow amendment—and to permit the Congress to retain control rather than surrender it.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield to me for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for advancing this proposal for rescission bills. The question I want to ask is this: There seems to be a debate as to whether responsibility should be in the Congress, or whether it should be with the President. I want to ask this question. If the House should take action to enact rescission bills, would not these be subject to veto by the President, so that the President would be making the ultimate decision with respect to whether he wanted to accept those recommendations or not? Would it not be better for him in the first instance to assume responsibility?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, any legislation passed by the Congress is subject to veto. The Bow amendment would be subject to veto. Any other piece of legislation would be subject to veto. But I think we ought to do our job and not just pass the buck to the President, because we were elected to do a job.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I fear the chairman of this great committee has overlooked, and perhaps helped some others to overlook, that the heart of our deficit problem is not the appropriations we are dealing with for fiscal year 1968. The heart of our deficit problem is the overall deficit created by expenditures.

The expenditures will come from two sources: $125 billion of previously appropriated money, plus $145 billion of money appropriated in this year. I think it is fair to say that in order for us to effectively reduce the expenditures overall in this fiscal year, we would have to cut back or rescind appropriations for 1968 to the tune of over $50 billion. That is the only way we could get at the $125 billion that has piled up from previous years' appropriation. The President has said that of the $135 billion he plans to spend—at least, that he is spending in this fiscal year—$95 billion of it is going to come out of this year's appropriations, and over $40 billion is going to come out of the previous years' appropriations.

I think there has been a tendency to overlook this. We can control expenditures separately by means of the Bow amendment much more effectively, in handling this grave deficit problem, that we can by cutting back on the appropriations or rescinding the appropriations for the current fiscal year.

I would like to say also with respect to the comments that the chairman made, what the Bow amendment would do would be an exercise of authority by the Appropriations Committee. I think our committee needs to recognize that we have not exercised our authority, that we have been guilty of delivering power to the hands of the President and the executive departments of the Government, without the control that the Appropriations Committee ought to have exercised in the past, and has a grave responsibility to exercise now, through expenditure control, and not only through reductions of appropriations for this Government.

I do not believe the situation is any different—certainly the deficit problem is no less critical—from what it was 6 days ago. This House felt then it was critical enough, in effect, to say, "We must control these burgeoning expenditures of Government from all sources, this year's

appropriations and other years' appropriations."

Having felt that way 6 days ago, there is nothing which ought to change the mind of any Member of the House.

I intend to vote against this continuing resolution. I will vote against every continuing resolution, as urgent as the matter is, unless and until Congress exercises its proper control over the expenditures of this Government.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only because I know the House is interested in the deliberations which have been going on with respect to the tax bill requested by the administration and the consideration of that matter by the Ways and Means Committee.

I believe the House would be interested in knowing that that committee has just met in executive session and has adopted a motion that the committee temporarily lay the matter of the tax matter on the table, and that further consideration of the tax increase be deferred until such time as the President and the Congress reach an understanding on a means of implementing more effective expenditure reduction and control as an essential corollary to further consideration of a tax increase, and that at such time this matter will again be given priority in the committee's order of business.

What is pointed out, I believe, by the adoption of this motion, Mr. Chairman, is if we are to get any kind of control over this deficit which faces us the first essential ingredient—and the absolute essentially—is to find some kind of implementation to bring expenditures under control.

This House, by practically a straight party line vote, so far as Congress is concerned, of the majority party, the Democratic Party, turned down an implementing provision.

The way is still open for an implementing provision to be adopted or to be developed.

As I pointed out in my remarks earlier, what this House did by turning down the opportunity to vote on the Bow amendment was to lose an opportunity we had to try to get some kind of control over expenditures. Those who voted to refuse to give us that opportunity I believe have on their shoulders the responsibility for the continuation of the deficit situation and its consequences, which continue.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I never thought it would be necessary for any Member of Congress to write a primer on the difference between appropriations and spending for the executive branch of our Government.

Yet the President in his press conference last Saturday and other spokesmen for the executive branch continue to talk of appropriations by Congress and expenditure rates as if they were precisely the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, I pondered this over the weekend thinking that surely, a President who spent more than two decades in both the House and the Senate and more than 3 years in the White House would know the difference between appropriations and spending.

Yet, statement after statement from the executive branch blurs and confuses the distinction between appropriations and spending.

In the interest of clarity and to dispel what is becoming a credibility gulch, I offer the following primer for any who need it. Copies are being furnished to the White House, the Budget Bureau, and the Treasury Department.

Congress appropriates money.

The executive branch spends it.

Another word for appropriations is new obligational authority.

It has been the practice of Congress in the past to deal only with appropriations or new obligational authority.

Congressional appropriations are like deposits in a bank account. Whoever deposits it makes that money "available" to whomever has the authority to write checks against that account.

It is like a husband depositing his paycheck into his wife's checking account.

He determines how much is "available."

She determines how much she will spend and when she will spend it.

Congress is the "husband."

The White House or the executive branch is the "wife."

At this point, it becomes slightly more complicated.

Congress, through its fiscal year 1968 appropriations, is making available x number of dollars in "new obligational authority."

But on top of all that it will make available in fiscal 1968 appropriations, there is what is known as "carryover authority" from previous Congresses. This carryover authority amounts to more than $50 billion.

For fiscal 1968, the President has requested $144 billion in "new obligational authority."

If Congress gives him this amount, he will have a total of $194 billion available in this "checking account."

But let us assume that Congress "cuts" that new obligational authority by $10 billion.

This will still leave "available" some $184 billion in spending authority.

Let us look at the husband and wife again.

Let us assume that the husband is paid on a yearly basis. He gets one check, say for $10,000, in January of a given year.

His wife is the one who writes the checks. She and only she determines how much she will spend and when she will spend it.

If she spends at the rate of $1,500 per month for each of the first 3 months, a quick calculation will tell her husband that they will be out of funds sometime during the seventh month.

He is then faced with a choice.

He can wring a promise from his wife that she will mend her ways, that she will reduce her expenditure rate by $800 or $900 per month.

Or he can remove the availability of those funds by withdrawing them from the bank or canceling her authority to write checks. If Congress took such action, it would be called a rescission bill.

Or he can instruct the bank only to honor checks within a given ceiling each month and thereby force her to live within an expenditure ceiling.

Congress has already wrested the promise on occasion after occasion from the executive branch that it will practice restraint through a self-imposed expenditure ceiling.

The result of one of those promises was the cause of great fanfare and publicity last November when the President announced he was "freezing" some $3 or $3½ billion in expenditures for fiscal year 1967.

Congress had appropriated that money for fiscal year 1967.

It was "available."

The President, by his announcement, was telling the country that expenditure control was his bailiwick—and indeed it was.

He froze those funds in November and released a good many of them by May.

Congress has decided that an emergency exists, that the promise of self-imposed restraint seems always to be very short lived.

It has looked around and seen that the country is in a fiscal mess.

It has observed past performance and decided that the executive branch, like the spendthrift wife, cannot be left to its own devices any longer, that it cannot be trusted to make prudent judgments about when to spend and when not to spend, about how much to spend and how much to postpone.

Faced with a deficit of some $30 billion, Congress seems in the mood to move into the area of expenditure controls—mandatory expenditure controls.

Congress, if it passes the Bow amendment, will do so reluctantly. It has been resisting this kind of drastic action for many months. But Congress, like the sober husband, is waking to the fact that the executive branch, the spendthrift wife, is buying us all into a fiscal mess.

Drastic measures are called for.

And, one way or another—through the Bow amendment or through a statutory provision on the tax bill—they will be applied.

For it is finally clear to the Congress and the people that there is no other way to obtain iron-clad guarantees that economy in a time of fiscal crisis shall be practiced.

Mr. Chairman, the above primer is admittedly oversimplified in the interest of clarity. The actual availability of funds in the Treasury, or the "checking account," derives from revenue-raising tax measures enacted by the Congress, from receipts, participation sales, the borrowing authority of the Treasury, and so forth.

But to illuminate the central issue that is involved in today's debate—namely, the difference between appropriations and spending and, that gentlemen, is all we are talking about today—the above primer is adequate.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, until the gentlelady from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] spoke, and

after listening carefully to these many hours of debate on this issue, I had found myself with an attitude akin to that of the child in the ancient fairy tale whose honesty compelled him to cry, "The Emperor has no clothes."

You will recall the old story—the entire populace had been brainwashed, to use a popular Republican expression, into believing that the Emperor was dressed in the finest raiment. Only the child protested that this was not true at all—that, in fact, the Emperor was naked.

The parallel that strikes me between the old children's story and this debate is that while the Bow amendment purports to cut Federal spending by $5 billion, the net effect would be nothing of the sort.

Yes, it would result in a disastrous dismemberment in many Federal services to the American people—cut off over a half-billion dollars in elementary, high school, and college funds, injure the postal service, the medicare and health programs, the farmers loans, cut back vital progress in parks, conservation, and recreation. But it would not cut back on real Federal spending because these areas are not where the big money goes.

The Bow amendment leaves untouched the fantastic mushrooming of expenditures which practically alone are responsible for the deficit. I refer, of course, to military spending—now approaching $80 billion per year—soon to approach $100 billion per year. I am troubled to note that the military budget has doubled in the 5 years I have been in Congress. The military now spends an amount per year approximately equal to the entire Federal budget of 1961.

I do not know how many billions of dollars are wasted by the military. The recent disclosures by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] indicate that the loss is substantial.

I do not know how large the Military Establishment should be to provide the ultimate the national security. I do know that the answer is a sophisticated combination of political, economic, psychological, and military factors which the military, neither by inclinaton nor education, is capable of providing.

The military has a massive conflict of interest in the area of defense appropriations. Its prestige, power, stature, comfort, and indeed its entire way of life are at stake. And yet, let me point out that when hearings are held on military appropriations by the House Appropriations Committee, virtually every witness called is on the military payroll.

I recently read the six volumes of hearings of the House Subcommittee on Defense held from February to May 1967, the subject being the $70 billion military appropriation bill recently passed by the House.

Mr. Chairman, should the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, have the audacity to bring to this floor any important bill where no adverse witnesses were called to the hearings, I suggest that we would be laughed off the floor.

Public hearings with adverse witnesses represent our only process where error can be found. Dialog without argument is generally worthless, a principle understood by Western man for centuries. So vital to truth finding is opposition that the Catholic Church in its procedures for the cannonization of saints provides as an essential ingredient, a devil's advocate.

The six volumes of hearings I refer to total 3,467 pages, and 3,461 of these 3,467 pages represent testimony or statements of witnesses on the Pentagon payroll.

Of the 263 witnesses who testified or submitted statements, only six of these were not on the military payroll. The six witnesses not military employees were two representing the American Legion, two the National Rifle Association, and two ladies speaking for overseas education for service children.

There was not a single adverse witness and no adverse questioning by subcommittee members. Indeed, the questioning was so friendly that the uninformed readers could only conclude that the process was a dialog within the confines of one happy family.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, the Bow amendment will not reduce Federal expenditures. These will continue upward in the familiar spiral until the military is submitted to the searching scrutiny that is our obligation.

Our Republican colleagues are not of a mind to provide this scrutiny that is their obligation as the minority party. Indeed, all of their recommendations are in the other direction—toward an even larger and more influential Military Establishment—a rubberstamping of all of the requests of the military.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I ask that the Clerk read.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 853

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of August 29, 1967 (Public Law 90–75), is hereby amended by striking out "September 30, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 10, 1967".

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RESNICK. Are we now operating under the 5-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening very carefully to this debate. I would like to say at the outset that I think this entire issue of "economy" has been manufactured from whole cloth by the Republican Party. I, for one, have not seen any "grassroots" demand for cutbacks in Government spending. During the 1966 campaign I went through this exact same exercise with my Republican opponent. I asked him the same question that was asked here on the floor today; namely, where are we going to cut? I got the same vague answer—somewhere.

The figures are very clear indeed that after we deduct defense expenditures, veterans pensions, interest on the national debt, social security, and other fixed changes from the total budget, we are left with $21 billion. After deducting $9 billion of Government salaries we wind up with $12 billion—$12 billion to cover everything else. Health, education, welfare, agriculture, housing, war on poverty, postal services, FBI the park service, and all the other thousands of functions and services that are a part of our everyday lives. I cannot see how you are going to cut $5 billion out of $12 billion without wrecking the entire economy and destroying vital Government services that affect each and every one of us.

Sure, we could save $240 million by cutting out Saturday mail deliveries and restricting postal service to one delivery a day for businesses. I would like to see the reaction to that particular piece of economy. And how those who are voting for the Bow amendment would vote on this action.

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

Mr. RESNICK. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to see the gentleman bring these figures on the floor today, because the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] said yesterday in a colloquy with me that today he would explain how you could cut $5 billion worth of expenditures out of a $12 billion pool. He has not done it today, and I do not think he can do it.

Mr. RESNICK. My Republican opponent in 1966, reading the Republican campaign literature, parroted the same line. He said we have to economize and we have to cut. He did not tell me then where to cut and the Republicans here in the House today will not or cannot tell us where these mythical savings are to come from.

I would like to make one other point, if I may. There are two ways to cure a deficit. One way is to cut and the other way is to increase taxes. Everybody is screaming about the 10-percent surtax. Everybody is screaming about cutting. I did not hear one single word about tax reform. What about the $10 billion or $20 billion that is lost in this country every year because of the 27.5 percent tax-free oil depletion allowance? What about the tax-exempt organizations that are not entitled to their tax-free status. I can go on and on and on and on. Not one word about that. All we hear about is the 10-percent surtax increase. We did not hear one word about the fact that Federal taxes are lower today than they were in 1964. We have not heard one word about that, either.

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

Mr. RESNICK. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Has the President recommended the elimination of the depletion allowance?

Mr. RESNICK. I would say to the gentleman that this is the House of Repre-

sentatives. I would say to the gentleman that the House of Representatives has certain responsibilities. I would imagine we are pretty big boys now and we could certainly bring in a tax reform bill.

Mr. JONAS. Yes. But he recommended the surtax bill.

Mr. RESNICK. I understand that.

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

Mr. RESNICK. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. It seems to me the minority party is tending to rely more and more on Presidential assistance in connection with their work.

Mr. RESNICK. I have to agree with my distinguished friend from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further at this time.

I would like to emphasize a couple of things. I say what we are being asked to do here today is this: There was an old saying when I was a kid—"Indian giving." You give with one hand and 5 minutes later you take it back. I do not know how anybody else is going to explain it, but what we are being asked to do is welch on every single vote we have taken in this Congress. Yes, we voted for urban renewal and we voted for the agriculture bill and we voted for everything else that costs money, but now in the sacred name of economy we are going to take it back, and nobody understands what we are doing. I for one do not intend to vote that way.

Thank you.

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

Mr. RESNICK. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIEGLE. I just wanted to say this: About 2 months ago I offered a tax-reform bill which included a substantial reduction in the oil-depletion allowance. I will be happy to send you a copy and have you cosponsor it.

Mr. RESNICK. I will be very happy to cosponsor it. I would like to see where a responsible Republican Party would come forward with a tax-reform measure. All we hear here is the Bow amendment and let us cut 5 percent. I made a lot of money in business. I never made any of it saving. I always made my money by investing it and spending it and getting it back. I think the United States runs the same way.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly each Member of this body could come up with a long list of what he considers to be nonessential Federal programs. Some such programs may be considered by the individual Member as puny, insignificant, and minor. But collectively all of them can add up to an amount in excess of the $29 billion anticipated deficit.

But equally as costly, Mr. Chairman, if not actually more costly in the long run, is the attitude of the agencies and departments of the U.S. Government toward the value of the dollar and how wisely and prudently that dollar now allocated to the various programs is being spent. Even though some programs are considered essential and cannot be abandoned, millions of dollars can be saved by better procurement and administration.

Mr. Chairman, there is an example, a most recent example, which in my opinion represents a totally reckless disregard for the dollars of the taxpayers on the part of the State Department. I make reference to the recent action taken by the State Department in locating a site for the Russian Embassy here in Washington, D.C. The net effect of this action on the part of the State Department will result in pouring $4.5 million of the taxpayers' money down a rathole.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Virginia yield to me at that point?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Permit me to finish my general statement and then I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. Chairman, I realize the difficulties involved in negotiating with the Russians in general and particularly in obtaining an agreement upon the location of an American Embassy in Moscow. But there should be no question as to where the location of the Russian Embassy should be in Washington, D.C. The facts stand out most clearly.

Mr. Chairman, there are two sites which were made available for this embassy. One of those sites is the old Mount Alto Hospital site, containing about 13 acres of land, valued in excess of $8 million. Another site is the old Davies site or Joseph Davies mansion known as Tregaron, which was made available to the State Department on numerous occasions at a cost of $3.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, the State Department repeatedly turned down the Tregaron site. In fact the Department never gave it any open-minded consideration.

Its representatives wanted the other site, despite the fact it would cost $4.5 million more. The Department claimed that citizens in the area surrounding Tregaron were opposed to it. The Department also claimed that the Russians preferred the Mount Alto site and this was important due to the fact they were having difficulty getting the Russians to agree on a site for the U.S. Embassy in Moscow.

Mr. Chairman, the citizens association in the area adjacent to Tregaron has gotten together and has unanimously adopted a resolution agreeing to the Russian Embassy being located in their neighborhood at the site of the Tregaron estate.

The Russians themselves on many occasions have stated that they prefer the Tregaron site over the Mount Alto site but the State Department ignores this and denies that the Russians have ever shown a preference for the Tregaron site.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Virginia yield to me at this point?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] after I have completed my general statement.

Mr. Chairman, even if the Russians do not prefer the Tregaron site, I still think we ourselves should face the economic aspects involved herein and, if we can in effect save the American taxpayers $4.5 million in the long run on the location of this embassy, we should do so. In addition we could put the Mount Alto property back on the tax rolls of the District of Columbia, which could produce several millions of dollars in additional revenue to the government of the District of Columbia, thereby reducing the cost of the Federal payment to the District.

So, Mr. Chairman, I consider that this is a tragic waste of the taxpayers' dollars and that the Department of State should be required to correct its error and correct it now.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should highly commend my distinguished friend from Virginia who is in the real estate business for helping a real estate firm named Weaver Bros. to make a commission. This is a perfectly normal and natural thing to do, because Weaver Bros. would make a real nice commission on the sale of the Tregaron property rather than to give the Russians property which the Government already owns at Mount Alto.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here and predict that the Russians are going to Mount Alto, not Tregaron.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. They will if it is the only site made available to them.

Further, I think the gentleman's statement objecting to any real estate agent in this community making a commission, as opposed to the proposition which has been offered to save the American taxpayers $4.5 million—and that is what I am talking about right now—does not come with good taste.

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

Mr. Chairman, I happen to know something about this real estate deal that the gentleman from Virginia is talking about, and I could not concur more with my colleague from New York that what is mainly involved here is the desire of a real estate firm to make some money.

Now, we can say that one site is worth this, and another site is worth that, but the fact remains, as the distinguished gentleman from New York said, that we already own the Mount Alto site, and the real estate firm would like to have us buy the Tregaron site for $3.5 million.

Now, you might be able to juggle this around and convince some people this is the way to save money, but you cannot convince me.

I also want to tell the Members about this so-called citizen committee out there. There happens to be two of them. I do not live in that area. I, unfortunately, sometimes when I get my tax bill, think unfortunately I live in Virginia, when Congress is in session, but there happens to be two citizens' committees, and the one that took a unanimous vote, their total membership could get in the No. 7 telephone booth out there in the Demo-

cratic cloakroom, so it is not very hard to get unanimous action out of an organization like that.

This thing has been kicking around for years and years. I am told the Russians are willing to accept Mount Alto, and they have offered us a piece of property in Moscow of comparable size and of even better accessibility, as far as the distance to the Foreign Office compares to the distance to the State Department. Certainly if any of the Members have seen our setup in Moscow I am sure they would say that we ought to accept because we need better and bigger quarters there.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe all this discussion about sites is academic, except for the fact that that real estate company does want to move the Davies property, and I am sure the Davies heirs would like to get their money out of it. But that is a fact that does not reflect on us, and it does not reflect on the State Department that they are going to move ahead without any cost to the U.S. Government.

I have sat here all afternoon wanting to talk a little bit about this business of the Bow amendment, and I believe I will just go ahead and say what I was going to say.

I spent a part of Saturday out at my farm in Ohio riding around looking at this year's calf crop. We have a policy there that we only save about two of the best bull calves for breeding purposes, and the rest of them are made steers and eventually wind up in the butcher shop. And while I was riding around, thinking about this, it occurred to me that had some application to the Bow amendment because, if I were the President of the United States I could not think of a better present that I would like the Congress to give me than a $5 billion gold-plated castration knife—and do not think I would not know where to cut.

There are a lot of projects that have been cut and probably ought to be cut. They are building a dam on the Ohio River right now which touches my district on one side of the river, and the district of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], on the other, at a total cost of about $65 or $70 million. It is for the purpose of navigation for some barge companies, and if the President wants to close it down tomorrow, well, I will explain to my people, and I assume the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] can do likewise.

And I can think of dozens of others that we can postpone.

I would just like to point out to the gentlemen if they want to give the President the power—and I voted against it the other day, I will vote against it today—but one of these days I am going to join you and, assuming that he is the political animal you are all saying he is, he will know which ones of you to send to the butcher shop, and which ones of you to save.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this resolution close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer the House of Representatives the Joelson plan by which we can cut $5 billion from our appropriations.

There are 435 of us here. Each of us knows his own district the best. I think each Member should compile a list of projects that he wants to be discontinued in his district. Those of you who have public works that you want stopped, please compile a list and submit them. Those who have defense contracts you want terminated in your district, please let me know and I will be pleased to offer a recission of that particular project in the Committee on Appropriations.

Those of you who are concerned about too many employees and who have letter carriers and postal clerks whose jobs you want abolished, please let me know and I will add that to the list and I am sure that it will come well beyond the $5 billion mark. I start the list as of now with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] who tells us about a national park that he does not want.

I assure you that I am willing to practice what I preach. If every Member submits that list for his district, I will be the 435th Member to submit that list for my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I deplore the action of the House last Wednesday in voting down the continuing resolution and in bringing the operations of the Government to the brink of chaos. I have been very much disturbed by the tenor of the debate today and last Wednesday.

The debate then and now reflects the frustrations, confusion, and doubts which have been created by the war in Vietnam, the political consequences of which are apparent in the gutting of essential Great Society programs on the one hand and the inviolability of the military-industrial complex on the other hand.

I have listened to a great deal of discussion about budget cuts and rescissions, about reducing Federal spending by $5 billion more than the $5 billion which the Committee on Appropriations already intends. Yet the debate has virtually ignored the sacrosanct military budget, which amounts to some 55 percent of the total budget of $136.5 billion.

Last week the President signed the defense appropriation bill which totaled $69,936,620,000. This afternoon the chairman of the Armed Services Committee will call up the military construction authorization conference report—to accompany 11722. The conferees have recommended for fiscal year 1968 $2,303.3 million compared to $1,005.8 million in fiscal year 1967. That is $1.3 billion or 129 percent more than last year. I suggest that this is an area for economy.

Let me quote from that conference report at page 37:

> The total construction authorization recommended by the conferees for fiscal year 1968 is $1,297,450,000 more than the amount of military construction authorized in fiscal year 1967 by Public Law 89-568, that figure being $1,005,842,000.

That is not double—that is 129 percent more than was authorized last year by this Congress for military construction.

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

Mr. RYAN. I am sorry, my time is too limited. But in the debate on that bill, I will be glad to discuss that with the distinguished chairman.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to discuss it on the floor now.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, military spending is an area in which substantial money could be saved, if the military budget were not regarded as sacred and untouchable.

Last Wednesday I pointed out that the Bow amendment specifically exempts $72.3 billion for the military.

There are other related areas where spending could be reduced or deferred. For instance, the House has voted $142.4 million for the supersonic transport, which is only the beginning of a Government subsidy which the Committee on Appropriations admits will be at least $4.5 billion.

As far as the NASA budget is concerned, I have made very specific recommendations both in committee and on the floor. I regret that those who are most vociferous about economy did not see fit to amend the Space authorization and appropriation bills. Administrative operations funds for NASA could be reduced by 10 percent, by simply maintaining its relationship to the rest of the NASA budget, without in any way impairing the space program.

I have raised questions about the possible duplication between NASA's Apollo applications program, which is estimated to cost $5 billion in the next 5 years, and the Department of Defense's manned orbiting laboratory, which will cost approximately $1.7 billion to $2 billion.

Members of the House may recall that I suggested a contingent authorization for the Apollo applications program of 50 percent of the committee recommendation pending a satisfactory program description and projection which does not yet exist.

Mr. Chairman, the current administration budget estimate provided in testimony by Budget Director Schultze is $136.5 billion. The administration has conceded that the actual level may reach $143.5 billion. If we take the figure of $136.5 billion, items which are considered "uncuttable" include:

Defense—$75.5 billion. I have already discussed the unwillingness of the House to reduce this.

Debt service—$14.2 billion.

Veterans' benefits—$6.1 billion.

Public assistance grants—$4.4 billion.

Farm price supports—$1.9 billion.

Health insurance payments to trust funds—$1.1 billion.

Postal public service costs and deficit—$1 billion.

General Government—$2.8 billion.

Space—$4.5 billion.

International affairs and finance—$4.3 billion.

Thus, "uncuttable" programs presumably total almost $116 billion.

Therefore, the realistic area from which budget reductions would have to

be made is approximately $20.7 billion. Included in this figure is $2.8 billion for education; $7.5 billion in health, labor, welfare, and antipoverty programs; $1.7 billion for housing and community development; $3.5 billion for natural resources and conservation; $2.7 billion for commerce and transportation; $1.5 for agriculture other than farm supports; and some $1 billion for miscellaneous programs.

In short, the cuts would have to come from the Great Society programs. Let me point out, because I think it is important that we understand what we are talking about when we talk about the $5 billion Bow amendment cut, it is really a 25-percent cut. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has also pointed out that we are really talking about making cuts in $20 billion—not $136.5 billion, which would mean a 25-percent cut in necessary and urgently needed social and domestic programs.

Let us look and see—I have some tables here, let us see what has happened to domestic programs, the Great Society programs which this Congress authorized in the 89th Congress.

The administration itself cut some $4.5 billion in domestic programs before it submitted its budget to this Congress.

As I said, the Bow amendment is directed at no more than $21 billion of Federal programs, of which over $12 billion represents programs in the vital areas of health, education, welfare, labor, housing, and community development.

In Health, Education, and Welfare, for example, the administration failed to submit budget requests for authorized programs in the amount of $2.8 billion. Higher education was cut 50 percent from the authorized level of $2.1 billion to $1 billion.

Elementary and secondary education was reduced by 45 percent from $3.5 billion to $2 billion. The bulk of this cut was in grants to States under title I.

In addition to the administration cuts of nearly $3 billion in Health, Education, and Welfare, the House pared off another $167 million.

This process operated even more severely in connection with Housing and Urban Development programs. The administration failed to submit budget requests for programs totaling $599 million to $2 billion. The bulk of this cut of the rehabilitation loan program and a 70-percent cutback in neighborhood facilities grants, basic water and sewer grants, and urban mass transportation grants.

In addition to the administration's reductions, the House cut an additional $689 million including $325 million from model cities, the entire $40 million rent supplement request, and another $60 million from housing loan program for the elderly. In all, the administration and the House together cut about one third of authorized HUD programs. And more generous Senate action will only restore a fraction of this, even if the House conferees accept the Senate levels.

Since authorization levels have changed somewhat between the administration's budget requests in January and later appropriations, the administration cuts plus the House cuts are not perfectly additive. Nevertheless, if we take the January authorization levels in HEW and HUD, which total about $18.6 billion, and compare them with the administration cuts plus the House cuts, we find that authorized funding in these critical areas has already been reduced by $4.265 billion, or some 23 percent. And since these are precisely the areas where any additional cuts would have to come, a $5 billion cut would reduce these programs by another 25 percent.

At the conclusion of my remarks I will include a table detailing this.

The old 5 percent Bow amendment has suddenly jumped a decimal place, and increased tenfold. The practical effect of slashing $5 billion more from the Federal budget would be to reduce programs in HEW and HUD to 50 percent of their authorizations. The administration and House action have already cut 23 percent, and the Bow amendment would cut another 25 percent.

The legislative gains of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations in New Frontier and Great Society programs would be wiped out.

The Vietnam war must not be used as an excuse to emasculate the progressive domestic programs of the past 7 years.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point in the RECORD, tables illustrating administration budget reductions in fiscal year 1968 authorizations and additional House reductions of administration requests for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

COMPARISON OF AVAILABLE AUTHORIZATIONS, 1968 ADMINISTRATION BUDGET REQUESTS AND 1968 HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1968 authorization	Actual administration request	Difference
Programs:			
Neighborhood facilities grants	121	42	−79
Alaska housing program	10	1	−9
Rehabilitation loans	100	0	−100
Housing for the elderly loans	95	80	−15
Urban planning grants	84	50	−34
Development incentive grants	50	30	−20
Basic water and sewer grants	400	165	−235
Mass transportation	205	125	−80
Urban information and technical assistance	8	6	−2
Community development training grants	30	5	−25
Total, administration cuts in HUD	--------	--------	−599

	Actual administration request	House appropriations	Difference
Programs:			
Neighborhood facilities grants	42	27	−15
Public housing contributions	290	275	−15
Housing for the elderly loans	80	20	−60
Urban planning grants	50	40	−10
Development incentive grants	30	0	−30
Urban beautification	125	75	−50
Mass transportation	230	175	−55
Urban research	20	5	−15
Rent supplements	40	0	−40
Demonstration cities (model cities)	662	237	−325
Other programs with minor cuts	992	918	−74
Total	2,561	1,872	−689
Total House cuts in HUD	--------	--------	−689

Total cuts in HUD, administration and House: $1,288,000,000.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1968 authorization	Actual administration request	Difference
Programs:			
Regional medical programs	200	65	−135
Health research facilities	100	35	−65
Medical library assistance act	23	13	−10
Higher education, total	2,088	1,000	−1,088
Facility grants	855	440	−415
Facility loans	400	0	−400
NDEA loans	225	193	−32
Educational opportunity grants	210	160	−50
Work-study	200	140	−60
Developing colleges	55	30	−25
Libraries	73	37	−36
ESEA	3,461	1,984	−1,517
Title I: Grants to States	2,314	1,200	−1,114
Title II: School libraries	154	105	−49
Title III: Supplementary centers	515	240	−275
Impacted areas	478	439	−39
Public libraries	114	68	−46
Vocational education	295	260	−35
Adult education	60	44	−16
Total, administration cuts in HEW	--------	--------	−2,810

	Actual administration request	House appropriations	Difference
Public Health Service	2,705	2,669	−37
Education funds	3,911	3,834	−77
Other	6,052	5,999	−53
Total	12,669	12,502	−167
Total House cuts in HEW	--------	--------	−167

Total cuts in HEW, administration and House: $2,977,000,000.

Grand total cuts in HEW and HUD, administration and House: $4,265,000,000 out of some $18,600,000,000 authorized, or nearly 23 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, last week a majority of the House voted, in effect, to place a ceiling or a limitation on expenditures and not turn over the full authority to the President to make such a limitation. Today, that spending limitation imposed by the House was reversed. Now, regrettably, by the vote today, the full authority to make any reductions has been returned to the President. I am amazed, I am dumbfounded that we have abdicated our responsibility in imposing an expenditure limitation. I regret very much that the House has not used a tool, an opportunity to put our own legislative imprint on what the spending ceiling should be.

I would like to make a suggestion to my dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I understood he asked me to make a suggestion as to where we could reduce expenditures. I have in my hand the budget document submitted by the President for fiscal year 1968. On page 46 of the President's budget document a statement appears that expenditures for fiscal 1968, he anticipates, will be $135.033 billion. That has been increased in a subsequent document to $136.5 billion.

The best way for us really to do something about that would be to vote as we did last week and not vote the way we did today, and then we could categorically cut the expenditures of the President's budget. I think it is too bad, it is tragic that we did not save $5 billion, and, unfortunately, those who changed their vote must bear some responsibility for it. Time is running out. We may not have another opportunity to reduce expenditures below the President's budget by appropriate legislative action.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I was happy to vote with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in both instances, and I intend to support his attempt to make rescissions when the time comes. But I wish to call the attention of the House also to this budget book to which the minority leader referred. Look at page 454. On that page the gross national product for the past 27 years appears. In the last column there is stated the percentage of the national debt against the gross national product. You will find out that during the war, and even before the war, in 1940, the percentage of the national debt was 51 percent against a gross national product of $95 billion. Then during the war it went up to one point at which the debt was 133.9 percent of the gross national product.

We come on down to 1966, when the gross national product had gone up to $712 billion and the public debt was 45 percent.

The estimate for 1967 is that it will be 42.9 percent, the lowest it has been in 25 years, the lowest public debt percentagewise against the gross national product.

I say those are meaningful figures because that is the difference between income and accumulated indebtedness. A gross national product of $762 billion is estimated with a 42.9-percent public debt against it.

We hear a great deal of screaming on the floor about a crisis, about calamity overtaking us. I say this country is in better condition today than it has been in the last 25 years. There are more people at work. There is less unemployment. There are more savings in the bank. And our national debt is the lowest percentagewise of the gross national product in 25 years. So why all the screaming?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I found the remarks of the gentleman from California very interesting. I would suggest that he had better go down and talk to his President. He had better go down and talk to the Council of Economic Advisers. He had better go down and talk to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Federal Reserve Board—yes, the financial experts, the economic experts who have been parading before the Ways and Means Committee. They have certainly expressed in no uncertain terms to the Ways and Means Committee the crisis they feel we are in.

If I have any judgment, Mr. Chairman, I think I would take the decisions or the judgments of these people as to whether or not we are in a serious situation, rather than the rosy picture painted for us by the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the comment of the gentleman from California relating the national debt to gross national product, is the argument always advanced by those who see no danger in an ever increasing national debt. This argument contradicts that made by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt who stated, when he was a candidate for President the first time, that a government is somewhat like an individual or a business enterprise in that it could spend more than it takes in for a few years but a continuation of that policy eventually leads to the poorhouse or the bankruptcy court.

The burden of the national debt cannot be evaluated by relating it to gross national product. The way to evaluate that burden is to relate it to administrative receipts, and when this is done the result shows that it now takes approximately 11 cents out of every dollar of administrative receipts to pay the interest on the national debt. After paying the first 11 cents in interest, the Treasury is left with only 89 cents out of every tax dollar with which to pay for running the war and all of the other expenses of Government.

You will have to go back a good many years to find a time when this burden was greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close the debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has said he would rather take the views of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers, and others. He seems impressed with the views which they have, and he reports that they state we are confronted with a very serious financial crisis.

The truth is, of course, that these same people have recommended a tax increase to reduce the estimated budget deficit for fiscal 1968, and under all of these circumstances I would think he would be willing to join with us in making all the reductions we can in appropriations. After we have done that, and if we have done a workmanlike job, and the prospective deficit is still unacceptable, then we should pass a tax increase to further reduce the deficit.

I fully agree that Congress ought to do its work on appropriations before we vote on a tax bill. We ought to make reductions wherever we can.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VANIK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 938, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

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

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 853, just passed, and to insert pertinent extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT DIORI HAMANI OF NIGER AT RECEPTION BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA IN RAYBURN BUILDING

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on September 27, 1967, the gentlewoman

from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and I, acting for the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, hosted a reception in the Rayburn Building for the Honorable Diori Hamani, President of the Republic of Niger.

In my remarks in introduction I said:

Today we have among us a real friend of the United States in Africa, a statesman of outstanding dedication and of great ability. Mr. President, you can go back to your country knowing that you are carrying with you the heart of the American people.

We have with us too a great woman of the Congress of the United States, Congresswoman Bolton, who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. If the good Lord gives the Republicans the House in the next Congress, this lady will be the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. She has a deep, warm and abiding interest in the nations and the peoples of Africa.

Following is a translation of the remarks of President Hamani:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, Members of Congress, and you, Madame Bolton, you who have been called God-mother of Africa. It is with great joy and happiness that I get in touch now with the representatives of this great American people.

You said a moment ago, Mr. President, that after we have stayed here a few days and have gone back to our country, we shall take part of the heart of the American people with us. We have a saying in our country, that when there is a place in someone's heart, the feet will move to go to that place. This is why we came here. In fact, we know that there is a little place in your heart, in this country, for us. You on your part know that we in Niger have a place in our heart for you. That explains why so many Americans come to our country.

We live now in a planet that is getting small for all of us. It is getting smaller all the time, and since you are the people with the most advanced and sophisticated sciences, with your astronauts, your spacecraft, and your space rockets, you know better than anybody that we are always shortening distances—and this always for the betterment of humanity because we live in a century of cooperation, friendship, human dignity, seeking a future of friendly and brotherly love.

There is only one regret I wish to express here. Too few of you men and women—that is, Members of Congress and Senators—come to our country, to Africa generally. We wish to see more of you because there is no better way to know each other than through personal contacts and human contacts.

And I am speaking to you also, Ambassador Ryan. All we know generally about the American Congress is that one year a decision is taken in this direction, the next year you tell us that Congress made a decision in the other direction, then the third year is something else again. What we want is more human contact so that we understand each other better and so that we can better follow what is going on.

We know now that you are changing directions in the field of African affairs toward regional projects. This is the trend today. But we feel that the gap can be bridged between the local or national project, as understood in the bilateral sense of the word, and the regional project. It is our understanding and hope that all this can be resolved in the spirit of compromise that will make it possible to find a solution.

In the seven years that have elapsed since most African countries acquired independence, this political maturity that was so eloquently mentioned by the Chairman of the Committee has been developing greatly and rapidly.

Now we are becoming more aware of the problems that are to be solved in the future, of the difficulties that are coming up, and of the gap between wishes and the possible. We do the best we can, but unfortunately we have limited resources.

We have the will to go forward but our physical and financial resources are unfortunately very limited. As leaders, our major job is to impart the truth to our peoples and this means telling them that it is not possible to do everything at once: we are only human and we cannot accomplish miracles; we can only work out human solutions to human problems.

To do so we have to determine priorities in planning for development and we have to renew our efforts toward achieving these goals. Independence brought with it a whole series of new problems to emerging countries: internal politics, diplomacy and defense.

I am not the authorized spokesman for the leaders of Africa and I am not speaking as such, but I can say that we are trying to organize ourselves with a view to achieving unity and, in so doing, to finding common solutions to common problems.

Each country will have to mobilize all its human resources to achieve maximum development notwithstanding social, religious or other differences. Cohesion will be of the essence.

All the new states of Africa are sovereign among themselves and they all show tolerance and understanding toward one another. Their experience as independent states is too new for them to proclaim that theirs is the right way of national life.

This spirit was clearly shown at the Kinshasa Conference and the international press was quick to recognize the realistic character of the decisions taken.

Most of all, we need peace in order to carry out our programs for economic development. Together we must fight underdevelopment.

We realize that we faced many handicaps when we acceded to independence. On the positive side, we must also recognize that the times are auspicious because of the fantastic potential for development made possible today by scientific progress and by the enormous capital available to advanced countries, the United States above all.

Therefore, our rendezvous with tomorrow is a rendezvous of friends working together for the welfare of many in a better world.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 726)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND

(First Army)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $3,210,000.

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,304,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Hospital facilities, $2,585,000.

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $976,000.

Fort Hamilton, New York: Operational facilities, $127,000.

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,893,000.

Fort Holabird, Maryland: Administrative facilities, $588,000.

Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $581,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, and utilities, $3,325,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $1,646,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Hospital facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,510,000.

Camp Pickett, Virginia: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, and ground improvements, $329,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Troop housing and utilities, $3,759,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $15,019,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Hospital facilities and utilities, $312,000.

Fort Gordon, Georgia: Training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, $4,364,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina: Hospital facilities, $11,412,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Training facilities and troop housing, $2,118,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,693,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $3,075,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Supply facilities, $954,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Training facilities and community facilities, $3,636,000.

Fort Wolters, Texas: Utilities, $379,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $15,152,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $4,462,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Administrative facilities, $392,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $21,962,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Training facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,575,000.

(Sixth Army)

Fort Irwin, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, $439,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $4,615,000.

Fort Ord, California: Hospital facilities, and troop housing, $27,329,000.

(Military District of Washington)

Fort Myer, Virginia: Troop housing, and utilities, $1,680,000.

(CONUS Various)

CONUS Various Locations: Community facilities, $1,053,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $5,142,000.

Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas: Utilities, $419,000.

Anniston Army Depot, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $964,000.

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $2,151,000.

Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland: Troop housing, $653,000.

Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $552,000.

Lexington Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky: Maintenance facilities, $160,000.

New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Utilities, $330,000.

Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas: Production facilities, $1,713,000.

Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado: Maintenance, and supply facilities, $855,000.

Red River Army Depot, Texas: Supply facilities and administrative facilities, $376,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and administrative facilities, $695,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Utilities, $320,000.

Sacramento Army Depot, California: Supply facilities, $93,000.

Savanna Army Depot, Illinois: Operational facilities, and utilities, $102,000.

Sharpe Army Depot, California: Supply facilities, $199,000.

Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $268,000.

Tooele Army Depot, Utah: Supply facilities, $680,000.

Watertown Arsenal, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, $3,471,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $4,781,000.

Fort Wingate Army Depot, New Mexico: Utilities, $166,000.

Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona: Research, development, and test facilities, $176,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Chicago Defense Area, Illinois: Operational facilities, $365,000.

Detroit Defense Area, Michigan: Operational facilities, $130,000.

New York Defense Area, New York: Troop housing, $327,000.

CONUS Various Locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $64,846,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Two Rock Ranch Station, California: Supply facilities, $174,000.

Vint Hill Farms, Virginia: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $433,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Utilities, $136,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $15,495,000.

ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE

Madigan General Hospital, Washington: Medical facilities, $185,000.

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Hospital facilities, and community facilities, $12,840,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Army Map Service, Maryland: Utilities, $156,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

Bayonne Naval Supply Center, New Jersey: Operational facilities, $95,000.

Oakland Army Base, California: Utilities, $289,000.

Sunny Point, North Carolina: Utilities, $70,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Fort Greely, Alaska: Operational facilities, $852,000.

Fort Richardson, Alaska: Utilities, $1,800,000.

Fort Wainwright, Alaska: Utilities, $84,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Fort De Russy, Hawaii: Troop housing, and utilities, $7,132,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities, $286,000.

Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Utilities, $1,944,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Camp Zama, Japan: Supply facilities, $193,000.

Korea: Hospital facilities, $2,810,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Fort Clayton, Canal Zone: Utilities, $7,985,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Kwajalein Atoll: Research, development, and test facilities, housing and community facilities, $12,255,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Various locations: Operational facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities, $4,601,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany: Supply facilities, $2,000,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $6,815,000.

Various locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area, $60,000,000: *Provided*, That, within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Various locations: Operational facilities and utilities, $3,821,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisitions, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the amount of $2,873,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That, the Secretary of the Army or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1968, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 87-554, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Third Army)" with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama, strike out "$1,352,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,554,000;"

(b) Public Law 87-554, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$102,370,000" and "$150,879,000" and inserting in place thereof "$102,572,000" and "$151,081,000" respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "ARMY COMPONENT COMMANDS (Pacific Command Area)" with respect to Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, strike out "$913,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,006,000".

(b) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$155,826,000" and "$200,695,000" and inserting in place thereof "$155,919,000" and "$200,788,000" respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 88-390, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Second Army)" with respect to Fort Lee, Virginia, strike out "$2,900,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,000,000".

(2) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Military District of Washington, District of Columbia)" with respect to Fort Myer, Virginia, strike out "$4,052,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,330,000".

(3) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Fifth Army)" with respect to Fort Sheridan, Illinois, strike out "$5,544,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,350,000".

(4) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND (United States Army Missile Command)" with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, strike out "$2,389,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,563,000".

(5) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)" with respect to Army Pictorial Center, New York, strike out "$1,120,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,185,000".

(6) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Medical Service)" with respect to Letterman General Hospital, California, strike out "$14,305,000" and insert in place thereof "$15,424,000".

(b) Public Law 88-390, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$252,994,000" and "$304,055,000" and inserting "$256,536,000" and "$307,597,000", respectively.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended under the heading "IN-

SIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the heading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Second Army)" with respect to Fort Lee, Virginia, strike out "$700,000" and insert in place thereof "$925,000".

(2) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND, less Army Materiel Command (Fifth Army)" with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$16,084,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,536,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$253,722,000" and "$310,583,000" and inserting "$254,399,000" and "$311,260,000", respectively.

SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 89–568 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and under the subheading "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)" with respect to United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, strike out "$2,451,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,705,000".

(2) Under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and under the subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND" with respect to Kwajalein Atoll, strike out "$31,333,000" and insert in place thereof "$36,907,000".

(b) Public Law 89–568 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$57,219,000", "$36,141,000," and "$126,360,000" and inserting "$57,473,000," "$41,715,000" and "$132,188,000".

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Utilities, $575,000

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Utilities, $496,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, Rhode Island: Troop housing, $2,613,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $4,368,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Supply facilities $82,000.

Naval Destroyer School, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $1,486,000.

Naval Schools Command, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $2,848,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,697,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,823,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,355,000.

Naval Submarine School, New London, Connecticut: Training facilities, $1,607,000.

Naval Submarine Medical Center, New London, Connecticut: Medical facilities, $1,590,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,786,000.

Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Research, development, and test facilities, $148,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,684,000.

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,526,000.

Naval Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,859,000.

Navy Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $80,000.

Naval Air Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $586,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Scientific and Technical Intelligence Center, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $1,374,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, and utilities, $874,000.

Naval Security Station, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $2,271,000.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Training facilities, Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,578,000.

Naval Hospital, Annapolis, Maryland: Hospital and medical facilities, $134,000.

Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Operational facilities, $5,000,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland: Utilities, $630,000.

Naval Communication Station, Cheltenham, Maryland: Troop housing, and utilities, $925,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Maryland: Utilities and ground improvements, $1,208,000.

Naval School, Explosive Ordnance Disposal, Indian Head, Maryland: Training facilities, $296,000.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,522,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Hospital, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina: Troop housing, $92,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,349,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $2,866,000.

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Training facilities, and troop housing, $2,378,000.

Naval Radio Station, Driver, Virginia: Troop housing, $86,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia: Medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,072,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Little Creek, Virginia: Training facilities, $693,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $4,723,000.

Headquarters, Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, Norfolk, Virginia: Troop housing, $2,508,000.

Fleet Operations Control Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, $424,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,997,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $4,714,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $153,000.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Troop housing, $808,000.

Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $65,000.

Naval Schools Command, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $1,787,000.

Nuclear Weapons Training Center, Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $1,557,000.

Navy Preventive Medicine Unit, Norfolk, Virginia: Medical facilities, $339,000.

Naval Radio Station, Northwest, Virginia: Troop housing, $143,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $8,412,000.

Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia: Troop housing, $1,084,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,051,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, $3,590,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Maintenance facilities, $5,260,000.

Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida: Troop housing, $302,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $6,975,000.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Supply facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $1,511,000.

Naval Hospital, Key West, Florida: Troop housing, $243,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $13,425,000.

Navy Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida: Troop housing, $441,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,608,000.

Naval Aviation Medical Center, Pensacola, Florida: Troop housing, $338,000.

Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Florida: Training facilities, and troop housing, $1,864,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,317,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Troop housing, $1,020,000.

Naval Air Station, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,530,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $3,143,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $955,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $3,063,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $4,048,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $17,172,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,246,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $12,784,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas:

Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,603,000.

Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, Texas: Troop housing, $344,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,894,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes Illinois: Troop housing, $6,869,000.

Naval Hospital Corps School, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training facilities, $1,561,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Utilities, $306,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Crane, Indiana: Maintenance facilities, $225,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Observatory, Flagstaff, Arizona: Research, development, and test facilities, $704,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,133,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Research development, and test facilities, $2,486,000.

Naval Aerospace Recovery Facility, El Centro, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $460,000.

Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California: Troop housing, $427,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, $4,918,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $489,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Community facilities, $800,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Facility, Long Beach, California: Training facilities, $434,000.

Naval Dental Clinic, Long Beach, California: Medical facilities, $821,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $509,000.

Naval Ship Missile Systems Engineering Station, Port Hueneme, California: Administrative facilities, $1,591,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Troop housing, $2,638,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,145,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, $381,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $8,380,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $6,590,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $7,692,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Ream Field, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,471,000.

Naval Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $4,720,000.

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $475,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare School, San Diego, California: Training facilities, $286,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Training facilities, and troop housing, $12,491,000.

Naval Hospital, San Diego, California: Troop housing, $986,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $5,955,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $383,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California: Operational facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $20,079,000.

Naval Radio Station, Dixon, California: Medical facilities, and troop housing, $172,000.

Naval Schools Command, Mare Island, California: Troop housing, $2,738,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California: Utilities and ground improvements, $119,000.

Naval Hospital, Oakland, California: Troop housing, $1,436,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco Bay, California: Troop housing at Hunters Point; and maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities at Mare Island, $9,174,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Utilities and ground improvements, $850,000.

Naval Schools Command, Treasure Island, California: Training facilities, and troop housing, $5,825,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $598,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon: Utilities and ground improvements, $65,000.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $6,923,000.

Naval Hospital, Bremerton, Washington: Troop housing, $83,000.

Naval Radio Station, Jim Creek, Oso, Washington: Community facilities, $130,000.

Naval Communication Station, Puget Sound, Washington: Operational facilities, $713,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Seattle, Washington: Utilities and ground improvements, $252,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $2,626,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing, $370,000.

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,237,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,395,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $4,102,000.

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $62,000.

Fleet Submarine Training Facility, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Training facilities, $944,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $7,636,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,554,000.

Fleet Operations Control Center, Kunia, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing, and utilities, $1,728,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,170,000.

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $494,000.

Naval Radio Station Lualualei, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $6,793,000.

Pacific Fleet Tactical Range, Barking Sands, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $2,264,000.

SEVENTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities, $4,587,000.

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $686,000.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Various Locations: Operational facilities, $55,000.

Various Naval Communication Activities: Utilities, $3,278,000.

MARINE CORPS GROUND FORCES FACILITIES

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,571,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $12,507,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $892,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, $2,149,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $1,230,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $6,704,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $11,290,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Troop housing, $912,000.

Camp H. M. Smith, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing, $1,549,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Facility, Antigua, West Indies: Utilities, $87,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Troop housing, $3,918,000.

Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Troop housing, $1,600,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,468,000.

Naval Hospital, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Hospital and medical facilities, and troop housing, $6,283,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico: Troop housing and community facilities, $513,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Midway Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, $1,669,000.

ATLANTIC AREA

Naval Station, Bermuda: Operational facilities, $1,253,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Londonderry, Northern Ireland: Medical facilities, $116,000.

Naval Radio Station, Guardamar del Segura, Spain: Community facilities, $58,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $288,000.

Naval Communication Station, Nea Makri, Greece: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $133,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $467,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, $142,000.

Naval Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $2,000,000.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, $284,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply facilities, $2,590,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $8,452,000.

Naval Radio Station, Totsuka, Japan: Utilities, $97,000.

Naval Ordnance Facility, Yokosuka, Japan: Maintenance facilities, $336,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Futema, Okinawa: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $6,169,000.

Fleet Activities, Ryukyus, Okinawa: Community facilities, $80,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines: Medical facilities, $105,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines: Community facilities, $501,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines: Community facilities, $179,000.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Various Locations: Operational facilities, $65,000.

Various Naval Communication Activities: Utilities, $662,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $6,784,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1968, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "BUREAU OF SHIPS (Naval Shipyards)" with respect to Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, California, by striking out "$850,000" and inserting in place thereof "$908,000".

(b) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended in section 602, clause (2), by striking out "$116,031,000" and "$202,930,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$116,089,000" and "$202,988,000".

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 88–390 is amended in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "BUREAU OF SHIPS FACILITIES (Naval Shipyards)" with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, by striking out "$4,760,000" and inserting in place thereof "$5,240,000".

(b) Public Law 88–390 is amended in section 602, clause (2), by striking out "$160,237,000" and "$225,639,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$160,717,000" and "$226,119,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "BUREAU OF SHIPS FACILITIES (Naval Shipyards)" with respect to Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, and Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, strike out "$2,931,000" and "$3,591,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "$3,857,000" and "$4,650,000", respectively.

(2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Station, Key West, Florida, and Naval Station, Treasure Island, California, strike out "$1,293,000" and "$1,856,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "$1,462,000" and "$2,234,000", respectively.

(3) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES" with respect to Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, strike out "$7,126,000" and insert in place thereof "$8,402,000".

(4) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out "$11,457,000" and insert in place thereof "$12,732,000".

(5) Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Dispensary and Dental Clinic, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, strike out "$2,800,000" and insert in place thereof, "$3,026,000".

(6) Under the heading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Autodin Facility, Albany, Georgia, and Naval Autodin Facility, Syracuse, New York, strike out "$313,000" and "$45,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "$926,000" and "$135,000", respectively.

(7) Under the heading "OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia, strike out "$5,560,000" and insert in place thereof "$7,368,000".

(8) Under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES" with respect to Headquarters Support Activity, Taipei, Republic of China, strike out "$199,000" and insert in place thereof "$370,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "$228,770,000", "$34,436,000", and "$314,305,000" and inserting in place thereof "$236,590,000", "$34,607,000", and "$322,296,000", respectively.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Administrative facilities and community facilities, $316,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Utilities, $204,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Administrative facilities and utilities, $290,000.

McCord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities and utilities, $1,598,000.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New York: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $377,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, $1,201,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Utilities, $184,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Training facilities, $264,000.

Paine Field, Everett, Washington: Operational facilities, $401,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,105,000.

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,812,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Utilities, $1,681,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Utilities, $166,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Utilities, $475,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Supply facilities and administrative facilities, $199,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities and community facilities, $730,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $1,628,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,147,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,940,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $365,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $5,130,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $3,597,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $10,862,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $1,554,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, $4,185,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $4,023,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $7,487,000.

Eglin Auxiliary Airfield Numbered 9, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $1,732,000.

Grenier Field, Manchester, New Hampshire: Troop housing, $465,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,621,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Operational facilities and utilities, $181,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,648,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida:

Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,040,000.

Eastern Test Range, Cocoa, Florida: Research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $4,787,000.

Western Test Range, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $15,333,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $7,137,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Training facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,523,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,665,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities and administrative facilities, $3,071,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $23,457,000.

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Texas: Utilities, $92,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $736,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Training facilities and troop housing and community facilities, $5,479,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $7,005,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, $875,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing and utilities, $1,203,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational and training facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,795,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,655,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Training facilities and utilities, $619,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,296,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,939,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $934,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $225,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $3,987,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $11,618,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $7,819,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $3,655,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,892,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities and utilities, $866,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $843,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $4,219,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, utilities, and real estate, $8,083,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,047,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCE

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Medical facilities, troop housing facilities, and utilities, $2,566,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,483,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $356,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Utilities, $88,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $795,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,689,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,132,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $2,954,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $537,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $229,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $345,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities and medical facilities, $389,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,652,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $584,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,032,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $759,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $388,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,428,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Administrative facilities, and community facilities, $5,471,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $430,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,354,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $960,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,203,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $2,068,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities administrative facilities, and utilities, $3,581,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,495,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $248,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,053,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $5,866,000.

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $6,311,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and real estate, $4,243,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $970,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $2,454,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $2,243,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Utilities, $51,000.

Lake Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $3,165,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,169,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,395,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities and administrative facilities, $470,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Community facilities and utilities, $839,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,201,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,099,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $613,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,582,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Training facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $4,648,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various Locations: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,876,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $818,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Wake Island Air Force Station, Wake Island: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $484,000.

Kindley Air Base, Bermuda: Operational facilities and community facilities, $584,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCE

Okinawa: Community facilities, and utilities, $950,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities and troop housing and community facilities, $1,355,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Troop housing and utilities, $1,255,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $1,778,000.

Goose Air Base, Canada: Administrative facilities and utilities, $90,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $2,502,000.

United Kingdom: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $10,457,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $4,520,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES SOUTHERN COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,625,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various Locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $486,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenance, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $59,422,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1968, except for those public work projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 87–57, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND", with respect to Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, strike out "$2,433,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,504,000".

(b) Public Law 87–57, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$146,868,000" and "$474,461,000" and inserting in place thereof "$146,939,000" and "$474,532,000", respectively.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 88–390, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE", with respect to Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, strike out "$3,137,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,998,000".

(2) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out $1,888,000" and insert in place thereof $2,259,000".

(b) Public Law 88–390, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$165,327,000" and $303,447,000" and inserting in place thereof $166,559,000" and "$304,679,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND", with respect to McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington, strike out "$3,736,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,277,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with respect to Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, strike out "$5,442,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,347,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with respect to Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out "$5,510,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,663,000".

(4) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with respect to Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia, strike out "$1,782,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,017,000".

(5) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with respect to Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out "$651,000" and insert in place thereof "732,000".

(6) Under the subheading "AIR UNIVERSITY", with respect to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike out "$770,000" and insert in place thereof "$970,000".

(7) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE", with respect to McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, strike out $2,094,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,440,000".

(8) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE", with respect to Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, strike out "$2,240,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,612,000".

(9) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, strike out "$1,785,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,945,000".

(10) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan, strike out "$148,000" and insert in place thereof "$223,000".

(11) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, strike out "$565,000" and insert in place thereof "$706,000".

(12) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$66,000".

(13) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "$109,000" and insert in place thereof "$132,000".

(14) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out "$218,000" and insert in place thereof "$250,000".

(15) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, strike out "$45,000" and insert in place thereof "$70,000".

(16) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND", with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, strike out "$3,696,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,063,000".

(17) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND", with respect to Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, strike out "$2,560,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,801,000".

(18) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND", with respect to Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina, strike out "$1,189,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,267,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$210,630,000" and "$334,376,000" and inserting in place thereof "$215,631,000" and "$339,377,000", respectively.

SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 89–568 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND", with respect to Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, strike out "$6,277,000" and insert in place thereof "$7,262,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", w ith respeect to Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, strike out "$586,000" and insert in place thereof "$885,000."

(3) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, strike out "$1,169,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,313,000".

(4) Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska, strike out "$1,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,500,000".

(5) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND", with respect to Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California, strike out "$7,706,000" and insert in place thereof "$8,560,000".

(6) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, strike out "$494,000" and insert in place thereof "$607,000".

(7) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "$440,000" and insert in place thereof "$498,000".

(b) Public Law 89–568 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$107,098,000" and "$198,014,000" and inserting in place thereof "$109,786,000" and "$200,702,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for defense agencies for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Sandia Base, New Mexico: Administrative facilities and hospital and medical facilities, $1,732,000.

DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

National Military Command System Support Center, Pentagon, Washington, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $600,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, $375,000.

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $847,000.

Defense Supply Depot, Tracy, California: Supply facilities, $4,026,000.

Defense Logistics Services Center, Battle Creek, Michigan: Adiministrative facilities, $305,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities and utilities, $2,429,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Operational facilities, production facilities, and utilities, $3,416,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Johnston Island: Community facilities, and ground improvements, $1,410,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Various Locations, Europe: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,407,000.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $150,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 403. (a) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 401 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY", with respect to Arlington Hall Station, Arlington, Virginia, strike out "$17,900,000" and insert in place thereof "$20,000,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended, by striking out in clause (4) of section 602 "$100,051,000" and inserting in place thereof "$102,151,000".

TITLE V

SEC. 501. The Secretary of each military department may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, which are necessary outside the United States in connection with military activities in Southeast Asia, or in support of such activities in the total amount as follows:

Department of the Army, $33,156,000

Department of the Navy, $17,964,000

Department of the Air Force, $23,880,000: *Provided*, That materials only are authorized in connection with dependent military housing facilities for the Vietnamese.

SEC. 502. The Secretary of Defense, in connection with construction projects undertaken in South Vietnam pursuant to section 501 above, shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives such reports as were heretofore furnished pursuant to section 401(c) of Public Law 89–367 (80 Stat. 36, 37).

TITLE VI

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 601. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations, hereinafter named, family housing units and trailer court facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Family housing units for—

(a) The Department of the Army, two thousand two hundred units, $40,644,000:

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, two hundred units.

Presidio of San Francisco, California, two hundred units.

Fort Benning, Georgia, three hundred and sixty units.

Fort Gordon, Georgia, four hundred units.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, fifty units.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, one hundred units.

Fort Meade, Maryland, three hundred units.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina, two hundred units.

Fort Hood, Texas, one hundred and twenty units.

Fort Stewart, Georgia, one hundred and twenty units.

Pacific Side, Canal Zone, one hundred and fifty units.

(b) The Department of the Navy, four thousand six hundred and twelve units, $93,810,000:

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, four hundred and thirty units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, one hundred units.

Naval Complex, Long Beach, California, five hundred units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, three hundred units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, one hundred units.

Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia, forty-two units.

Naval Complex, Oahu, Hawaii, five hundred units.

David Taylor Model Basin Field Station, Bayview, Idaho, four units.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, one hundred and fifty units.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, thirty-two units.

Naval Communication Station, Cheltenham, Maryland, fifty units.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Boston, Massachusetts, one hundred units.

Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, fourteen units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada, one hundred units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Oklahoma, thirty units.

Naval Complex, South Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Newport, Rhode Island, two hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Charleston, South Carolina, one hundred and fifty units.

Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, one hundred units.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, one hundred units.

Naval Security Group Activity, Marietta, Washington, thirty units.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, two hundred and fifty units.

Naval Communication Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, twenty units.

Naval Station, Guam, two hundred units.

Naval Communication Station, North West Cape, Australia, seventy units.

Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, two hundred units.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, one hundred and forty units.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, one hundred units.

(c) The Department of the Air Force, three thousand seven hundred and ninety-seven units, $75,890,000:

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, three hundred units.

Luke Air Force Range, Arizona, four units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, one unit.

George Air Force Base, California, three hundred and seventy-two units.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, one hundred and sixty units.

Hickam-Wheeler Air Force Bases, Hawaii, four hundred units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, two hundred units.

McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, two hundred units.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, two hundred units.

L. G. Hanscom Field, Massachusetts, one hundred units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, two hundred units.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, three hundred units.

Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, three hundred units.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, fourteen units.

Laredo Air Force Base, Texas, four hundred units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, one hundred units.

Reese Air Force Base, Texas, one unit.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico, one hundred units.

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, two hundred units.

Wake Island Air Force Station, twenty units.

Albrook-Howard Air Force Bases, Canal Zone, fifty units.

Bentwaters Air Base, United Kingdom, one hundred units.

Upper Heyford Air Base, United Kingdom, seventy-five units.

SEC. 602. Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures:

(a) The average unit cost for each military department for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska) and Puerto Rico shall not exceed $19,500, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(b) No family housing unit in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding $35,000, including the cost of the family unit and the propor-

tionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than those listed in subsection (a), the average cost of all such units, in any project of fifty units or more, shall not exceed $32,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed $40,000. The cost limitations of this subsection shall include the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 603. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorizations Acts on cost of construction of family housing, the limitations on such cost contained in section 602 of this Act shall apply to all prior authorizations for construction of family housing not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been executed by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 604. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(a) For the Department of the Army, $7,000,000.

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $5,000,000.

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $5,000,000.

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $671,000.

SEC. 605. Section 507 of Public Law 88–174 (77 Stat. 307, 326), as amended by section 505 of Public Law 89–188 (79 Stat. 793, 814), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 507. For the purpose of providing military family housing in foreign countries, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements guaranteeing the builders or other sponsors of such housing a rental return equivalent to a specified portion of the annual rental income which the builders or other sponsors would receive from the tenants if the housing were fully occupied: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount guaranteed under such agreements entered into during the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 shall not exceed such amount as may be applicable to five thousand units: *Provided further*, That no such agreement shall guarantee the payment of more than 97 per centum of the anticipated rentals, nor shall any guarantee extend for a period of more than ten years, nor shall the average guaranteed rental on any project exceed $185 per unit per month, including the cost of maintenance and operation."

SEC. 696. Section 501(b) of Public Law 87–554 (76 Stat. 223, 237) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following new clause: "and (3) notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of debt service, proceeds of the disposal of family housing of the Department of Defense, including related land and improvements, whether disposed of by the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency, but less those expenses payable pursuant to section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 485(b)), to remain available until expended."

SEC. 607. Section 515 of Public Law 84–161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1968 and 1969, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities, for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge, at or near any military installation in the United States, Puerto Rico, or Guam if the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, finds that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military installation and that (1) there has been a recent and substantial increase in the personnel strength assigned to such military installation and such increase is temporary, or (2) the permanent personnel strength of such military installation is to be substantially reduced in the near future, or (3) the number of military personnel assigned to such military installation is so small as to make the construction of family housing uneconomical. Such housing facilities may be leased on an individual basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may not exceed an average of $175 per unit per month for each military department, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation."

SEC. 608. Subsection (g) of section 407 of Public Law 85–241 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1594j(g)) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "Any such housing so exempted in connection with depot-type installations, as to which the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines, subsequent to July 1, 1967, that indefinite retention may be necessary to satisfy unanticipated housing requirements resulting from future expanded activity at such installations, may be retained and utilized as necessary, notwithstanding that the foregoing criteria are no longer satisfied."

SEC. 609. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to acquire by transfer, without reimbursement, all rights and interests of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, in ten family housing units located on Auxiliary Field Number 6, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.

SEC. 610. (a) None of the funds authorized by this or any other Act may be expended for the repair or improvement of any single family housing unit, or for the repair or improvement of two or more housing units when such units are to be converted into or used as a single family housing unit, if the cost of such repair or improvement to such unit or units, as the case may be, exceeds a total cost of $10,000, including any costs in connection with (1) the furnishing of electricity, gas, water, and sewage disposal; (2) roads and walks; and (3) grading and drainage, unless such repair or improvement in connection with such unit or units is specifically authorized by law. As used in this section the term "repair or improvement" includes maintenance, alteration, expansion, extension, or rehabilitation of any housing unit or units.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish repairs and improvements to existing public quarters in amounts in excess of the $10,000 limitation prescribed in subsection (a) of this section as follows:

United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, eight units, $158,000.

Commandant, United States Marine Corps Quarters, Washington, District of Columbia, one unit, $67,000.

Chief Naval Air Training Quarters, Pensacola, Florida, one unit, $19,900.

Commandant, Ninth Naval District, Great Lakes, Illinois, $40,000.

Quarters A, Naval Station, New York, one unit, $23,500.

Flag Quarters T–143, PWC San Diego, California, one unit, $18,100.

Flag Quarters Number 23, Honolulu, Hawaii, one unit, $16,300.

General Officers Quarters, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, twelve units, $190,400.

Sandia Base, New Mexico, twelve units, $125,000.

(c) Section 609 of the Military Construction Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 111) is hereby repealed.

Sec. 611. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(a) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including improvements to adequate quarters, improvements to inadequate quarters, minor construction, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of trailer court facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed $230,225,000, and

(b) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1517m), an amount not to exceed $520,000,000.

TITLE VII

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE

SEC. 701. In accordance with subsection 1013(i) of Public Law 89–754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1292) there is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense for the purposes of section 1013 of Public Law 89–754, including acquisition of properties, an amount not to exceed $27,000,000; but no funds may be expended for the purposes of such section 1013 after the expiration of thirty months following the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase exchange of Government-owned land or otherwise.

SEC. 802. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $282,359,000; outside the United States, $100,480,000; section 102, $2,873,000; or a total of $385,712,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $414,833,000; outside the United States, $39,515,000; section 202, $6,784,000; or a total of $461,132,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $312,050,000; outside the United States, $26,904,000; section 302, $59,422,000; or a total of $398,376,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of $167,547,000.

(5) for title V: Southeast Asia support—Department of the Army, $33,156,000; Department of the Navy, $17,964,000; Department of the Air Force, $23,880,000.

(6) for title VI: Military family housing, $750,225,000.

(7) for title VII: Homeowners assistance, $27,000,000.

SEC. 803. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with that project,

and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 804. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. Regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense implementing the provisions of this section shall provide the department or agency requiring such construction with the right to select either the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, as its construction agent, providing that under the facts and circumstances that exist at the time of the selection of the construction agent, such selection will not result in any increased cost to the United States. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 805. (a) As of October 1, 1968, all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing) to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, and IV, of the Act of September 12, 1966, Public Law 89-568 (80 Stat. 739), and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before October 1, 1968, and authorizations for appropriations therefor.

(b) Effective fifteen months from the date of enactment of this Act, all authorizations for construction of family housing, including trailer court facilities, all authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions to existing family housing, and all authorizations for related facilities projects, which are contained in this or any previous Act, are hereby repealed, except (1) authorizations for family housing projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions or manufactured structural component contracts in whole or in part before such date, and (2) authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions to existing family housing, and authorizations for related facilities projects, as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts before such date.

SEC. 806. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project inside the United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $36 per square foot for cold storage warehousing;

(2) $9 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $2,300 per person for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per person for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 807. Section 610 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1967 (Public Law 89-568; 80 Stat. 756) is amended as follows:

(a) By inserting, after the words "under this Act" appearing in subsection (b), the following: "or hereafter authorized" and

(b) By striking the period at the end thereof, substituting a colon therefor and adding the following: *"Provided, however,* That this authorization may be averaged and applied to a single facility of two or more facilities, or among projects on an installation, when such application will result in more fallout shelter space, or is needed to meet minimum fallout protection standards in such facilities or projects."

SEC. 808. None of the funds authorized by this Act shall be expended for the construction of any waste treatment or waste disposal system at or in connection with any military installation until after the Secretary of Defense or his designee has consulted with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration of the Department of the Interior and determined that the degree and type of waste disposal and treatment required in the area in which such military installation is located are consistent with applicable Federal or State water quality standards or other requirements and that the planned system will be coordinated in timing with a State, county, or municipal program which requires communities to take such related abatement measures as are necessary to achieve areawide water pollution cleanup.

SEC. 809. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the lands constituting Fort DeRussy, Hawaii, may be sold, leased, transferred, or otherwise disposed by the Department of Defense unless hereafter authorized by law.

SEC. 810. (a) The Naval Academy Dairy Farm is a self-supporting operation, an economic and morale-building asset to the Department of the Navy, and shall continue in its present status and function.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.) or any other provision of law, the real property located in Gambrills, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, and comprising the Naval Academy Dairy Farm shall not be determined excess to the needs of the holding agency or transferred, reassigned, or otherwise disposed of by such agency, nor shall any action be taken by the Navy to close, dispose of or phase out the Naval Academy Dairy Farm unless specially authorized by an Act of Congress.

SEC. 811. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1968."

TITLE IX

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 901. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, $10,000,000.

(b) Army Reserve, $10,000,000.

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $4,500,000.

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, $9,800,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, $4,000,000.

SEC. 902. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 903. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1968."

TITLE X

NAVAL DISTRICTS AND THE RANK OF COMMANDANTS THEREOF

SEC. 1001. Part I of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) A new chapter 516 is inserted after chapter 515 reading as follows:

"Chapter 516.—NAVAL DISTRICTS

"Sec.

"5221. Naval districts.

"5222. Commandants of naval districts.

"§ 5221. Naval districts

"There shall be included within the organization of the Department of the Navy, naval districts. These naval districts and their headquarters are as listed in the subjoined table:

"District No. or name	States and counties	Headquarters
1	Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island (including Block Island).	Boston.
3	Connecticut, New York, northern part of New Jersey, including the counties of Monmouth, Middlesex, Somerset, Hunterdon, and all counties north thereof; also Nantucket Shoals Lightship.	New York.
4	Pennsylvania; southern part of New Jersey, including counties of Mercer, Burlington, Ocean, and all counties south thereof; Delaware, including Winter Quarter Shoal Light Vessel; Ohio.	Philadelphia.
5	Maryland less Anne Arundel, Prince Georges, Montgomery, St. Marys, Calvert, and Charles Counties; West Virginia; Virginia less Arlington, Fairfax, Stafford, King George, Prince William, and Westmoreland Counties and the city of Alexandria; also all waters of Chesapeake Bay including its arms and tributaries except waters within the Fourth Naval District and the counties comprising the Naval District Washington, D.C., west of a line extending from Smith Point to Point Lookout thence following the general contour of the shoreline of St. Marys, Calvert, and Anne Arundel Counties, as faired by straight lines from headland to headland across rivers and estuaries; Kentucky; and the counties of Currituck, Camden, Pasquotank, Gates, Perquimans, Chowan, Dare, Tyrrell, Washington, Hyde, Beaufort, Pamlico, Craven, Jones, Carteret, and Onslow in North Carolina.	Norfolk.

"District No. or name	States and counties	Headquarters
6	North Carolina less the counties of Currituck, Camden, Pasquotank, Gates, Perquimans, Chowan, Dare, Tyrrell, Washington, Hyde, Beaufort, Pamlico, Craven, Jones, Carteret, and Onslow; South Carolina; Georgia; Florida; Alabama; Tennessee; and Mississippi.	Charleston.
8	Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico	New Orleans.
9	Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, and Wyoming.	Great Lakes.
11	Arizona; Clark County, Nevada; southern part of California, including counties of Santa Barbara, Kern, and San Bernardino, and all counties south thereof.	San Diego.
12	Utah, Nevada (except Clark County), northern part of California, including counties of San Luis Obispo, Kings, Tulare, Inyo and all counties north thereof.	San Francisco.
13	Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana	Seattle.
Naval District, Washington, D.C.	The Potomac River up to the Frederick County line; the District of Columbia; the counties of Anne Arundel, Prince Georges, Montgomery, St. Marys, Calvert, and Charles in Maryland; the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Stafford, King George, Prince William, and Westmoreland in Virginia; and the cities of Alexandria, Falls Church, and Fairfax, Virginia. The waters of the Naval District Washington, D.C., include the waters within the counties comprising the command west of a line extending from Smith Point to Point Lookout, thence following the general contour of the shoreline of St. Marys, Calvert, and Anne Arundel Counties, as faired by straight lines from headland to headland across rivers and estuaries.	Washington, D.C.

"§ 5222. Commandants of naval districts

"The Secretary of the Navy shall detail an officer of the Navy not below the grade of rear admiral as commandant of each of the naval districts listed in section 5221 of this title."

(2) The chapter analysis is amended by inserting the following item after item 515:

"516. Naval districts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
F. EDW. HÉBERT,
MELVIN PRICE,
PORTER HARDY, JR.,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
L. C. ARENDS,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Managers on the Part of the House.

H. M. JACKSON,
SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
STROM THURMOND,
JOHN TOWER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On August 1, 1967, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 11722, which is the fiscal year 1968 military construction authorization for the Department of Defense and Reserve components.

On September 25, 1967, the Senate considered the legislation and amended it by striking out all language after the enacting clause and wrote a new bill.

COMPARISON OF HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

H.R. 11722, as passed by the House of Representatives, provided construction authorization to the military departments and the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1968 in the total amount of $2,378,843,000.

The bill as passed by the Senate, provided new authorizations in the amount of $2,251,846,000.

The Senate bill, therefore, represented a decrease of $126,997,000 in the amount previously approved by the House of Representatives.

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES

As a consequence of a conference between the House and Senate on the differences in H.R. 11722, the conferees agreed to a new adjusted authorization for military construction for fiscal year 1968 in the total amount of $2,303,292,000.

The total new authorization, therefore, represents an increase in the amount previously approved by the Senate of $51,446,000 and represents a reduction of $75,551,000 in the amount previously approved by the House.

The total construction authorization recommended by the conferees for fiscal year 1968 is $1,297,450,000 more than the amount of military construction authorized in fiscal year 1967 by Public Law 89-568, that figure being $1,005,842,000.

The Department of Defense and the respective military departments had requested a total of $2,635,238,000 for new construction authorization for fiscal year 1968. The action of the conferees, therefore, reduces this departmental request by $331,946,000.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The attitude of the conference concerning this bill was that whatever was essential for the military should be provided and whatever could be safely deferred should be deferred until a later period.

Among the items in this category were the commissaries requested by the Department of Defense. It was pointed out that in all of the commissaries, the cost per square foot was considerably above that of comparable supermarkets built in the vicinity of the requested commissaries. The conferees were concerned about this great disparity in cost. While both House and Senate conferees believe that a commissary is an important part of the military pay structure, it was felt that the commissaries should not be authorized until their cost was more nearly in line with that of supermarkets being constructed in their vicinity. It is expected that during this year, the Department of Defense and the services will carefully review their commissary construction program with the view of eliminating any items which are not absolutely essential to their operation.

Naval Weapons Station, Concord, Calif.

Both the House and Senate approved $19,800,000 to help remedy a very dangerous situation existing at this plant. The Navy requested authority to acquire a buffer safety zone of 5,021 acres around the naval ammunition outloading facility at Concord, California, which includes the town of Port Chicago.

Neither the House nor the Senate were fully convinced that the proposed solution is the most desirable one. Many plans for the elimination of this hazard have been developed and studied by the Navy and have even been presented to the Congress. Each plan has had many variations. It is recognized, however, that some permanent solution must be found to alleviate the safety hazard at this installation.

The conferees, as both committees, were not entirely satisfied that the current proposal by the Navy is the most desirable solution to the problem, and it was evident that the overall costs are likely to be much greater than current Navy estimates. Therefore, the House accepted the change in the Senate language which added the words "operational facilities" in order to follow flexibility in selecting the work to be done and thus permitting the Secretary of Defense to select an alternate proposal if it is seemed desirable.

As the conferees view this matter, consideration should be given to reconstructing the piers so that they conform to minimum safety regulations. Consideration should also be given to relocating at least a portion of this facility along the seacoast in the northwestern part of the United States.

The conferees recognized, too, that there is an immediate problem of encroachment to this danger area by new real estate developments.

It is the desire of the conferees that the Secretary of Defense shall conduct an exhaustive study leading to a final solution to this grave problem and report his findings to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate as to his decision and reason therefor prior to proceeding with the proposal selected.

TITLE I—ARMY

The House had approved construction authorization in the amount of $379,830,000 for the Department of the Army.

The Senate reduced this amount by $52,030,000, but in so doing, deleted projects approved by the House totaling $93,225,000 and authorized projects totaling $41,450,000, most of which were denied by the House.

The conferees agreed on a new total authorization for the Army in the amount of $385,712,000. But for this figure to have meaning, it must be realized that $60,000,000 for NATO infrastructure which was included in the bill that passed the House but not in the Senate bill, has been restored in conference. The military construction bill as it was presented to the Congress contained a section authorizing the Secretary of Defense to carry out bilateral or multilateral arrangements with any foreign government for sharing the costs of acquiring and construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for collective defense. Although the language in the original bill did not so state, the arrangements related only to NATO and the money figure, which was not set out in the bill language, was $60 million.

The House committee modified this language to place the authority in the Secretary of the Army, who is in fact the executive agent for this construction; limited the construction authority to NATO; and inserted the specific money figure of $60 million which is the anticipated expenditure for these purposes for the coming year.

The Senate committee taking note of the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee granted similar authority for the NATO infrastructure, deleted the proposed authority from the military construction bill. The Conference between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee has not yet been concluded.

On the basis of representations made by the conferees to the effect that inclusion in the military construction bill of authority of this kind is both logical and desirable, the Senate conferees agreed to the House language. A detailed exposition of the position of the House in this respect is set out in detail in House Report 512, 90th Congress, 1st Session.

The position of the House prevailed in eliminating from the bill three projects which were deleted during House consideration but which were restored by the Senate.

Petroleum Laboratory Training Building, Fort Lee, Va.

The Army had asked for a laboratory classroom building relating to the analysis, supply and/or storage of petroleum products at a cost of $493,000. The building which was constructed in 1943, was modified in 1954 for its present use.

The conferees agreed that replacement of this building could be deferred without impairing the primary training mission.

Fort Campbell, Ky.

The Army had requested $1,342,000 for administration and supply buildings for the Airborne Defense Artillery, other direct support Straf units, and Campbell Army Airfield Army and Air Force units.

At present, they are utilizing 866 diverted enlisted men's barracks spaces to satisfy this requirement, and the conferees agreed that for the present this space should suffice. It was recognized, however, that sometime in the future these facilities must be constructed.

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.

The Army had requested $2,086,000 for a welding training building.

The House conferees while recognizing the need for this facility, believe that the unit cost of $27.65 per square foot was excessive and that next year the Army should submit a similar project at a more realistic cost.

The position of the House conferees prevailed on one Army project which was authorized by the House but deleted by the Senate.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.

This project is for air conditioning of the Finance Center at a cost of $3,356,000.

The House conferees pointed out that there are approximately 6,000 military and Government employees working in this Center. Presently the need is being met by use of 3,000 electric fans and inefficient window units which augment a central ventilating system installed when the building was constructed. This method of ventilation causes drafts, frequent illnesses, costly internal electrical breakdowns due to overloading of electrical circuits not designed for fan power requirements, and is a safety hazard.

The work load at the Finance Center has greatly increased to meet the requirements of the Southeast Asia conflict. The average maximum temperature for the month of July 1966 in the Indianapolis area was 97.7° with an average relative humidity of 62 percent. This combination exceeds the figures established for dismissal at non-air conditioned buildings in the D.C. area.

TITLE II—NAVY

The House had approved $474,202,000 in new construction authorization for the Department of the Navy.

The Senate reduced this amount by $18,579,000 but in so doing deleted projects approved by the House totaling $40,971,000 and authorized projects totaling $22,212,000 which were denied by the House.

The conferees agreed on a new total authorization of $461,132,000 which is $10,070,000 less than the House had authorized but $5,509,000 more than the Senate authorization.

The House conferees were able to secure restoration of the following items which had been authorized by the House but were deleted by the Senate:

U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

The Navy requested $1,135,000 for a new laundry and dry cleaning plant.

While the Senate recognized its need, it questioned the design and cost.

The House conferees after pointing out that some of the members had made an on-site inspection the day before the conference, of the laundry, insisted that the present building is totally inadequate to meet the needs. In fact, the building is required to be shored up in order to continue in operation. In actuality, the House conferees pointed out that the Navy is currently operating in "sweat shop" conditions in its present plant.

The proposed laundry will be designed to use economical steel frame and inexpensive brick wall construction.

The Senate yielded.

Naval Radio Station, Driver, Va.

The Navy requested $65,000 for barracks rehabilitation at the Naval Radio Station, Driver, Virginia.

The present barracks consists of a two-story building designed for 100 men, constructed in 1953 at a cost of $228,000. The condition of the building is far below acceptable standards with regard to provision of cubicles; wall and ceiling finishes; quality and quantity of furniture; and lounge and recreational facilities.

Because of the isolated location of this activity, the House conferees believe that this barracks rehabilitation would have a substantial morale effect on the enlisted personnel quartered in these barracks.

Naval Schools Command, Norfolk, Va.

The Navy requested $1,787,000 for an electronics training building.

The Electronics Technician School at Naval Schools Command, Norfolk, provides the only specialized electronics equipment maintenance training in support of the Atlantic fleet except for three electronics countermeasures equipment maintenance courses conducted in limited facilities at the Naval Schools Command, Newport, R.I. The existing facilities at Norfolk contain 20 rooms used as combination classrooms/laboratories, a test equipment qualification laboratory and minimal administrative spaces. These facilities will support only 18 established courses and 11 courses in the process of being established. Classroom/laboratory space is not available for 37 additional maintenance courses required to provide training in support of complex electronic equipments which will be introduced into the Atlantic fleet during the Fiscal Year 1968 through 1972 time period. This line item will support, primarily, these new courses and secondarily will alleviate the overcrowded conditions in existing facilities.

The only alternative to approval of this line item is to support maintenance training on new electronics equipments by costly factory training.

Naval Radio Station, Northwest, Va.

The Navy requested $143,000 for a bachelor officers' quarters and mess.

The House conferees pointed out that there are no bachelor officers' quarters at this Station. Officers messing is accomplished through the enlisted general mess. The nearest BOQ is at Naval Air Station, Oceana, 35 miles away. The connecting roads are mainly secondary county roads with inherent hazardous conditions. The increased operational tasks have caused a considerable increase in the number of officer personnel assigned. The mission of the Station requires that highly trained civilian technicians and officers of other operational units visit the Station for consultation, familiarization and testing of equipments. These visits extend up to six month periods and require the presence of the technicians on the Station to ensure proper continuity and efficient performance of the tests.

Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Va.

The Navy requested $586,000 for barracks rehabilitation.

These buildings constructed in 1942, are structurally sound but grossly inadequate for quarters for enlisted personnel.

Barracks consist of open dormitories which do not provide personal privacy in any form. They are furnished with double bunks and lockers. Walls are drab; lighting is archaic; and the combination of heat and humidity during summer months is unbearable due to the lack of natural or mechanical ventilation. Heads, washrooms, and utilities are antiquated, of insufficient capacity, unreliable, and unsightly. Recreation and lounge areas have bare concrete ceilings, without accoustical treatment, and fail to provide a relaxing, restful atmosphere. The housing of staff and student personnel in such a gloomy, old fashioned, prison-like environment does not contribute to their study, rest, and relaxation so necessary to efficient performance of military duties.

Naval Station, Mayport, Fla.

The navy requested $417,000 for an administration and storage facility.

The House conferees pointed out that existing facilities are overcrowded, scattered, temporary and scheduled for demolition. These facilities consist of: one building at the Naval Reserve Training Center located in downtown Jacksonville which is now in a blast area and is to be torn down in conjunction with a waterfront improvements program; and three renovated house trailers located at Mayport Station.

This item will provide administrative space (14,352 sq. ft.) for the current 112 positions with an expected personnel expansion to 135 needed to perform current workload demands. It will also provide a material storage and work area (3,000 sq. ft.).

As an interim solution to the requirement to vacate, negotiations to rent are now underway. Preliminary estimates at $4.00/$4.25 per sq. ft. indicate a rental cost of $69,400. Since there is no space available near the Mayport Naval Station, rental will be in Jacksonville. This requires administrators of Mastership Ship Repair Controls, Engineers and Technical personnel to make frequent trips of approximately 25 miles (or 45 minutes) from the rental space to the Mayport Naval Station. Personnel should be located closer to the ships to solve suddenly arising urgent ship repair problems; and to perform design, planning, contracting, coordination, inspection, procurement, and related functions in conjunction with a $12,000,000 annual ship repair and overhaul program.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, S.C.

The Navy requested $986,000 for the fourth increment for a community center.

Currently, there are 900 children enrolled in Sunday School and/or religious education requiring two separate services on Sunday and two during the week. Space available will accommodate only 85 children. There are 875 adults attending chapel services each Sunday in a chapel with a seating capacity of 209.

There are no club facilities at Naval Weapons Station for enlisted men to relax after long hours of work and on duty at sea. An Enlisted Men's club is urgently required to boost the morale of highly trained enlisted technicians assigned to Naval Weapons Station/Polaris Missile Facility, Atlantic.

Presently, there are 984 units of family housing at Naval Weapons Station; and, an additional 150 units of section 810 located adjacent to the station. An additional 150 units are scheduled for construction on Naval Weapons Station property in the FY 1968 military construction program. The FY 1968 POSEIDON construction program alone will add $15,570,000 worth of production facilities to the station. With a continuous build-up of production facilities and personnel, it is essential that community facilities be programmed concurrently.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif.

The Navy requested $754,000 for a dispensary and dental clinic.

The House conferees pointed out that this item is needed to replace a deteriorated World War II constructed facility which is functionally and spatially inadequate.

Crowding is to the point where 5 or 6 officers and their respective patients must share the same room during sick call without the benefit of privacy usually afforded during consultation and/or examination. The continuance of existing conditions is costly and inimical to efforts which tend to promote a suitable environment for the assigned 8,000 military personnel and their families. Although this facility may be small in scope in comparison to those throughout the Navy, it is large in stature with respect to the needs of the assigned personnel who man and/or support the aircraft homeported at the Navy's sole Master Jet Fighter Air Station on the West Coast.

The Senate restored one item in Title II of the bill, for a degaussing range facility at the Naval Degaussing Station, Portsmouth, Virginia.

Naval Degaussing Station, Portsmouth, Va.

The Navy has requested $364,000 for this item.

The House conferees pointed out that since this was a replacement item, this project could be safely deferred without impairing the mission of this activity.

The Senate yielded.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

The House had approved construction authorization in the amount of $433,511,000 for the Department of the Air Force.

The Senate reduced this amount by $58,608,000, but in so doing, deleted projects approved by the House totaling $65,365,000 and authorized projects totaling $16,027,000 which were denied by the House.

The conferees agreed on a new total authorization for the Air Force in the amount of $398,376,000.

Of the items authorized by the House but deleted by the Senate, the House conferees were able to secure restoration of the following projects:

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Beginning 1 January 1968, the Air Training Command will conduct a pilot indoctrination program for senior Air Force Academy cadets. Each qualified cadet will receive 36.5 hours of flying time in T–41 aircraft. This operation will be conducted out of Peterson Field.

Five buildings and underlying land, located contiguous to the existing Air Force area at Peterson Field, Colorado, are required to accommodate the U.S. Air Force Academy Cadet Pilot Indoctrination Program.

This is the only remaining area on the east side of Peterson Field available for this mission. With the planned move of all civil activities to the west side of the field, the acquistion of this area will permit complete Air Force control of the east side of the field, thus providing maximum security and integrity of operation. The five buildings are privately owned on land leased to their three owners by the city of Colorado Springs. These leases may be canceled by the city subject to payment by the city for the buildings current value. The fair market value of $407,000 represents improvements for which the Air Force would reimburse the city. By this acquisition, the Air Force will gain hangar, administrative and shop space as well as an aircraft parking apron.

Through this expenditure, $955,000 in new construction at a less satisfactory location on the field will be avoided for a net savings of $548,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Fla.

The Air Force requested $114,000 for an administrative office addition.

The House conferees pointed out that this project is essential to relieve an extremely overcrowded condition now prevalent in the base supply administrative organization. The efficient and expeditious management of a $22 million inventory, involving in excess of 62,000 base supply type items, requires adequate office space for the 155 administrative personnel and associated equipment in execution of their supply management responsibilities. A survey of the base revealed that there is no space available for this function within the supply and industrial areas. The existing 18,875 sq. ft. wood frame building, built in 1943, is currently fully utilized for administrative purposes, and mission accomplishment at this base will be seriously jeopardized if this project is not constructed.

McClellan Air Force Base, Calif.

The Air Force requested $905,000 for an air freight terminal.

This project is required to replace the existing Air Freight Terminal which was developed to support a World War II airlift system. It is substandard, undersized, located an excessive distance from the warehousing complex (2.2 miles) and is functionally inadequate to support the projected airlift capability of the future. It supports the Sacramento Air Materiel Area mission which involves first line aircraft weapons systems, warning and surveillance systems, missile and aerospace programs, critical priority and deadline date items world wide. It also serves as a terminal point for the Air Force CONUS Airlift System.

A total of 31,542 tons of cargo was processed through this terminal during 1966. However, a substantial portion of this cargo was relegated to outside storage and processing, suffering the effects of inclement weather, due to the inadequacies of the terminal. The 1966 tonnages represent a 6 percent increase over the tonnage processed in 1965. Based on experience factors and projected airlift capability the workload at this terminal will be reflected in increased outdoor processing.

Eglin AFB, Fla.

The Air Force had requested $400,000 for an armament test preparation facility.

The House conferees pointed out that this project is urgently needed to meet the increasing demands for new Air Force weapons. Limited war munitions capabilities are made possible by the Air Force Armament Lab capability to develop new munitions and "quick-fix" field deficiencies. The successful solution of these unforeseen problems is attributed to the flexibility of the in-house laboratory capabilities. Contractual efforts to attack these problems, especially if they occur in the chemical process-explosive mix discipline, cannot be achieved quickly. For example, many new munitions have been deployed into Southeast Asia. When the enemy finds means to counter these weapons, the Armament Laboratory is frequently called on to make quick reaction changes to circumvent these counter-measures. The in-house capability at Eglin is now inadequate in this area. Delay in construction of this facility will aggravate the current Air Force difficulties in making quick reaction to munitions deficiencies identified by the operational forces.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Mass.

The Air Force had requested $166,000 for a photographic laboratory.

The House conferees pointed out that a new photographic laboratory is needed because of existing inadequate facilities. The facilities are inadequate for the following reasons:

1. Space limitations prohibit installation of required camera and automatic processing equipment.

2. The insufficient space does not properly allow for office, supply equipment custodian room, administration area, an additional color room, a photostatic room, a preview room, an audio-visual photographic repairs room, a chemical mixing room, and a field storage room.

Satellite control facilities, Calif.

The Air Force had requested $4 million for an electrical power plant.

The House conferees pointed out that the design specifications for this power plant require more than provision of a secondary or auxiliary power supply. Most significantly, this project must provide a higher quality electric power than is available in the current source. High quality electric power is required to prevent transient outages and loss of transmission capability in space communications.

This project is more correctly identified as a complete all-purpose utility facility. It will provide: (1) all electrical support consisting of high quality and high reliable prime power, not secondary power; (2) mechanical support such as chilled water and steam to operate the entire Sunnyvale Test Center (STC); and (3) the fire protection control system for the STC. It will be operated under the total energy concept in that exhaust heat from the gas turbines, which generate the electrical power, will be used to provide air conditioning in the summer and heat in the winter.

The recommended second loop from the existing commercial power source may improve the reliability by providing an alternate route but will not improve the quality required to operate the technical loads. The momentary transient outages and other power degradations inherent in the present system cannot be eliminated by a second loop. A fluctuation lasting only a fraction of a second can result in an operational outage necessitating synchronization of data circuits in order to re-establish data transmission capability. The basic justification for this item has been the recognition by the present source of commercial power that they cannot meet the quality required in either frequency or voltage regulation without costly expenditures.

The most critical mission of the Sunnyvale Test Center is the monitoring, control, data acquisition and evaluation of the highest priority national defense satellite reconnaissance and detection programs. The successful accomplishment of this mission is directly dependent upon high quality and high reliable power.

Maxwell AFB, Ala.

The Air Force had requested $632,000 for a U.S.A.F. archives facility.

The House conferees pointed out that the Archives collection cannot be properly protected or preserved in the building presently being used. The threat of losing the entire collection by fire causes great concern. Documents are deteriorating, some to the extent of disintegrating, under the variable heat and humidity conditions. Temperatures in the metal file cabinets range from 30° F in winter to 130° F in summer as heat radiates from the metal roof. During these extremes of temperature the personnel who service and research the documents can stay in the files area for limited periods of time.

In the annual reports to the Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, the Air University Board of Visitors has expressed serious concern over the existing conditions.

Further delay will only contribute to accelerated decay of these invaluable documents.

Scott AFB, Ill.

The Air Force requested $7,500,000 for a headquarters for the Military Airlift Command, and $124,000 for a land fee purchase.

The House conferees pointed out that the existing dispersed and obsolete facilities now utilized are not adequate to support the speed and accuracy of response required to meet the various demands of the intercontinental airlift mission of the Department of Defense. Today, over 200 of the new C–141 jet cargo aircraft have been delivered to the Military Airlift Command. This is one-half of the

total MAC force. Next year, the C-5 will make its first flight and shortly thereafter begin entering the MAC force in quantity. These two airlift aircraft procurement programs presently represent some $4.9 billion of capital investment. The capability they represent is essential to the defense posture of the nation. For about ten years, MATS—MAC—has been headquartered at Scott. Its Command, Staff, and Control elements are fragmented and scattered throughout the base in structures which date from 1940, many of which are of wooden construction. This condition may have been tolerable in the past. However, the situation which the Military Airlift Command now faces is identical to the needs of the Strategic Air Command at the time that the jet B-47 began to replace the piston engine B-50/B-36. MAC must now be immediately responsive to contingency and emergency airlift needs of the DOD. The ability to respond immediately and effectively to airlift requirements is dependent on the capabilities of the airlift force and efficacy of the Command and Control organization which directs that force. The vision and direction of the Congress has assured the acquisition of the airlift force—the Air Force now requests facility support with which to manage the force effectively. The MAC Command headquarters facility will provide this assurance at an investment of only $7.5 million.

The conferees, however, were extremely concerned over the acquisition of the one acre of land at a cost of $124,000. While it was recognized that on this one acre of land was an operating, privately owned laundry and dry cleaning plant, the conferees were in agreement that the land authorization should not be utilized unless it will impede or impair the construction of the Military Airlift Command Headquarters.

Westover AFB, Mass.

The Air Force requested $375,000 for officers' quarters.

The House conferees insisted that their objective is to provide quarters on base for those bachelors who are required on base for military necessity or who wish to reside on the installation or who cannot find adequate off-base housing within their housing allowance. On the average, 187 assigned officers at Westover reside off base and receive BAQ because of inadequate on-base facilities.

Pope AFB, Fort Bragg, N.C.

The Air Force had requested $419,000 for a new dispensary.

The House conferees pointed out that this project is required to provide adequate base level medical support for approximately 5700 military personnel. The present facility is 51 percent deficient in square feet.

Kindley AFB, Bermuda

The Air Force requested $1,012,000 for a dependent elementary school.

The House conferees pointed out that this project is urgently required to provide an adequate elementary educational facility for some 410 dependent children at Kindley AFB. The current facility consists of pre-World War II CCC-type structures shipped to Kindley and erected in 1942-43. These buildings are beyond the point of economical repair. Structural deterioration requires use of external bracing and shoring to prop up sagging floors and roofs. Continued use of these facilities will be at a serious risk to student health and safety. Inadequate electrical wiring will not permit use of lighting and training aids at the same time. Lack of adequate sanitary facilities require these children to attend school under conditions which would not be tolerated in a stateside school. Existing sanitary facilities are substandard, inadequate, and expose children to inclement weather during the winter months.

The Air Force and OSD have recently completed an evaluation of the future mission of the base. The net effect has been a reduction in base strength. The remaining missions are firm for the foreseeable future. The scope of this project has been based on the long range, reduced strength of future firm missions. It reflects an accurate appraisal of future elementary educational facility requirements.

The conferees agreed to reduce this amount to $500,000 and request a re-design of the proposed facilities. It was suggested during the conference that perhaps temporary or relocatable buildings might be utilized rather than permanent construction. But it was also recognized that there was an immediate urgent requirement to replace the existing facilities.

Ramey AFB, Puerto Rico

The Air Force had requested $431,000 for an officers' quarters.

The House conferees pointed out that this project is required to partially alleviate an existing deficiency of 76 quarters. The existing facilities suffice for the present only by continuing to house 24 officers in substandard quarters and issuing certificates of non-availability for 32 transient spaces. The nearest metropolitan area is located approximately 30 miles from the installation.

Section 302

The Air Force had originally asked for $19,500,000 for war reserve material storage facilities.

The House had reduced this figure by $9,500,000, and the Senate eliminated the remainder.

During conference, the conferees agreed to restore $5 million to provide for petroleum storage.

In the area of contingency operations, the Air Force had requested $29,382,000.

The House reduced this amount by $4,382,000.

The Senate further reduced this amount by $22,500,000.

The conferees agreed to a restoration of an additional $2,500,000.

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

The House authorized $169,000,000 for Defense Agencies while the Senate had authorized $217,547,000.

The big difference between the House and Senate versions relates to the contingency fund for the Secretary of Defense.

In the House version, $150 million was authorized with a further restriction that of this amount, $50 million was specifically earmarked for construction of roads and highways in Southeast Asia.

The Senate had authorized $200 million without any restrictive language.

A compromise was reached whereby the Senate reduced this authorization for the Secretary of Defense by $50 million, and the House eliminated the restrictive or limiting language.

The conferees agreed to a new figure of $167,547,000.

TITLE V—SOUTHEAST ASIA

There was no difference in the authorization between the House and Senate.

TITLE VI—FAMILY HOUSING

The House authorized 12,500 units of family housing.

The Senate reduced this figure by 2,816 units.

The House was able to secure restoration of 725 units as follows:

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas—100 units
Naval Command Station, Cheltenham, Md.—50 units
Naval Complex, Boston, Mass.—100 units
Naval Station, Lemoore, Calif.—50 units
Andrews AFB, Md.—200 units
Hanscom AFB, Mass.—100 units
Bentwater AFB, England—100 units
Upper Heyford AFB, England—75 units

The conferees agreed to delete 50 additional units at Pensacola, Florida.

The total number of houses now authorized is 10,409 units.

Section 602

Both houses increased a cost limitation on units of family housing from $17,500 to $19,000 but the Senate included the cost of land while the House had excluded it.

The House yielded on this provision.

Section 602(b)

The House had increased cost limitation on an individual unit of family housing to $35,000 excluding the cost of land.

The Senate set a limit of $32,000 including the cost of land.

A compromise was reached whereby the maximum cost of any unit of family housing could be $35,000 including the cost of land.

The House had included a provision which would permit an increase in both cost and size limitations for houses of commanding officers. It was recognized that there might be instances whereby it would be essential to increase the cost limitation and size of the house of the commanding officer but the Senate was adamant in not writing this increase into law.

However, it was the consensus of the conferees that the Department of Defense should have no hesitancy in presenting to the committee a special request any time they feel that the size and cost limitations for the house of a commanding officer are inadequate.

In all other instances relating to family housing, the House accepted the Senate version but insisted that the house of the commandant of the Ninth Naval District located at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, be restored at a cost not in excess of $40,000.

While the language of section 605 of the House bill has been rewritten, it is now included in section 610 of the Conference Report.

TITLE VII—HOMEOWNERS' ASSISTANCE

During the conference, the House receded on its position that the Homeowners' Assistance Program should be limited to military personnel only. Therefore, the conference report includes both military and civilian employees, and raises the amount of the authorization from $22,000,000 to $27,000,000, the amount requested by the Department of Defense.

It was the position of the conferees, however, that a time period for assistance provided by this authorization should be limited to thirty months. During that period, the whole question of whether this type of financial assistance should be given should be gone into in depth.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 805

The House accepted the Senate version of section 805 which would insure that trailer court facilities and improvement to current family housing assets would be repealed if not utilized at the same time that the family housing authorization would expire.

Section 806

The House receded on section 806 and retained the cost limitation of $2300 per person for permanent barracks and $8500 per person for bachelor officer quarters.

Section 809

The House accepted a Senate provision requiring the retention of the entire property constituting Fort De Russey, Hawaii.

Section 810

The Senate receded and accepted the House version of the bill calling for retention and continued operation of the Naval Academy Dairy Farm for the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis.

TITLE IX—RESERVE FORCES

There was no difference in the authorization between the House and Senate.

TITLE X—NAVAL DISTRICTS

Title X of the House bill would establish by law the boundaries and headquarters of the present naval districts and fix the rank of the commandant as that of rear admiral. The Senate deleted the section.

During the conference, a compromise was worked out whereby the naval districts within the continental limits of the United States will be designated by law and the rank of the commandant will be fixed as that of rear admiral. The language relating to naval districts outside the continental limits of the United States was eliminated during the conference.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
F. EDW. HÉBERT,
MELVIN PRICE,
PORTER HARDY, JR.,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
L. C. ARENDS,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RIVERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I bring you the conference report on H.R. 11722, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1968. I wish I could say that the position of the House conferees prevailed on all matters, but like most conferences, it was a give and take proposition and the original House figure of $2,378,843,000 has been reduced by $75,551,000—or a total for new authorization in the amount of $2,303,292,000. The bill passed by the Senate has been increased by $51,416,000 so you can see that both sides yielded. Naturally, when a military construction authorization bill is reduced, certain projects have to be eliminated. I think all that were eliminated will eventually be required but the conferees, acting in a spirit reflective of what I believe to be the attitude of Congress, deleted the projects which were not of the greatest military necessity.

I would not attempt to detail the nearly 200 differences that existed between the House bills. The conference report will show the items we were able to get restored which the Senate had eliminated as well as those items which the Senate added and we were able to delete.

As you will recall when I presented the military construction bill to the House, I told you that we had carefully considered slightly over 1,800 individual line items, but line items alone are only a portion of this bill.

When we went to conference we had been mandated by the House of Representatives to include funds for the construction of international military headquarters at NATO in the military construction bill. I refer not only to the passage of our bill itself but also the rejection by the House of a provision in the foreign assistance bill which would have authorized these same headquarters. I am happy to report that the Senate accepted the House version of the bill.

We also were able to prevail upon the Senate to accept our language in regard to the retention of the naval dairy farm at Annapolis.

Equally as important, we were able to sustain our position insofar as a retention of the naval districts in their present form within the continental limits of the United States. We did, however, accept a compromise which limits the statutory description to the area constituting the continental limits of the United States. I think this is a very workable and satisfactory compromise and reflects the present intention of the Department of Defense.

On the other hand, the House was unable to prevail in its position that financial assistance be provided only to military personnel who suffered financial losses as the result of the base closure program of the Secretary of Defense. Thus, the House version was increased by $5 million and both military and civilians who were affected by this program are now covered, but we did work out a compromise whereby this program is good for only a 30-month period.

I am hopeful that this action will cause Mr. McNamara to more carefully scrutinize the total cost of his base closure program and perhaps this will slow down certain of these unwarranted closure actions.

In the area of family housing, we were able to secure restoration of 725 units of family housing. As I am sure you are aware, the House of Representatives has strongly and consistently backed the philosophy of constructing adequate housing for our military personnel. The Senate, however, has been less enthusiastic toward this housing program so I feel that we made a major accomplishment when we were able to secure this restoration.

We accepted most of the Senate language in regard to the family housing program. Their language tightens up the controls of Congress on the use of rental authority and spending for repair and rehabilitation of family housing units.

As you know, this bill contained approximately $45 million in requests for an initial step in a program to eliminate inadequacies in current sewage and industrial waste disposal systems directed toward the implementation of the recently enacted Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The conferees authorized all but one project in this regard; however, we did accept the Senate amendment which provided in essence that the authorizations could not be used unless they are carried out only in those areas where the local government is also complying with the Water Pollution Control Act. Letters from some of you indicate that you think that this thwarts the purposes of the act. We do not believe this to be the case. Rather, it is to insure that our tax dollar is spent only in areas which will actually correct a condition of pollution.

During the hearings, we learned that at least in one portion of Honolulu where a substantial request had been made for the construction of sewage treatment facilities, the city was not prepared to proceed with its program until at least 1972.

Would it not be ridiculous at a time when we are trying to economize for us to spend large sums of money on a sewage treatment system if all of the surrounding area was dumping sewage into the same stream or body of water? Thus, if we permitted the immediate construction of sewage facilities, we would not be eliminating the pollution in the area as long as the municipality was continuing to pollute the water.

I feel as strongly as any of you gentlemen regarding the pollution program but when we spend money, I believe the pollution problem should be corrected, not just a small segment of the problem caused by one of the groups creating the pollution.

Gentlemen, I feel confident that we have before you a sound conference report. I feel that we have considered and met our responsibility to the military. I feel equally confident that we have been responsible to the American taxpayer by eliminating projects which could be deferred without impairing our military mission.

Let me recapitulate the figures for you. The Department of Defense requested new authorization in the amount of $2,635,238,000, plus unlimited permanent authority for construction of international military headquarters.

The House approved $2,378,843,000 including $60,000,000 for NATO construction.

The Senate authorized construction in the amount of $2,251,846,000 excluding any funds for NATO construction.

This conference report reduces the Department of Defense request by $331,946,000 and includes $60,000,000 for NATO construction. So, in reality, we have reduced the amount of projects requested by over $390,000,000.

Gentlemen, that is the conference report. I urge your support.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Certainly.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for yielding to me. I have two questions to propound to the chairman of the committee.

The first question has to do with section 808 of the bill, which involves a provision added by the other body and accepted by the House and which lays down two requirements, that a waste treatment or waste disposal system constructed at or in connection with a military installation, must meet applicable water quality standards for the area, which presents no difficulty.

The second question has to do with the fact that a State, county, or municipal program which requires communities to take such related measures as are necessary to achieve areawide water pollution cleanup, before any funds authorized by this act for water pollution control facilities at or in connection with

military installations may be expended, could create problems if administered in an arbitrary manner.

If a community has defaulted on its responsibility to abate pollution from sources within its jurisdiction, I assume that this language means that the Federal Government should not proceed with measures to abate pollution from sources within its jurisdiction until the community has indicated that it will proceed to meet its responsibility.

Mr. RIVERS. I think the gentleman is correct. That is our intention.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, one more question: If a community has not acted, but if its contribution to the total pollution problem in an area is relatively minor, and a military installation is a major offender, the community may have withheld abatement action because the military installation had not acted, and it appeared that the community's undertaking of control measures would therefore be to little avail. In such a situation, the Federal Government would clearly have a responsibility to lead. What would be the impact of section 808 in such a situation?

Mr. RIVERS. Permit me to answer the gentleman in this manner. I think we should cooperate with this community where we are the major offender. I further think that there should be some cooperation and close liaison between the two. I think I can substantially agree with the import of the gentleman's question. Further, I want to do all I can to see that there is cooperation between the parties, particularly where we have made a substantial agreement that we should act and do all we can to end the pollution, because this is what we are attempting to end.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for his response to my questions.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Would the gentleman please tell me how much money is in this bill for the construction of military facilities abroad or outside of the United States?

Mr. RIVERS. I cannot tell the distinguished gentlewoman how much is to be expended abroad. However, I can obtain those figures and furnish them to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, how much have you earmarked for NATO?

Mr. RIVERS. $60 million.

Mrs. KELLY. Just $60 million?

Mr. RIVERS. That is all.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, have we determined how much we will get from France as a result of the closure of our installations there?

Mr. RIVERS. No. But if we can hurry up and get that information together, we can refer it to the State Department, because I am just as anxious to get it as you are.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

I also wish to thank the Members of the House for being so patient with me in taking up their time.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would ask the gentleman has the Committee on Armed Services ever put together a bill as to the cost of our being thrown out of France?

Mr. RIVERS. I will say to the gentleman yes, we have those figures. I sent the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] over there, and he made a very comprehensive report. I do not have the figure available with me at this moment, but I will be delighted to send the report to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I would appreciate having it.

Mr. RIVERS. It is a valuable document. We lost a considerable amount of money. And that is another thing—we have to construct houses in Great Britain as a result of our being there, and as a result of our men being cast into these communities with very limited accommodations, as a result of this. But I will be glad to send the report to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

I would also ask the gentleman have we been ordered out of the Wheelus Air Force Base as a result of the Middle East situation?

Mr. RIVERS. No. We are still at the Wheelus Air Force Base, and this is very, very valuable as far as the training of our Air Force units are concerned.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to express my personal deep gratitude to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and to the members of the conference committee of this House, and of the other body, not only on my own behalf, but on behalf of the people I represent, for the admirable consideration which they accorded me in my district to attempt to work out some solution in the conference report concerning the ammunition loading piers at Port Chicago, and the determination of the conference committee to make it very clear that there were several suggestions reached in the conference to take care of this situation in the community. And I wish to thank the chairman and the committee for the determination they made on the solutions that had been suggested as to which might be more preferable in reducing as much as possible the hazards that exist there. I believe it is an admirable determination for a very complex problem.

I want to again express my gratitude to the committee and to the chairman. And also to express my apologies for the time that I have consumed of theirs in discussing that problem and in attempting to work out the best possible help. I am most grateful, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that the chairman will express that to the other members of the committee.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California. I have been here a long time, and we have had a great number of Members of Congress and of the House appear before our committee on various problems. I do not know of any one Member who has made a more profound impression on our committee than has the gentleman from California. He pointed out eloquently and with great authority and knowledge the conditions prevailing in his district. He presented to use facts that we were unable to obtain from the military. The gentleman has rendered a great service to the committee, to the Congress, and to his people, because this has to do with the saving of human lives. His assistance helped us in writing something in the report which I hope will bear fruit and protect the people who have not been completely protected heretofore.

Again I want to thank the gentleman, and I also want to congratulate him on a meaningful presentation for his people and for his country. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. WALDIE. I thank the chairman very much. I am deeply grateful to the chairman. I just want the Members of this House to know that this is one question that has been delayed overlong in receiving a solution of the problem.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

We had rather extensive debate on the NATO infrastructure item when the foreign aid bill was considered in the House. As the distinguished chairman knows, this item was removed from the foreign aid bill and added to the Military Construction Act. In the other body it was left in the foreign aid bill, and as the gentleman knows, the foreign aid bill is still in conference, and this particular item has not yet been decided upon. I wonder if the gentleman, knowing that there was no debate on this question about the $60 million of NATO infrastructure, during the military construction bill in the other body, would comment on an observation?

I know the chairman is a strong conferee, I see now he brings back from his conference the $60 million for the NATO infrastructure in the military construction bill.

It seems unusual that this $60 million could be kicked around and acted on by the House, and there not be one word of debate in the other body—not one single word.

I had heard from good authority, via the grapevine from the Pentagon, that the deal to get this $60 million in the military construction bill was to not mention it in the other body and that the House conferees were going to overpower the Senate conferees and bring it back in the military construction bill. This is exactly what happened. It seems unusual

that we could have a $60 million item adopted when in the other body there was not one single word of debate on it.

Mr. RIVERS. We did prevail on them in conference. I know that you can congratulate us on prevailing on the House position. We prevailed all right and it is going to stay in here.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Looking over the conference report, I appreciate very much the work of the committee and the conferees on this bill.

The question I would like to raise is whether in view of our present financial dilemma, we need to spend this $2.25 billion this year? And, Mr. Chairman, how much of the $2.25 billion in the conference report is set aside for housing as distinct from other purposes? It would seem that at this particular time of labor and material shortages these funds will not buy as much as would otherwise be the case. Why shouldn't we defer this particular item until next year. I recognize that the housing is needed, but if it can be deferred a year, it might carry us over through a critical period.

Mr. RIVERS. Let me answer the gentleman in this way. You can defer everything if you want to and take the calculated risk. You can defer a lot of these things. But you must remember this—that every time we want to save some money, some would take it out of the hide of the military. These military people can continue to live in trailers. They can continue to live in converted garages and they can continue to have to be subject to unfriendly people in some communities. They can go on and live like that, but I do not think that we would then be providing them with what they need when they are making the kind of fight they are making for our way of life.

The philosophy of the Committee on Armed Services is that the military are entitled to a way of life that is equal to the way of life that they are defending. We could cut them back and we could deny these things to them to which they are entitled, but I do not think it would be wise to do that.

But answering the gentleman's question, about 220 million and some-odd dollars is in this authorization for housing.

Mr. VANIK. That amounts to about one-fifth of the money?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes, it amounts to about that much.

Mr. VANIK. Then my next question is this. A good part of this is being spent in Europe?

Mr. RIVERS. Very little for housing—it amounts to 175 units out of 10,000 units.

You must remember that these people in Europe were sent to England because they had to get out when De Gaulle gave us a deadline. They are living in very, very austere accommodations.

Mr. VANIK. My question is going beyond the NATO situation. I understand the necessity with regard to NATO. But what about construction in Europe outside of the NATO area.

Mr. RIVERS. It is the same wherever they are. But this $60 million has nothing to do with NATO.

Mr. VANIK. I recognize the need for housing our military and I certainly join with our chairman in feeling that they should be given the best possible kind of accommodations, but it seems that some can be deferred.

Mr. RIVERS. There are only 715 units in England, where they had to go.

Mr. VANIK. But I am talking about the remainder of the $2.5 billion.

Mr. RIVERS. You can defer all of it, if you want them to continue living as they are. But this is vital now. You must remember that Secretary McNamara cut back $668 million on construction 2 years ago and the housing was needed then. They got some of them last year and some are being built now.

At Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., the boys had to sleep on the ground during subzero weather. These are very vital things that they need. If you want to cut back on them, you will just have to take the responsibility.

Mr. VANIK. To refer to a specific instance, we had an $8 million authorization for the Bolling Air Force Base headquarters command. Could that be deferred over to next year?

Mr. RIVERS. That was deleted.

Mr. VANIK. That was deleted?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. We required the military to give us a priority list and where it was not a matter of top priority, we deleted $300 million—or $100 million on each branch of the service, in round figures.

They had to be high priority. We cut out four hospitals—one in my district, one in the district of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], one in Massachusetts, I think, and one in Texas. We have given you the most austere bill we can conscientiously bring to this House. I recognize the gentleman's concern, but I doubt that we could conscientiously go below the dangerous minimum which this bill represents.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, a member of the committee.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the chairman of the great committee yielding. I wish to address a question with relation to the report on section 809, where the statement appears:

> The House accepted a Senate provision requiring the retention of the entire property constituting Fort DeRussey, Hawaii.

I think that was also the House position, as I recall.

Mr. RIVERS. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. As I recall, a special committee appointed by the chairman went there and studied the matter. I hope this means that in the foreseeable future we will keep this great tri-service area for rest and recuperation in the Pearl of the Pacific, where it is needed so badly for the remarkably administered and highly efficient use to which it has been put.

Mr. RIVERS. We accepted the language of the Senate, which will keep the entire project, which the gentleman knows is a vital project.

Mr. HALL. I compliment the gentleman, and I concur in the conference report.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BROTZMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. I would like to speak about Fitzsimons General Hospital, which happens to be in my district. As I recollect, at the time this measure left the House of Representatives there was authorized some $9.5 million for that hospital.

Mr. RIVERS. And the deletion was unanimously approved by the committee of the other body. I think the gentleman had a representative on that item.

Mr. BROTZMAN. I would certainly hope so.

Mr. RIVERS. I congratulate the gentleman. We did the best we could. You lost your fight down the hall.

Mr. BROTZMAN. I wonder what the objection was to this particular construction? I have visited that hospital on numerous occasions and I have seen the broken bodies that we have brought back from Vietnam. It would seem to me that this is a rather important place to authorize this particular expenditure.

Mr. RIVERS. I cut out a hospital in my own district that had a high priority. But the Secretary of Defense said he did not need it. He knew more than the Navy.

Over in the other body the conferees said the hospital did not have high enough priority, and they were adamant about it. They said, "If you want to restore any facility, there was one cut out in Texas that had a higher priority." They said nobody objected to it in the committee.

Mr. BROTZMAN. I thank the chairman. I have had an opportunity to talk to the chairman and the ranking member. I want to thank you for your support in this particular position. But when it gets to the point of setting priorities, I rather question how you can set a higher priority than to take care of those broken and battered bodies that are returning after fighting a war for this country.

Mr. RIVERS. That is what I have said. This bill is very austere. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the chairman. I am sure we are comforted by the chairman's reply to the effect that this is a barebones bill, and and that the conference report is also barebones.

I would point out to the chairman that I read with some care 3,467 pages, not of the chairman's committee, but the hearings of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Appropriations Committee on the $70 billion military bill. Of the 3,467 pages of testimony, 3,461 pages were from witnesses from the military, all on the Federal Pentagon payroll. Out of 263 witnesses testifying on the $70 billion appropriation bill there were only six who were not on Uncle Sam's payroll, and those six were made up of two

American Legion representatives, two representatives of the National Rifle Association, and two ladies lobbying for the overseas education program.

So I would like to ask the chairman, is the same procedure followed in his distinguished committee, with witnesses only from the Pentagon, so that we only get one side of the picture?

Mr. RIVERS. No.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Are adverse witnesses called?

Mr. RIVERS. We do not call anybody. We have open hearings, and all are invited, anybody who can contribute something we are glad to have.

In this bill, only the classified items were handled in classified sessions. But this was an open hearing. We do not deny anybody who can contribute.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. In other words, does the gentleman encourage outside witnesses, scientists, and so on?

Mr. RIVERS. Historically, we have done that. We do not deny anybody.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Does the gentleman agree that for a $7 billion appropriation, it would seem unusual to have all the witnesses for the bill?

Mr. RIVERS. It does help, I might say. I do not know what the Appropriations Committee does, but when we have classified subject matter, we have classified hearings. We do not provide a sounding board for people who want to get their names in the paper, and I am sure the gentleman is not talking about that. But generally, we have pretty strong proponents favoring our bill. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the committee knows very well that year after year the field of military construction has been subordinated to all the other programs of defense—procurement, pay, and all the things that go into the defense establishment. Military construction usually has to take what is left. That is understandable, because we can in many instances postpone military construction. That is what has been done.

Regrettably, that has resulted in a situation where a great many of the people who serve in uniform are having to live in definitely substandard quarters. In some areas they are training in substandard quarters. This is a most unfortunate thing for morale and a most unfortunate thing for providing the necessary training and maintenance that will enable our men in uniform to do the kind of defense job we expect them to do.

I am confident that the distinguished gentleman regrets—as I regret—the necessity for making very substantial cuts in this bill. I subscribe to what the gentleman has done. My Appropriations Committee hopes to bring the appropriations for this bill to the floor very soon, but probably we shall be trying to make additional cuts. Yet, I deplore the fact that our fiscal picture is such that this is necessary, because I fully believe every project that was requested by the Department of Defense for military construction this year is needed.

Mr. RIVERS. I think so.

Mr. SIKES. It is just that we are in such a bad fiscal situation that we do have to cut somewhere. This is the bill we cut. I do endorse what the gentleman has done.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield whatever time is remaining to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

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

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to commend the chairman and conferees of the committee for bringing out a report which appears to be acceptable to all concerned, even the die-hard economists.

I would like to put one question to the chairman. With reference to troop housing and utilities at Fort DeRussey, appearing on page 4 of the conference report, it was my understanding when the House first acted on H.R. 11722, before it went to the Senate, that the type of construction, whether it be high rise or low rise, will be left to the sole discretion of the Army. For the purpose of establishing legislative history, am I correct in assuming that this legislative intent has not been altered by the conference report, and the type of construction at Fort DeRussey as provided for in H.R. 11722 will still be left to the sole discretion of the Army?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 11722, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1968.

I feel that we have provided those operational requirements essential to provide the facilities to take care of new equipment coming into the military inventory while at the same time deleting the many highly desirable, but not absolutely necessary items that were contained in the original request by the Department of Defense.

As you may remember, our committee worked diligently day and night to reduce this bill and we succeeded in reducing it by approximately $280 million.

Apparently there were some items that we included which the Senate felt could safely be deferred and we agreed with them, and now the bill represents a reduction of $331,946,000 from the amount requested by the Department of Defense.

This bill is not exactly as I would have had it but then what bill of this magnitude ever is after it has gone through intensive hearings before both the House and Senate and then the differences are resolved in conference.

For instance, I still believe that we should not embark on the new principle of guaranteeing losses on homes caused by base closures. I think the Congress opened a Pandora's box when it passed this basic legislation and which this program authorizes funds to carry out.

I think we are engaging on a program which ultimately will cost the Government many millions of dollars. But if we wanted a military construction bill this year, we had to include this section or there would have been no bill.

I do think that on the majority of issues the House achieved substantially what we set out to obtain—in other words, careful deletion of unnecessary projects and certain restrictive language which would prevent the Department of Defense from closing certain selected military installations or consolidating naval districts.

The chairman has generally detailed what we accomplished in conference, and I refer you to the conference report rather than using time today to go over the nearly 200 differences that we were required to resolve.

I do want to point out, however, that authorization is contained in this legislation in the amount of $60 million for the construction of international military headquarters pertaining to NATO. This authority was also contained in the house version of the foreign aid bill but was deleted from that bill on a vote of the House of Representatives because it had already authorized this amount of money in the military construction authorization bill.

The Senate has now accepted our version of this authorization. This makes sense to me because the money is to be used for a military purpose and should be contained in a military bill considered by your Armed Services Committees.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that we have done a good, thoughtful, constructive job on this bill both during the House consideration and in the conference. We have provided that which military necessity requires and we have eliminated that which safely could be eliminated without impairing national defense.

I hope each of you will join me in supporting H.R. 11722.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. 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 pro tempore. 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 377, nays 33, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

YEAS—377

Abbitt	Annunzio	Belcher
Abernethy	Arends	Bell
Adair	Ashbrook	Bennett
Addabbo	Ashley	Berry
Albert	Ashmore	Betts
Anderson, Tenn.	Aspinall	Bevill
Andrews, Ala.	Ayres	Biester
Andrews, N. Dak.	Baring	Blackburn
	Bates	Blanton
	Battin	Blatnik

Boggs
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—33

Adams
Bingham
Bolling
Brown, Calif.
Carey
Cohelan
Collier
Conyers
Curtis
Edwards, Calif.
Farbstein
Fraser
Gilbert
Green, Oreg.
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Kastenmeier
Kupferman
McCarthy
O'Hara, Ill.
Ottinger
Pike
Rees
Reuss
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
Scheuer
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Vanik
Yates

NOT VOTING—22

Anderson, Ill.
Barrett
Boland
Broomfield
Daddario
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Flynt
Fountain
Hanna
Heckler, Mass.
Holifield
Holland
King, Calif.
Landrum
Martin
O'Konski
Rarick
Resnick
Stuckey
Utt
Watkins

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. King of California with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Resnick with Mrs. Heckler of Massasetts.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. YATES changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order, scheduled for 30 minutes today, be transferred to tomorow.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 676, TO AMEND CHAPTER 73, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE TO PROHIBIT THE OBSTRUCTION OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 933 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 933

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 (S. 676) to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States. 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 the Judiciary, 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 Hawaii is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 933 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of S. 676 to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations being conducted by proper officials of the U.S. Government.

Existing laws provide penalties for any person attempting to influence or impede witnesses or jurors in judicial proceedings, or witnesses in pending proceedings, or witnesses in inquiries or investigations before Congress or a committee of the Congress. My colleagues will be amazed to learn, as I was, I'm sure, that under the present law there is no protection for potential witnesses prior to the institution of proceedings.

There have been many instances where potential witnesses or their families were intimidated, threatened, or gravely injured during investigative preliminaries preceding criminal prosecution.

S. 676 would remedy the deficiency by making it a Federal crime to coerce or threaten a person who is willing to furnish information to Federal investigators, prior to the convening of a grand jury. This remedy would be effected by adding a new section to chapter 73, title 18, United States Code to prohibit the obstruction of Federal criminal investigations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 933 in order that S. 676 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii.

The purpose of the bill, S. 676, is to make an offense any effort to willfully try, by means of bribery, misrepresentation, intimidation, force or threats of force, to obstruct or prevent the communication of information to any Federal criminal investigator.

The bill will also prohibit injuring any person or his property because he did give information to any Federal criminal investigator.

Penalties prescribed by the bill are a fine of up to $5,000 or 5 years imprisonment, or both.

The reason for the bill is that under current law witnesses are protected from any intimidation once court proceedings are commenced, but while preparing a case there is no protection for those who know something useful and might come forward if protected by statute.

The bill is supported by the Attorney General.

Additional views are submitted by Messrs. WHITENER and HUNGATE. They believe that the use of the word "misrepresentation" in section 1510(a) is too broad; they believe it should be removed from the bill.

They also believe the words "criminal investigator" as used in section 1510(b) is too broad and think it should be redefined to narrow its scope to regularly employed by the particular department, and those departments which regularly employ such persons should be enumerated.

Along this same line, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] points out that there are over 50 Government agencies which would be covered under the present language; he believes it should be cut down to those regularly doing investigative work.

Mr. Speaker, although on occasion there is extensive argument on bills reported by the Judiciary Committee, I believe this bill almost could be passed on the call of the Consent Calendar. We will see what happens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule, and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, as will be noted, I have expressed views with reference to this legislation in the appendix to the principal committee report.

I believe all of us agree with the purpose of this legislation, but it seems to me the use of the word "misrepresentation" is creating a situation which none of us would want to see happen.

During my career as a prosecuting officer I found it was rather characteristic for members of a family to throw a protective shield around other members of the family who were charged with criminal offenses. As a matter of fact, it was my feeling, as a prosecuting attorney, that I should not unduly cross-examine a mother or a wife of a defendant. I stated so to the jury, usually, that I had not done so because it is not unusual for good people to misrepresent fact when their own children or their husbands are involved.

I am perfectly content with the provisions of the bill which would make certain actions a crime.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I would be perfectly willing to accept the amendment to strike the word "misrepresentation."

Mr. WHITENER. I want to thank the chairman for that. I just wish he had done it in the full committee when we tried to get it done. That would have saved a lot of trouble and writing. I will offer the amendment at the proper time.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I want to congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina on the tightening of this legislation.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE].

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I want to see where we are on these amendments. We have agreed to an amendment that will take the word "misrepresentation" on page 1, line 8, out. Is that correct?

Mr. CELLER. That is right.

Mr. HUNGATE. I join with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] in that position.

Also, on page 2, subsection (b), line 7, if I may read it, it says:

> (b) As used in this section, the term "criminal investigator" means any individual duly authorized by a department, agency, or armed force of the United States to conduct or engage in investigations of or prosecutions for violations of the criminal laws of the United States.

What I am seeking to do is amend that to limit it to the agencies which would more commonly use this power. There are some 10 or 11 departments in the Federal Government, and I would suppose there are more than 50 agencies in the Government, all of whom would inherit the benefit of this rather broadly drawn criminal statute. That is the question I direct to the chairman.

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman's amendment in that regard would be entirely too broad and would to a very marked degree so weaken the bill that I could not accept that amendment. It may be that if the gentleman could make a speech on the subject and indicate these various bureaus that primarily have to do with a criminal investigation, it might help in that respect and I might indicate in my colloquy or dialog with him that I am in deep sympathy with what he seeks to do. That might answer for the situation.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HUNGATE. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I wanted to point out with respect to the word "misrepresentation," which we have been discussing here, as I understand it and as the report points out, it is the procuring of the misrepresentation that is the offensive thing. It is the person who may be involved in all kinds of crime that the bill is trying to get at and not the person who makes a misstatement in regard to a fact in regard to a criminal investigation. I do not think the gentleman would want to prevent us from prosecuting the procurer of a misrepresentation under this bill. That is what it is intended to get at and what we are trying to do here.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. However, that is not the point I am expressing myself on.

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

Mr. HUNGATE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. There is not a single word in this proposal that mentions procuring a misrepresentation. It says:

> "Whoever willfully endeavors by means of bribery, misrepresentation * * *.

There is nothing about procuring in there.

Mr. HUNGATE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. It says anybody who makes a misrepresentation.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina and point out that it is always possible and probable that lawyers will disagree on an interpretation, but I agree with his interpretation. The statute says, "Whoever willfully endeavors by means of bribery," and so forth, and it gives you a number of these items, one of which is misrepresentation. As I understand it, the chairman has accepted that amendment. I am now addressing myself to page 2, line 7, which reads:

> As used in this section, the term "criminal investigator" means any individual duly authorized by a department—

And there are at least 10, although we have created some more and I am not certain whether they are included—

> agency, or armed force of the United States.

As I understand it, this is a chart that gives you an idea of the Government agencies and departments to whom you are delegating this authority. I simply think that is too broad a delegation of authority. I spoke to the Department of Justice on this, and they will not give you any limiting list, of course, but among the ones that commonly use it and the amendment I would offer would provide this protection to are:

> The FBI, Food and Drug Administration and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; the Immigration and Naturalization Service; the Intelligence Division and the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Service; the Secret Service, Customs Bureau and the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department, the Postal Inspection Division of the Post Office Department.

Now, those groups and the Armed Services are the ones, I think, which would now have the greatest need for this.

I think we need not grant this authority and that it would be unwise to do so, to all of these various agencies. I might add that I believe I am joined in that view by the Civil Liberties Union.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. HUNGATE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand the gentleman from Missouri to say that you want to spell out the names of every agency of the U.S. Government that may be investigating crime?

Mr. HUNGATE. The gentleman from Colorado senses the problem perfectly. I do not think we should give it to every agency of the U.S. Government. However, I think we should spell out those specific agencies that have a substantial need for this authority before writing a blank check to grant it to them in the form of criminal prosecutions.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HUNGATE. I yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would the gentleman's amendment spell out those agencies that he has contained on the chart and make them a part of a section of this bill?

Mr. HUNGATE. I just read the ones to which my amendment would refer. They are not, by any means, inclusive overall on that chart.

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

Mr. HUNGATE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding to me at this time.

As I understand this proposed amendment, we would be condoning and excusing the obstruction of justice on the part of criminal investigators by some governmental departments and agencies—that it only makes this applicable only to them.

It seems to me, if we want to prohibit the obstruction of investigators of criminal activities, we should make it affect the entire Federal Establishment.

Mr. HUNGATE. Apparently, I have not made myself clear to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY]. I am not talking about the authority.

As I read the statute, this is an additional authority, an investigative privilege which we are granting to certain agencies of the Government.

The question is, should we grant these privileges to every agency of the Government. I think many of them have no need at all for it. I further believe that many of them have very slight need for it.

This is not a question of excusing those agencies from misconduct. It is giving them additional authority that they now do not have. I think this is going too fast, to grant all of this authority to these agencies, authority which they have never had before.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, apparently my assumption was incorrect when I heretofore stated that we had a noncontroversial bill, for once, out of the Committee on the Judiciary. We now have an amendment halfway adopted during the consideration of the rule making this legislation in order. However, it seems to me that there is disagreement even on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, let me make it plain that I am not willing to accept the amendment that the gentleman from North Carolina will offer. I hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee would reconsider the consent he gives to the amendment, as I am sure that the Department of Justice would not agree to striking the word "misrepresentation." By such amendment it might be possible to cure some of the ills to which the gentleman from North Carolina is addressing himself, but, it would most certainly create other ills which would make the legislation next to useless. I would be prepared to accept that amendment only if another amendment were made to make it plain that it would hereafter be a crime for an accused to use misrepresentation in obstructing the transfer of information from an informant to an investigator.

And that it be made equally unlawful for a person to procure a misrepresentation by the informant in relaying information to the investigator. But by striking the word "misrepresentation" from this bill you have effectively negated both acts, and that, I suggest, is not a worthy end, and I do not believe it is one that the chairman upon reflection will be content to accept.

I agree that the word "misrepresentation" as presently used, is somewhat ambivalent, unclear, and equivocal, but you would do utter violences to the legislation to strike that word and do nothing more.

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

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I believe the gentleman would have to agree that after striking the word "misrepresentation" we would still have covered any attempt to obstruct, delay, or prevent the communication of information if the parties seeking to obstruct, delay, or prevent this communication did so by means of bribery, intimidation, force or threat.

Mr. POFF. I do agree.

Mr. WHITENER. All right. So now the gentleman is contending that if someone makes a misstatement to an individual, or a misrepresentation of a subsisting fact and causes that individual to give it to the investigating officer in such a way as to delay or obstruct the investigation, that the person who makes the misrepresentation is then to be sent to the penitentiary for 5 years or fined $5,000. Is that what the gentleman means?

Mr. POFF. As the gentleman understands, this legislation is not in any sense aimed at the actual informant. The legislation is aimed at the person who corrupts the informant who is passing information to the investigator. And if that person uses misrepresentation of facts to corrupt the informant and thereby to obstruct the transfer of information to the investigator, yes, he should be guilty of a criminal offense. He should be guilty because it is precisely that individual who is too often frustrating the proper prosecution of some of the most heinous organized criminal activities in the United States, and I most certainly do believe that that kind of conduct should be a crime.

Mr. WHITENER. But the gentleman is leading us down the primrose path which so many tried to lead us down, and leave the impression that when Federal crimes are created by statute that the Federal courts in effect deal only with organized crime. That is not true. The organized criminal would represent a very small portion of those who come into the Federal criminal courts. And this act, if it is passed, would apply to the ignorant mountain mother, it would apply to the loyal lowland brother who may make a misrepresentation of a fact which would in fact delay the investigation.

But if the gentleman had had the experience of being a prosecutor for a while he would find that it is a human frailty not only of bad people, but of good people to protect their own, and I would never vote for this bill or any other bill which would make a mother, a wife, a brother, or a sister subject to 5 years' imprisonment for telling some investigating officer that that member of the family is not at home who is under investigation.

Mr. POFF. I believe the gentleman has adequately made his point, and I know also that the gentleman, who is a good lawyer, will understand that the case he puts does not come under this law unless the mother or the wife has a criminal scienter, the so-called guilty mind and the willfulness must be to obstruct the transfer of information that would lead to a prosecution.

Mr. WHITENER. The scienter under this bill that would be required would be that black heart and guilty purpose to hinder and delay the investigation. If that mother willfully stated a fact which was not true, then you would have no difficulty in going to the jury with the charge that she had violated the statute because the scienter involved here would exist.

Mr. POFF. I would say to the gentleman that if a wife or mother engaged in similar conduct with respect to a witness or a juror after a judicial proceeding had been commenced, today she would be guilty of a criminal act. The obstruction of justice statute would apply to a mother and to a wife who corruptly influences, obstructs, or impedes a witness or a juror or an officer.

I fail to understand why the gentleman would not extend the same principle, already in the law, to cases which have not yet reached the judicial proceeding stage, but are still in the investigative stage.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I had understood that this was a little, noncontroversial bill. It does not seem to be so little and so noncontroversial.

I just wonder if it is the intention to try to bring this bill up tonight, because

I have been impressed by the arguments made by the gentleman from North Carolina and after listening to his argument, I do not want any part of this bill. If you are going to bring it up tonight, I just want you to know that I am going to insist on a quorum being here while we discuss this little, noncontroversial, and unimportant piece of legislation.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1411, TO AMEND TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH RESPECT TO USE OF MAILS TO OBTAIN MONEY OR PROPERTY UNDER FALSE REPRESENTATIONS

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 932 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 932

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. 1411) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes. 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 members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 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 Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]; and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 932 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 1411 to amend the United States Code with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property fraudulently.

The civil postal fraud statute is a protective statute seeking to protect a consumer from being victimized by false representations sent through the U.S. mail. It protects the consumer by authorizing the return of his mail containing remittances, generally in the form of checks or money order, addressed to the unscrupulous promoter.

In order to establish a basis to issue a mail-stop order under the civil postal fraud statute, the Post Office Department is required to prove, first, that advertising is being used by a promoter who seeks money or property through the mail; second, the advertising contains representations which are material and false as a matter of fact; and, third, the false representations were made with intent to deceive.

The Post Office Department is not usually troubled with proving the first and second points. It is seriously hampered, however, by the necessity of meeting the burden of proof as to intent.

H.R. 1411 will eliminate the necessity for establishing the intent to deceive. To retain such a requirement is wholly incompatible with the underlying purpose of the civil fraud statute—the protection of the public and the consumer—against the use of the mail to distribute false representations as a basis for obtaining money or property. More specifically, the legislation would eliminate the necessity for establishing an "intent to deceive" in connection with the issuance of mail-stop orders, which are issued to protect consumers who are being victimized by false representations by promoters through the U.S. mails.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 932 in order that H.R. 1411 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, House Resolution 932 provides a 1-hour open rule for the consideration of H.R. 1411, entitled "False Representations by Mail."

The purpose of the bill is to strengthen existing law under which the Postmaster General can issue mail-stop orders to protect consumers who are being victimized by false representations made by promoters through the mails.

The bill will remove the requirement of establishing an "intent to deceive" in connection with the issuance of such orders by the Postmaster General.

Under current law the Department, to issue a mail-stop order, must be able to prove, first, advertising through the mail is being used; second, the advertising contains false representations of fact of a material nature; and third, such representations were made with an intent to deceive.

The bill will eliminate this third requirement, which is incompatible with the intent of the statute, consumer protection. It will not remove any legal rights held by the mail advertiser. It merely removes the possibility that he will receive remittances through the mails. If an order is issued, he can still go into court for an injunction.

The Post Office stated to the committee that it has investigated a number of cases where advertising was false, but not necessarily fraudulent, and that under current law they cannot stop such activity.

The Post Office supports the bill, as does the Bureau of the Budget. The Justice Department defers to the Congress on the matter.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] filed individual views, believing the bill is unnecessary and that current law is adequate to handle the problem.

Minority views are submitted by Messrs. WALDIE and WILLIAM D. FORD opposing the bill on the grounds that it unduly infringes on the rights of citizens by conferring additional powers on the Government. They do not believe that mail-stop orders should be issued unless it can be shown that there was an intent to deceive by the promoters.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] has submitted minority views opposing the bill because a jury trial is not provided before a mail-stop order can be issued.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to this rule, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. 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.

DEVELOPMENT OF BOTH URBAN, RURAL AREAS ESSENTIAL—NATIONAL POLL REVEALING

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime advocate of a sustained, comprehensive program of growth and development in our rural areas and small towns, I want to commend and congratulate President Johnson on his announcement of the pilot project to attract business and industry to urban and rural areas.

In this connection, I have also been advised that a national poll on a bill I introduced, H.R. 9060, to encourage industrial development in small town areas shows overwhelming support of this proposal which should be reported out of the Ways and Means Committee and enacted as a part of a national program to curb the outmigration to our already congested and crowded cities.

President Johnson's test project for creation of jobs and opportunities in rural and urban areas is keyed to a strong, creative role by business. My bill has the same goal and objective: the inducement and encouragement of business and industry to locate in small-town and rural areas through tax incentives—including an added 7-percent credit, in addition to the investment credit already in effect, for machinery and equipment investment.

This bill which I introduced last April 25 grew out of hearings before our House Small Business Committee into the problems and progress of small town and rural America, and I am pleased to note that the Small Business Administration will play a vital role in the President's proposal by guaranteeing leases, plant, and

equipment for a business which will provide jobs in urban and rural areas.

The simple truth that the long-range solution to metropolitan problems is the curtailment and reduction of the population influx is so apparent and so obvious that it has escaped notice in many quarters. Some cannot see the forest for the trees. The solution of our overall problem of population concentration lies in applying basic solutions to the problems that exist in urban areas—and in creating more attractive and more productive small towns and rural areas in America to hold down the population outmigration to big city America.

In this connection, I wrote the following letter to President Johnson on July 27, 1965, more than 2 years ago:

JULY 27, 1965.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I read with great interest recently a speech given by Richard N. Goodwin, one of your special assistants, to visiting foreign students. Mr. Goodwin observed at one point in the speech that "we have cleared the boards of most of the old ideas." He suggested a need for new ideas, new departures to meet the massive problems of our age.

I would like to propose a new concept which, if accepted and implemented, would attack many of our social and economic problems from a new direction in a new dimension. My suggestion basically is that rather than continuing to encourage urban growth we shift emphasis and encourage a national small town improvement and development campaign.

The proposal is this:

1. Large metropolitan complexes are becoming unmanageable, unwieldy and ungovernable. They have far exceeded the cities' ability to provide adequate services. They are not single entities; they are conglomerations of unrelated communities that have grown like Topsy. They breed slums, poverty, violence, suicide, discord, unhappiness. Cities have simply outgrown their original concept and their governments. They have exceeded in population and size the quantitative areas that can be governed effectively.

2. The community concept with all of its corollaries is basic to our American system. It is an effective unit. It embraces the psychological dimension that is missing in cities—the dimension of belonging, of being a part of a community, of being neighborly, of identifying with local government, of feeling significant.

3. This concept has been eroded as populations have migrated to our urban areas. Urban populations have been called "the lonely crowd." There is no identification, no feeling of belonging. There is distrust, lack of concern and compassion, lack of identification. Basic human values erode.

As you said in a speech on February 22 last, Mr. President, "The old, tried values of family and neighborhood and community are imperiled or eroded."

4. There are efforts to build whole new communities to retain the community concept and respect inherent in our forefathers' philosophy. But these are isolated efforts. What is needed is a concentrated effort to strengthen the small town base of America, to bring industry and business to small towns, to create towns that embody the best of the new technology and the best of the old philosophy.

5. I believe that people move to cities basically because that is where the greatest economic opportunities are found. You can see departures from this trend in small towns with progressive industry. The children think of staying, rather than leaving. And families who have lived in rural and small town areas prefer to move to a similar environment—but with greater opportunity to live the good life.

Your magnificent effort to build the Great Society is developing the nation in urban areas, rural areas and smaller communities. The new thrust that is needed—the new concept I suggest is a concentrated effort to develop the small town to its peak of perfection and to wage a national campaign to "sell" the small town to our new generation. This would ease urban problems by shifting growth to manageable divisions away from urban complexes.

The true values of our society are strongest in our small towns. We need to strengthen our society by inducing our younger people to live within the strong town structure and concept.

I will be glad to discuss this matter with you at your convenience.

With highest esteem and best regards, I am,

Sincerely your friend,
JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

In a major policy address in Dallastown, Pa., on September 3, 1966, President Johnson enunciated as policy the interrelationship of the problems of rural and urban America, and adopted the thesis that the solution of the problems of our cities hinges on the developing of jobs and opportunities in rural and small town areas.

Our major cities are caught in a population strangulation—our small towns are caught in a population decimation. Their problems are interrelated and intertwined.

As our major cities swell with population our smaller cities and towns suffer from the outmigration of their young people—the loss of verve and leadership and creativity as the young seek opportunities in the metropolitan areas.

Leading authorities on the problems of our cities like Lewis Mumford emphasize that our big cities and smaller towns complement each other—that they have unique roles to perform in our society. We must continue to assist and strengthen both our big cities and our small towns. Our large cities are centers of diversity—the nerve centers of vast networks of commerce and industry—the heart of dynamic human interaction between millions of people in every phase and facet of life.

Our smaller towns—the citadel of the community concept—present a golden opportunity to ease the population pressure on our major cities by reducing the outmigration. In our smaller cities we can combine the best of the old community concept—the community spirit—the spirit of cooperation and feeling of being a part of a unit and a sense of belonging—with the best of the new technology and science. It seems to me that we must work to build this community concept into cities. Leading authorities say that if our cities are to be human cities serving people, the neighborhood community units must be strengthened.

We must strengthen our free enterprise system to provide the opportunities that will hold our young people in Small Town U.S.A. We can do this in many ways: By improving the quality of our education and training; by attracting business and industry to provide opportunity in our rural areas; and by generally improving the quality of life in our small towns and rural areas throughout the Nation.

In doing this, we will not only broaden our economic base and breathe new vitality into small business, we will also be assisting our major cities in solving their problems by reducing the influx of populations, reducing city problems, and thereby reducing the number of people who overtax their services, congest their streets, jam their subways, and crowd their schools. As our small business hearings on metropolitan areas indicated, many big cities have become almost unmanageable with their problems of housing, slums, urban blight, traffic and transportation, parking, crime, and air and water pollution, among others.

By failing our cities and towns—the pillar of our civilization—we fail America. We must not fail them. We must succeed. We are heading in the right direction with more emphasis on small town and rural development and we must accelerate this trend—make it a national theme song of progress.

The press release announcing the introduction of the job development bill follows:

REPRESENTATIVE JOE L. EVINS (Democrat-Tennessee) INTRODUCED TAX-INCENTIVE ACT TO STRENGTHEN SMALL TOWN AMERICA

(Statement by Representative EVINS on the floor of the House of Representatives follows:)

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for increased job opportunities and employment—the Tax-Incentive Development Act of 1967—a bill that can mean much to our cities, large and small, by creating employment opportunities in our smaller cities. Several of my Colleagues are also introducing similar bills. This bill provides tax incentives to induce business to locate in smaller communities—a proposal that has the endorsement of many officials in our Government. This bill will offer—

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

—Accelerated tax amortization of investment in industrial and commercial facilities, including land, over a sixty-month period, to industry locating new or branch plants in Small Town and Rural America.

It is my hope that this bill will assist small town and rural areas to develop their resources and their people and provide jobs and employment opportunities for our young people and others who want to live at home. A recent poll shows that 50 percent of our people want to live in Rural America.

Our major cities are caught in a population strangulation—our small towns are caught in a population decimation. Their problems are inter-related and inter-twined.

By providing jobs and opportunities in our small towns, our young people will be encouraged to channel their talent and their creativity into their own communities, rather than into major cities to compete with residents of those cities for jobs. The Washington Post said in a recent editorial: "The country cannot accept as inevitable the further concentration of rural refugees in its large cities . . . The neglect of this problem is rapidly producing two nations—one a rural wasteland and the other an urban slum."

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

"The cities will never solve their problems unless we solve the problems of the towns and smaller areas." And he concluded: "Modern industry and modern technology and modern transportation can bring jobs to the countryside rather than people to the cities."

That is the objective of this bill—that is what we hope to accomplish. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the purpose of this bill is to bring the benefits of an expanding economy to Rural and Small Town America—there is a specific clause which prohibits the pirating of industry from another section.

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

The announcement of the results of the national poll on the job development bill follows:

RELEASE FROM NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, INC.

While big city mayors, perhaps understandingly so, and big city-oriented sociologists clamor for billions in Federal funds to solve every problem from rat extermination to jobs for idle teenagers, Congressman Joe Evins, Tennessee, Chairman of the House Small Business Committee proposed a no-cost solution based on furnishing private enterprise incentives.

It is this latter approach that the nation's independent business proprietors support. In a nationwide poll just concluded by the National Federation of Independent Business, the vote in favor of the Evins' proposal is a majority of 63 per cent, with 29 per cent opposed, and 8 percent undecided.

The heavily endorsed Evins bill, which has since been duplicated by similar bills introduced by other members of the House Small Business Committee would encourage the economic development of rural and submetropolitan America by offering special tax incentives to new business enterprise.

After long study of the problem, the House Small Business Committee concluded that not only the present problem, but also a continually growing problem of the big cities is the migrations into these congested centers from the outlying areas by people who are unable to find employment in their home areas. The result being that the cities are overloaded with unskilled and semi-skilled unemployed futilely seeking work in metropolitan areas that are becoming more and more technologically sophisticated.

The bill would give an additional 7 per cent tax credit on the cost of machinery and equipment for enterprises which open up in areas declared to be short of jobs, provided that such enterprises employ at least 20 persons, of whom at least half shall be from the area of location.

To prevent an established firm from taking advantage of this incentive, the bill also provides that the incentives shall not be available to any enterprise that diminishes its operations, or reduces employment in an already established location. In other words, the gain in new jobs must be a net gain.

Special tax provisions over a five-year period are also provided for the cost of plant and real estate and also tax allowances for training workers.

No appropriation of tax money is called for in the bill. Capital investment needed to provide jobs and reverse the migration to the big cities would be provided by private enterprise assured of partial tax forgiveness during the critical early years of getting an enterprise off to a sound start.

Although there has long been recognition that the national industry and commerce is too heavily concentrated in the big metropolitan areas, this is the first time that a no-cost solution to the problem of decentralizing the economic structure has been advanced.

Federation researchers are also inclined to believe that with a proper understanding, the measure will pick up support from farmers growing increasingly bitter over their returns in ratio to the prices consumers pay for their products.

They point out that as the costs of transportation and transportation labor increases, the costs of food distribution steadily climb, raising not only prices to the consumer, but also cutting down the farmers' share of the food dollar. More equitable distribution of job opportunities bringing people closer to the sources of food supply will shorten the distances from farm to consumer, and thus make reductions possible in the overall costs of food distribution.

This bill would provide added 7% tax credit for business locating in rural areas.

STATE BREAKDOWN FIGURES

	Percent in favor	Percent against	Percent undecided
Alabama	68	26	6
Alaska			
Arizona	64	23	13
Arkansas	64	31	5
California	59	33	8
Colorado	65	26	9
Connecticut	59	36	5
Delaware	61	34	5
Florida	63	30	7
Georgia	74	21	5
Hawaii			
Idaho	61	33	6
Illinois	64	29	7
Indiana	61	31	8
Iowa	62	30	8
Kansas	57	32	11
Kentucky	70	30	
Louisiana	75	21	4
Maine	74	24	2
Maryland	61	29	10
Massachusetts	50	35	15
Michigan	59	32	9
Minnesota	61	31	8
Mississippi	75	25	
Missouri	70	25	5
Montana	62	31	7
Nebraska	66	25	9
Nevada	73	15	12
New Hampshire	53	34	13
New Jersey	59	31	10
New Mexico	78	16	6
New York	69	25	6
North Carolina	54	37	9
North Dakota	75	18	7
Ohio	60	32	8
Oklahoma	75	19	6
Oregon	57	35	8
Pennsylvania	64	28	8
Rhode Island	46	38	16
South Carolina	66	24	10
South Dakota	82	13	5
Tennessee	68	24	8
Texas	65	29	6
Utah	62	30	8
Vermont	86	14	
Virginia	65	29	6
Washington	55	36	9
Washington, D.C.	60	30	10
West Virginia	56	35	9
Wisconsin	66	26	8
Wyoming	57	32	11

CAN FEDERAL SPENDING INSURE PROSPERITY?

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the fantastic rate of growth of Federal spending in the last several years is of concern to every taxpaying American.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, recently spoke on this important subject at the Conference for Better Business Relations in Gearhart on the beautiful Oregon Coast.

I had the privilege of introducing Congressman CURTIS at this conference, and am able to report that his incisive, critical look at Federal spending was most enthusiastically received by those at the conference.

This speech is of such timely importance that I would like to have it presented at this time for the RECORD:

CAN FEDERAL SPENDING INSURE PROSPERITY?

(Address by Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS (Republican, Second District of Missouri) at the Better Business Relations Conference, Gearhart, Oreg., September 18, 1967)

The answer is no, and if a people ever pursue this course they will end up in economic disaster.

As one who has argued for years that "hoarding" is one economic sin I can identify, I must make it clear that this does not justify spending without a purpose. Spending for spending's sake is spending without a purpose. Spending on the assumption that spending per se increases aggregate demand in the society is a fallacy—if aggregate demand is increased as the result of increased spending it is because, in reality, the spending has been related to specific purposes and it behooves us to examine into the matter to find out the specific purposes and the results of the spending.

Government spending, federal, state and local, must be related to governmental purposes—supplying the needs of the people for goods and services through the mechanisms of government—the majority compelling the minority to contribute through taxes to pay for programs which they may even disapprove. The governmental purposes must be translated into purchasing goods and services, not rhetoric. To insure prosperity, to end poverty, to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the national defense and to promote the general welfare are rhetoric. Only by developing specific programs to fulfill these rhetorical purposes can we attain our objectives. This means spending for a purpose—a purpose that can be disciplined by cost-benefit ratios.

Another problem is to determine what we mean when we speak of "prosperity." Are we equating prosperity and true economic growth with a rapid increase in gross national product? If so, we are committing a basic error that will confuse all our further attempts to identify these Federal expenditures which do indeed contribute to real economic growth. The gross national product is an indicator of economic activity, not economic growth, and certainly not of wealth creation.

The best rebuttal to those who imply that GNP measures true economic growth is to point out that during periods of war, the economy is highly active, economically and in every other way. Gross National Product soars to high levels. Unemployment is very low. Yet no one would contend that this reflects true economic growth. Quite the contrary. It is economic activity that destroys wealth.

Even in peacetime, economic activity may destroy wealth, rather than create it. This is particularly true in a society governed by central economic planning. Witness some of the gross errors committed by the Russian economic planners, such as in agriculture or in the heavy public investment in hydroelectric plants instead of coal burning steam electric plants. These errors of economic judgment showed up as increased gross national product because they stimulated economic activity. But ultimately they proved to be economic mistakes. They used up

wealth, instead of creating it, and economic activity itself diminished in the long run. The ability of the Russian economy to move forward has been sharply limited by these economic errors which were hidden by the inability of the GNP indicators to measure the quality of economic activity.

The second source of confusion that needs to be cleared up at the outset is the difference between the impact of the aggregate level of Federal spending and particular types of Federal expenditures. It should be clear that when the productive resources of our economy are fully employed, Government spending for current consumption takes resources that otherwise might be used to increase our capacity to produce. It should be equally evident that some types of Federal expenditures do add to our productive capacity and the nation's stock of wealth, both physical and human.

Government expenditures may contribute a great deal to real economic growth. The gains in agricultural productivity which have occurred to a large extent were based on the agricultural research that was financed by State governments and the Federal Government in the 1920's and the 1930's. Federal land grants to railroads and the financing of highways out of Federal funds contributed importantly to the growth of productivity. Today our expenditures for manpower training and retraining are having a similar beneficial effect on our economic performance. Mainly and fortunately, I hasten to add, private, not governmental spending. The Private-for-profit—the business sector—of our society spent about $16 billion last year in training and retraining, and the amount spent for these purposes by the non-profit sector of the society still exceeds that of all governmental spending, local, State and Federal.

Those economists and policy-makers who have emphasized the aggregate impact of Federal spending on economic activity have tended to erode the fiscal discipline upon which a sound expenditure policy must rest. The aggregate economists have said, in effect, that we must have spending for spending's sake, in order to stir up economic activity when aggregate demand is insufficient. This philosophy undermines a sound and wealth-creating expenditure policy.

If the purpose of Federal spending is to equate demand to the economy's capacity, then what does it matter what you spend the money for, so long as it is spent? In my view, expenditure policy must relate to what the money is spent for. If Federal outlays are for investment purposes, they must increase wealth and earnings. If they are for current expenditures, they should not exceed present revenues, except in periods of identifiable emergencies, and the length of those periods must be related to the basic wealth already in being. Military expenditures are designed to protect the wealth and the institutions of society itself. But these expenditures are non-wealth-creating in themselves, and should therefore be eliminated whenever possible and certainly supplemented as soon as possible by future wealth-creating expenditures. I can think of no expenditures more likely to create wealth than those on education and training. It has a powerful effect in creating more wealth and new and increased earning capacity.

The reason I believe a capital budget for the Federal Government is vital is that it would give us means of evaluating expenditure policy. We would know what portion of Federal spending is being devoted to capital or investment expenditures, and we could judge those outlays accordingly. We would also be in a position to know the level of current expenditures and to establish the amount of current income necessary to cover those expenditures.

Finally, we cannot discuss Federal expenditures and their economic impact without discussing fiscal policies as a whole. Federal expenditures are financed either by levying taxes, which may seriously restrict private economic growth, or by creating new Government debt, preferred taxation, if you please, which may also have adverse economic consequences, inasmuch as our monetary system has been so interwoven through the Federal Reserve System with the Federal debt. We cannot neglect monetary policy as it relates to the Government's expenditure, tax, and debt actions as we have so often done in the past, and as recently as the year 1966, and as President Johnson seems to want to do in asking for an increase in tax rates without cutting back on the level of expenditures.

So much effort has been spent in post World War II years by economists debating the economic impact of economic aggregates embodied in Federal monetary and tax policies that government expenditures policies and government debt policies have been neglected. Yet, unlike monetary and tax policies, I said *unlike*, there seems to be no dispute that Government expenditure policies should be used affirmatively to effect economic health and growth, but in terms of the objectives set in the specific programs for which the money is to be spent. The value of governmental expenditures lies in what the money is spent for, not that money is spent. If the same objectives can be obtained without spending money, of course then money should not be spent, even though those who seek certain high expenditure levels are faced with lower levels. Certainly if the social objectives can be obtained by not spending money—or, to put it more positively—if spending Federal money would actually hurt the progress, the social objectives, it should not be spent, no matter how much this disturbs the Macro-economists, the new economists, who have simplistically—and falsely—equated economic and social progress with maintaining a scheduled increase in the amount of aggregate demand, or purchasing power, within the society with the Federal Government providing the extra spending when in the judgment of these planners the total demand is insufficient. Even liberals are now beginning to understand that spending Federal money can diminish the total amount of money being spent on the social objective, be it education, health, welfare, or what. The Curtis Corollary to Gresham's Law—Government spending drives out private money, Federal spending can dry up State and local spending—begins to operate.

The promoters of the theory that governmental money and fiscal policies should be used, beyond what I consider their primary functions, to directly promote economic health and growth think they have found an axiom. Otherwise, how can they conclude they do not have to prove their theory or rebut the points of those who disagree with it?

In this kind of intellectual climate I find it necessary to at least restate for the purposes of clarification the opposing theories about monetary and fiscal policies, even though I wish to concentrate primarily on expenditure policies in this discussion.

It is my belief that monetary policy should be directed exclusively to establishing and preserving a "weight and measure," if you please, of economic values of goods, services, labor and savings. In this way, our money can best serve as a sound and reliable medium of exchange and an accurate base for our economic statistics. Anything that distracts monetary policy from achieving this most difficult and, like an ideal, unattainable goal, in the long run, is detrimental to the economic health and growth in the society.

It is likewise my belief that fiscal policy, principally taxation and debt policies, should be directed exclusively to raising, as efficiently as possible, the revenue necessary for pay for the goods and services demanded by and for the society through governmental expenditure policies. Anything that distracts fiscal policy from achieving this difficult goal in the long run also is detrimental to our economic health and growth.

However, in the use of these two great governmental powers economic health and economic growth are constantly being affected. It is a great temptation to conclude that this is a simple operation of the law of cause and effect, so that all we have to do is cut or raise taxes, for example, to produce immediate effects which seem to be in the interest of economic welfare. This is like assuming we can gain the moon because we can see it. Self-discipline accompanied by a bit of humility is necessary to resist this temptation. I suppose this human temptation to tinker with things we do not fully understand has come to us in economics as the result of the newly emerging science of economic statistics. As useful as our statistics are, it is my judgment that this new science is, in 1967, at the stage of development that astronomy and chemistry were as they were emerging from astrology and alchemy.

I think governmental expenditure policies should be determined by forthright political decision after proper Congressional study and debate of the needs and desires of a society. Governmental expenditures should be limited by fiscal policy, only hopefully on a temporary basis, when these needs and desires exceed the fiscal abilities of the society. In establishing its expenditure policy, society should consider that it has available for the purpose of meeting social needs two basic mechanisms, the market place mechanism and the mechanism of political government. After all, the base for governmental revenues is the non-governmental sector, unless we are to have a totalitarian state in which the political and the economic powers are merged.

If a governmental expenditure has been deemed needed or desired and it is most efficiently attained, with a proper regard for the balance of economic and political power, through the Federal political mechanism, then it is just a question of how and when we most efficiently finance this expenditure. In other words, fiscal policy should be based upon the needs of the people which it is felt must be met by means of the mechanism of government as expressed in expenditure policy.

Tax policy must be based upon long term considerations. The economic and social impact of a particular tax structure and tax take upon the tax base must always be a matter of concern to those who establish policy. If the tax structure and tax take weakens he economic structure upon which it is based, then the economic impact of total expenditures, the bundle of program costs which have run the rigid tests of cost-benefit ratios, must be weighed against this economic impact and the net result calculated. In order to shape total government policy, it may be necessary, and probably usually will be necessary, to establish priorities among desirable expenditures, even needed expenditures, so as not to overburden the tax and debt structures and thus weaken the economic base. I believe this is clearly a requirement of national policy today.

Happily, the neo-Keynesian economists joined the tax neutralists in pressing the tax cut of 1964. They finally recognized the merits in the arguments of those who had been saying for many years that our Federal income tax structure was undermining our economic structure and damaging economic health and future economic growth. Tax rates were beyond diminishing returns; lower the rates and the base—economic activity—expands. So the total take is greater—*provided*, and this was the point at issue, that total spending is held down. The tax cut of 1964 was an economic success. Query: were expenditures held down or were

they increased as the new economists insisted must be done if the tax cuts were to assist in increasing aggregate demand? The figures are there for anyone to read. In Fiscal Year 1960, Federal expenditures were $77 Billion. In 1961, $82 Billion; 1962, $87 Billion; 1963, $92 Billion; 1964, $97.7 Billion; and the test year, 1965, $96.5 Billion. The only stop in the new economists expansion of Federal spending in this decade.

However, tax policy is only one part of fiscal policy. When we fail to obtain the revenues necessary to meet our governmental expenditures, we must then resort to deferred taxation by issuing government bonds.

It is important when considering the soundness of a tax structure and its economic impact to consider it in its entirety, which is debt and taxation, both the present and future abilities of the tax structure to produce revenues. So, although the neo-Keynesians have reached the same conclusions which the neutralists reached some time before them, about the deleteriousness of the amount of revenue take by means of our Federal tax structure, they are by no means in full agreement with the neutralists' conclusions that the amount of Federal debt is equally, if not more, deleterious to our economy.

Why is Federal debt not like private debt or even like local and State governmental debt? Private debt, whether personal or corporate, is related to specific expenditures. The debt itself is related to two things, singly or composite . . . security of the asset itself and the earning capacity of the asset or the ability of the borrower to repay the debt and to pay the charge for the loan. In other words, it is directly related to and, indeed, based upon the assumption that it is going to create economic wealth.

Local and State debt is similar to personal and corporate debt. Most municipalities and counties float bonds for capital improvements, schools, roads, bridges, sewers, what have you. All increase the wealth, measured in real estate values, if nothing else, of the community which is the primary tax base for local governments. These debts relate to specific assets; they relate to the tax base, the ability to pay. State debt is quite similar.

Only Federal debt differs. It relates primarily to the defense of this country—a service which we badly need, but a service which is economically barren. Defense expenditures do not create wealth in the assets purchased; the missiles, the aircraft carriers, the atomic bombs, etc.,—even military buildings have little asset value. They are created for a single purpose and they do not bring in revenue. That portion of the Fderal debt which does relate to creating economic wealth, except for the traditional public works projects, relates to the area where most of the debate lies as to whether the Federal governmental mechanism is the best mechanism in our society by which to direct these expenditures. Indeed, I would argue that where a wealth creating expenditure is involved, the presumption is quite strong that the expenditure would be better and more efficiently handled by the private sector through the market place mechanism. If other factors suggest that the mechanism of government be used, I think generally it would be best done by one of the other two tiers of government, State or local, rather than by the Federal Government.

The Congress has developed a mechanism for dealing with only one phase of expenditure policy. Congress, though the authorization process of the legislative committees and the appropriation process of the Appropriation Committees, passes upon the desirability of and the need for the components which go to make up total spending. The mechanism needs to be improved and better policy guidelines need to be established. But at least Congress has the necessary machinery.

Congress does not have the machinery to make policy decisions on the optimum size of the Federal debt. Congress makes little effort to establish priorities between needed programs when the tax revenues and the optimum bonded indebtedness are exceeded by the total of expenditures. Some of us have tried to develop the debt ceiling legislation into a mechanism whereby the Congress can make such judgments.

Let me illustrate my points by reference to the Federal budget. Each year, the Administration requests new obligational authority to spend, but only a portion of this new obligational authority is scheduled to be spent in the fiscal year in which it is appropriated; the balance is scheduled to be spent over the following three or four ensuing fiscal years. Each year, there is a carryover balance of unused authority to spend granted by the Congress in previous years. In other words, if the Congress through its appropriation bills grants to the President his original request for $144 Billion of new obligational authority in Fiscal 1968, he would have a pool of $267 Billion of authority to spend in this fiscal year. Of course, the President has no plans to spend this amount of money in one fiscal year. Nonetheless, he alone has the discretion to set the expenditure level for Fiscal 1968. In his January 1968 Budget, he set that level at $135 Billion, although the figure has increased throughout the year to where the Director of the Budget, in early August, revised it upwards $9 Billion to $144.2 Billion. Really it was revised upward $11 Billion to $146.2 Billion, because the Director of the Budget said that the Administration had cut expenditures by $2 Billion. It is true that, take two from eleven, and you have nine Billion. This is what can be referred to in the new arithmetic with Johnson rhetoric as an expenditure cut.

All Presidents have expenditure flexibility and properly so. They have frozen programs, accelerated programs, and decelerated them in accordance with changed circumstances occurring after the authority to spend had been granted and scheduled in the Congressional appropriation bills. The point is, the Congress doesn't spend money—the President spends money. The Congress only gives him the power to spend it. The President has considerable flexibility in the use of this power. He could have cut Federal expenditures in Fiscal Year 1968 from the projected $135 Billion level set in January this year to $130 Billion, as the Joint Economic Committee in its unanimous report said he must do. But, instead of cutting to $130 Billion, as I have said, he increased it $11 Billion, minus $2 Billion, to $144 Billion.

Congress has an obligation to express its judgment on total fiscal policy, and to do this, it must make its determination of what the expenditure rate should be in light of the revenues anticipated for each fiscal year. Failing to do this, Congress has no way of expressing its judgment on the debt aspects of fiscal policy except through setting the debt ceiling which, though effective, is cumbersome, but I would argue, less cumbersome and economically damaging than the meat-axe expenditure cut of inflation. Indeed, if we do nothing to lower total Federal expenditures for Fiscal Year 1968, the increase of .5% in the Consumer Price Index of July, the first month of Fiscal Year 1968, will continue throughout the year to reduce the expenditures in all programs by 6%.

The most the Congress has been doing to set budget and policy is through its control over grants of new authority to spend, but this has a very limited effect upon the expenditure level of the current fiscal year.

The art of budgeting on the expenditure side of the ledger, I have ofttime remarked, is not so much a question of cutting out waste, extravagance and inefficiency, as it is with establishing priorities between needed and efficient programs. Cutting out waste, extravagance and inefficiency is a matter of identification. Establishing priorities between good programs requires judgment and political fortitude. Expenditures must always be related to objectives. Money can be spent effectively to bring about prosperity, to increase standards of living, to maintain domestic tranquility and provide for defense, but to do so it must undergo the tests of rigid cost-benefit ratios. If the components of spending are poor, the aggregates of spending will be bad.

Hoarding is an economic sin, but so is spending for spending's sake.

THE BOW AMENDMENT

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, now that the House has denied itself the privilege of considering the Bow amendment, it would seem that there was sufficient debate on this subject this week and last week when the original continuing resolution was before us. However, there are some basic facts that still have not been stated and ought to become a part of this record.

I think we need to specifically identify the reasons why the resolution is before us in the first instance, and further why an amendment was suggested by the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. The amendment would establish an expenditure ceiling of $5 billion less than the original budget.

It is obvious that the reason a resolution is necessary is that Congress has failed to do its work on time; namely, appropriate the moneys to the respective departments for their operation during this fiscal year. This, as I mentioned last week, is abdicating the power of the Congress in that the departments are permitted to run on with expenditures based on either last fiscal year's appropriations or this fiscal year's budget, whichever is smallest. The departments then continue their activities without any direction from the Congress and in some cases even continue programs that have yet to be reauthorized.

Now, what about the suggested limitation of expenditures? It seems to have developed all kinds of substantial arguments as to whose responsibility it is to make recommended reductions in expenditures. This is necessary in order to prevent further increases in interest rates with continuing inflation and to accommodate the proper effects of a tax increase.

It seems to me that the recommendations by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] are proper in all respects and fulfill the intent and concern of the Appropriations Committee as specifically emphasized by the minority of this committee.

Let us look briefly at the facts that have given cause to the need for the

amendment. When the budget was presented to the committee last February 7 by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, and the Director of the Budget Bureau, Mr. Schultze, the following economic statistics and policy was presented to us with great emphasis. This was done even though many members of the Appropriations Committee questioned the figures and raised grave doubts as to their accuracy and reliability.

First, it is significant to note that in January of 1966 when the fiscal year 1967 budget was presented to us, they predicted a deficit of $1.8 billion. On February 7 of this year, Mr. Fowler and Mr. Schultze predicted this deficit to be $9.7 billion. By May of this year, the Secretary, in appearing before the Ways and Means Committee in support of a demand for a $29 billion addition to the national debt limit, then estimated the fiscal year 1967 deficit to be around $11 billion. At the end of the fiscal year, it was then announced that the deficit was approximately $9.9 billion. It seems that it makes a substantial difference in the estimates when the purpose of the estimate is accounted for. The estimate is low when they are requesting money, but high when requesting expansion of the national debt limit.

Now then, for a moment let us turn to the fiscal year 1968 budget and estimates. We will first note that on February 7 it was presented to us as resulting in a $8.1 billion deficit with a proposed tax increase of 6 percent. However, by August of this year, the Secretary of the Treasury, again appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee in support of the tax increase, then stated as follows:

> The budgetary consequences of these revised estimates of revenues and the expenditure contingencies outlined would imply a deficit of $23.6-billion. In the event no tax increase were enacted, and in the absence of tight expenditure control, the deficit could rise to $29-billion (including $700-million for the higher interest cost on the public debt that such a deficit would involve).

These two discrepancies positively identify the extent to which information presented to the Appropriations Committee has been unreliable with error of such magnitude that it literally has been of no value to our deliberations.

While the Secretary presented a glowing report of how the economic policy of the Nation would be well served by the budget presented to us, he had a substantial change of heart in his statement to the Ways and Means Committee on August 14. To quote briefly, he said:

> But given present private demands for credit, an outsized Federal deficit, such as would result without the proposed tax rise and expenditure restraints, cannot be accommodated without severe disruption to the credit markets, sending interest rates sky-high and shutting off the flow of credit to sectors such as the home mortgage market and small business.

The original budget and the recommendations that went with it are of course what the Appropriations Committee had to work with during this session. To that budget and the accompanying analysis, the House Appropriations Committee responded with a commendable concern for the best interests of our military and domestic needs.

The chairman of our committee has stated several times that we have already accomplished reductions in the House in excess of $4 billion with indications that another billion dollars will be added to that when we have completed considerations of the three remaining bills. This then makes a total reduction to the credit of the House of approximately $5 billion. It follows that, with that reduction and if the President's budget had been reliable, we could have eliminated the 6-percent tax increase and still have had a deficit that was less than originally recommended.

There are now two factors which identify the immediate need for the expenditure limitation that Mr. Bow has suggested. First, there is evidence that the other body has restored most of the reductions made by the House and in some cases provided additional moneys for new programs. Many of these additions came about because of requests by the executive department to restore House reductions and to add new programs. Second, and more significant, is the disturbing budget picture with a $29 billion deficit that has now been acknowledged and attested to by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, together with other economic advisers.

It is difficult for me to understand how the Secretary could state on February 7 that:

> The fact that revenues have exceeded estimates has enabled the President to compile an overall record of unusual accuracy in estimating deficits.

I can find no accuracy in estimates that miss their mark by 200 to 300 percent in just a matter of a very few months. Nor can I justify—and I quote:

> The Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Council of Economic Advisers work closely together on these matters. Together we try to provide the President with the best possible information on revenue estimates and fiscal requirements necessary to the smooth functioning of the national economy.

If these figures which I have just quoted represent a smooth functioning of the national economy as Secretary Fowler implied on February 7, then it is obvious that all of them have a lot to learn.

It further occurs to me that with these consistent inaccuracies, what reliance do we have that the figures being presented to us now are any more correct than those that were presented to us at the beginning of the year? It seems to me that in the absence of any reliable statistics or policy on the part of the administration, the only course for us to follow in attempting to bring fiscal sanity to budgeting chaos is by the amendment as recommended by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. This would permit the Bureau of the Budget to attempt to adjust the expenditures within a described limit on a quarterly basis and in compliance with their own figures which, as we have seen, change every quarter.

The House Appropriations Committee and the House action taken last week fulfilled the responsibility that we have to the American taxpayer. It was a sincere attempt to prevent increased interest rates and resulting inflation.

The Congress next year should very thoroughly analyze in its own right the budget and fiscal requirements of the Nation and respond accordingly. We cannot expect the American taxpayer to be satisfied with a budgeting process that is as unreliable and unpredictable as has been practiced by the administration during recent years.

TEXTILE TRADE ACT OF 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the Textile Trade Act of 1967. This bill and similar bills demonstrate the deep concern I have for the rising textile imports which affect so many of our wool and cotton producers in this country. Last year the total import picture of textiles shows that a record $2.1 billion in textile imports were brought into this country. This is an increase of $839 million since 1960.

It is the wool producing picture of this Nation that I am very concerned about today. One out of every 4 yards of wool textiles consumed in this country comes from a source outside of this Nation. This means that the American wool producer in this country has lost since 1962 the potential market of $101.3 million a year in manufactured textiles. The imports since 1955 have increased by 61.5 million pounds of wool a year. In addition, total imported sheep products reached $606 million last year. These imports most certainly mean a hardship for our American wool producers. This hardship is reflected in the latest cash price from the Wall Street Journal which shows wool-fine staple down from $1.37 last year to $1.21 now. Obviously this reflects on prices received by our wool producers in this country.

It is becoming clearer that the recent Kennedy round of tariff cutting has left the American farmer with no hope to capture more of the foreign market that was hoped for by our negotiators. We must reexamine the recent cut made in the field of textiles.

My bill would authorize and direct the President to negotiate agreements with single countries or with groups of countries. The agreements reached would limit imports by articles to a period prior to 1967. If after 6 months from the enactment of my bill the textile import levels have not been negotiated, then the quantity of textile imports will revert to the average levels of 1961–66.

I urge prompt action on this bill for it is important that we attempt to bolster another sector of our agriculture economy from the onslaught of foreign trade.

BRING ON ST. LOUIS

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, along with the great events celebrated by all Americans—such as Paul Revere's ride and the Boston Tea Party—there must now be added the indomitable achievement of the Boston Red Sox in winning the American League championship.

Along with the names of those great American victories where Americans came from behind to win, must be inscribed the name of Fenway Park.

Boston, long known for its dignity and decorum, gave way to screams of delight at the last out. And even editorial writers, who are not always noted for excitable phrases, have risen above themselves.

A Boston Globe editorial, in words that ring with the spirit of Massachusetts Pine Tree flag, has given us not just a local yell of glee—but an inspired assessment of baseball.

It describes the challenge and the excitement and the rewards of sport.

I appreciate that you all know which is the greatest team in the American League—that rose from a lowly ninth place in 1966.

And you all know that Carl Yastrzemski won the triple batting crown—and how to spell his last name.

But you probably do not all subscribe to the Boston Globe; so, under unanimous consent, I place its memorable editorial in the RECORD so you may all have copies of this epic piece of prose on an epochal event:

RIGHT OUT OF SIGHT

There are those who say that major league baseball is a bore. They say it is downright ridiculous for grown men to run around a field in knickers and caps. They say baseball fans are suckers, paying to watch three minutes of real action over a period of two or three tedious hours.

They are benighted souls, deserving of our pity.

Baseball, as played by the pennant-winning Red Sox this golden season, has been a mystical union of physical grace, intellectual vitality and moral toughness.

It has been poetry, universally elevating, and yesterday's victory over the Minnesota Twins was its apotheosis.

Baseball this year has been the hard, gemlike competitiveness of a Jim Lonborg, the introspective young pitcher who started the winning sixth-inning rally by dropping a safe bunt down the third-base line with impeccable precision.

It has been the superb athletic craftsmanship of a Carl Yastrzemski, who cracked out four base hits in as many times at bat in the game that counted for everything.

It has been the utter professionalism of a Jerry Adair, who injured himself in starting a hair-raising second-to-first double play in the eighth, and the youthful elan of a Mike Andrews, who replaced Adair and promptly executed the same spectacular play in the ninth.

It has been the gifted all-round play of men like Rico Petrocelli, George Scott, and the injured Tony Conigliaro; the implacable hitting of men like Dalton Jones and Reggie Smith; the hard pitching of men like Jose Santiago and Gary Bell; the exuberant hustle of men like Jose Tartabull and Russ Gibson.

Baseball this year has been delirium, and no one has expressed this better than did the players themselves in the dressing room right after the game.

Said Dalton Jones bashfully: "I lost my head right out there on the field."

Said Jim Lonborg, with shower water streaming down his thoughtful face: "I don't think there'll ever be another day in baseball like this."

Said Jose Tartabull: "I don't know what I am right now."

And the cool reliever, John Wyatt, said it perhaps best of all, grinning mightily: "How do I feel? Out of sight, baby. Right out of sight."

Bring on the Cardinals!!!

THE WIDENING CREDIBILITY GAP

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, my office in the past few days has been deluged with mail concerning Vietnam. My constituents ask the almost unanswerable questions of "why," "how," and "when"?

I suffer extreme frustration in attempting to provide responsive answers. And, I find my frustration stems in most part from a lack of information or, more importantly, a lack of consistently reliable information. I find myself leaving "off the record" briefings wondering whether or not I can rely upon the information gained—not so much because I think anyone in the administration takes great pleasure in misleading—but rather, I oftentime conclude there may be those who feel Congressmen, and members of the public, are not to be trusted with, or need not be informed of, the unpublicized data upon which decisions are based. And, just as often, I conclude the unilateral attitude taken by the administration toward dissemination of information places me in no better a position to determine what our policy should be than that of the reasonably well-informed person outside Government.

This dissatisfaction with the reliability and credibility of administration-disseminated information was recently expressed in a talk given by Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN. I think his remarks are well worth repeating here and are expressive of my sentiments. He said:

THE WIDENING CREDIBILITY GAP

(An address by U.S. Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN)

In the current issue of the *New Yorker* magazine, Washington correspondent Richard Rovere writes, "Every surveyor of public opinion, every traveler returning from the provinces, reports that the primary cause of disaffection—or at least what is more often stated as the primary cause—is the feeling that this President cannot be counted upon to tell the country the truth—to keep his word—to be straightforward in his dealings with others."

Rovere describes it as a national disaster. For as he sees it, "The lack of confidence in the integrity of a particular president diminishes respect—not only for him—but for the office he holds and will be part of the heritage of any man who succeeds him."

Time magazine reported in the September 22 edition on an exhaustive study on the progress of the Vietnam war. The study, according to *Time* magazine, produced very encouraging news about the military situation. But *Time* also indicated that the President probably won't release the report because the public is just not in a mood to believe it.

Four years ago, on October 2, 1963, the Secretary of Defense said this about our involvement in Vietnam: "The major part of the United States military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a number of United States training personnel."

Only three years ago, on September 25, 1964, President Johnson cautioned against what he termed "reckless action" and remarked: "We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for the Asian boys. We don't want . . . to get tied down in a land war in Asia."

In January of 1966, President Johnson stood before the Congress of the United States and indicated to the Members of Congress and the American people that he was disturbed about the problem of strikes; he solemnly stated that very shortly he would send proposals to Congress to revise and overhaul the legal machinery available to deal with crippling nationwide strikes. You know, many Members of Congress believed him, and the American people—many of them—believed him; and they waited and they waited; and they're still waiting—because President Johnson to this day, 19 months later, still has not submitted those proposals for revision of our labor laws.

There is great concern in the country now about President Johnson's proposal for a 10-percent surtax. I'd like to say—and I'm sure my colleagues in the Congress would agree—that there is widespread opposition to this proposal. In fact my mail is running at least 100 to 1 against it.

After analyzing my mail and talking to many constitutents, I have concluded that a root cause of the public's opposition to the proposed tax increase is a widespread lack of faith in the Johnson Administration and its handling of domestic and foreign affairs.

The war in Vietnam is very costly. At home the summer riots have dramatically drawn attention to the crisis in the cities which constitutes one of the most serious domestic problems that this nation has ever known.

It would appear that a strong case is available for additional demands upon the taxpayer, and that the American people—out of a sense of responsibility—ought to respond to the President's appeal. But this is not their reaction.

I believe there are several basic reasons for the present resistance to the proposed surtax. First, I think there is at work in the country something which has been described as the opposite of "crying wolf too often." As Senator James Pearson, of Kansas, said the other day in the United States Senate, after too many false alarms have been sounded, the point is finally reached when people fail to respond even to a genuine alarm.

And, as Senator Pearson pointed out, the reverse of this principle also is true. In the past, the Administration has assured the people over and over again that we can have a full measure of both guns and butter, without significant dislocation of our econ-

omy and without additional tax burdens. And now, after the Administration has told the people so many times that we can have "business as usual" while the Vietnam war goes on, the public is skeptical when the Administraiton suddenly reverses itself and says, in effect, that the demands upon the country are so heavy that taxes must be increased.

Closely related to this is another type of public reaction. Month after month, over the past several years, the public has seen the Administration continually underestimate the level of federal expenditures and overestimate the amount of taxes that will flow into the Treasury. Republican spokesmen pointed out, shortly after President Johnson submitted his economic message for this fiscal year, that the deficit could go as high as $30 billion unless proposed expenditures were cut. But those assessments made by Republican spokesmen were dismissed out of hand by the Administration. Indeed, as late as June, Gardner Ackley, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, was saying that any suggestion of a budget deficit of $30 billion was "outrageous."

But then, just six short weeks later, President Johnson in asking for his 10-percent surtax confirmed that the "outrageous" was essentially the fact, which had the effect of admitting that Republicans were telling the country the truth.

Thus, after becoming accustomed to a pattern of confusing, changing estimates and predictions, perhaps the public is justified now in expressing doubts as to whether these new estimates and predictions by the Administration are reliable.

The opposition to the surtax, borne of the public skepticism as to the reliability of the Administration's word, is reinforced by growing doubts and concerns about the Administration's conduct of foreign and domestic policy. Even those who share the general objectives proclaimed by the Johnson Administration have growing doubts about its capacity to properly and effectively execute its programs.

In regard to Vietnam the American public has been repeatedly told over the past three years that the war is going well; but day after day the evidence seems to pile up that the situation grows worse. To many it appears that we are further from a settlement today than we were in 1964, despite the fact that our effort there has undergone a massive escalation—escalation which the Administration has indicated would never occur.

At home, the gap between promise and reality is very wide. The American people have been generally willing to participate in the Administration's declaration of war on poverty because they share the objective of eliminating poverty from our society. But despite the flowing pronouncements of the past few years, poverty has not been significantly reduced and the problems which it breeds seem to have been multiplied.

If anyone thinks that only Republicans are critical of the Johnson Administration on the issue of credibility and truth in government, let me suggest that members of the Nation's press corps are even more disturbed and concerned. The current (September 1967) issue of the *Progressive*, a magazine reflecting liberal Democratic thoughts, has a lead article entitled "The White House Lies". This article documents statement after statement which the authors brand as lies.

The article is part of a book ready for publication. In it, the authors, William McGaffin, Washington correspondent for the Chicago Daily News, and Erwin Knoll, White House correspondent for Newhouse National News Service, describe what has become known as an LBJ credibility test. It goes something like this: "When the President smooths down the hair on the back of his head, he's telling the truth. When he rubs his hands, he's telling the truth; but when he starts moving his lips, watch out."

When Governor Romney used some terminology not long ago that touched off a national dialog, he was talking about the same problem that I'm talking about here today.

And it's a problem not exclusively the burden of those who occupy or seek public office. More significantly it's a problem of the American people, whatever their political posture and whatever their station in life or their race or color or creed. For when confidence in our government begins to fade, let me suggest that the sun begins to set on freedom as we know it.

One of the most unfortunate casualties of the Vietnam war has been the loss of confidence of the American people in the word of their own government. Imagine Ambassador Arthur Goldberg feeling compelled to tell the United Nations, and I quote: "We have a great problem maintaining our credibility with our own people."

Now, the American people realize full well that some matters relating to *military* security cannot, and should not, be revealed. But they do not accept the proposition that information can be withheld or distorted for purposes of *political* security. And they do not accept the proposition that the government has the right deliberately to deceive or to lie to those whose consent is essential to the very operation of our system.

Last year, Wes Gallagher, the general manager of Associated Press, said that an examination of the record of what has been reported about Vietnam during the past four years, and what Administration officials have said about Vietnam, leaves no doubt that the news reporting has been much more accurate than official statements. And, he added that there seems to be an Orwellian 1984 concept which pervades the thinking of this Administration. They seem to believe that if reporters would just report the good news, somehow things would be better.

Now I want to be fair. I remember, and you remember too, how shocked the American people were during the Eisenhower Administration when a State Department press officer said, four days after a U-2 spy plane disappeared over Russia, that there had been no attempt to violate Soviet air space. In that case, I suggest, a government agency departed from President Eisenhower's usual policy of candor; the country was rightfully upset and shocked. But stop and think about it; people just don't get shocked anymore about this sort of thing. In the last four or five years, the manipulation and the suppression of government information has become the rule, and not the exception that it was under previous administrations.

Perhaps Walter Cronkite summed it up the best when he said that this is not just a moral or a philosophical problem. The problem has grown to such proportions that today it directly affects the very ability of our system to survive. As he pointed out, the very foundation of representative government is built on honesty, and belief in the honesty of fellow men.

If it is to endure, surely a representative government must accept a basic commitment to the citizens it represents. The people who have the sense to put a government into power must be accorded credit for having enough sense fairly to judge that government's performance. And failure on the part of a representative government to fulfill that fundamental commitment can only sow the seeds of decay and destruction of the system itself.

When our nation was very new, James Madison said this: "Knowledge will forever govern ignorance. And a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power that knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce, or a tragedy, or both."

REPORT OF REPRESENTATIVE ALEXANDER PIRNIE, PRESIDENT OF THE U.S. GROUP TO THE INTERPARLIAMENTAY UNION

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, as president of the U.S. Group of the Interparliamentary Union, it is my duty to report on the recent activities of that body, with particular reference to the session held in Geneva September 10 to 15. The regular plenary conference of the Union had been scheduled to be held in Moscow from the 7th of September to the 15th. Unfortunately, action had to be taken canceling this meeting and I feel it most important that the reason for so doing be fully understood by the Congress. Therefore, I will recount the factual sequence in some detail.

Mr. Speaker, over a year ago the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics invited the Inter-Parliamentary Union to hold its plenary session in Moscow, in September 1967. This was duly followed by an official invitation sent by the U.S.S.R. to the IPU, and the signing of the official agreement, dated at Moscow, November 11, 1966.

A copy of this official agreement is in our IPU files in Washington. Here are some points of the signed agreement which I would like to place in the RECORD:

The Group (Soviet) will issue an invitation to all National Groups affiliated with the Union in conformity with a list to be supplied by the Secretary General not later than May 30, 1967.

The Group will make arrangements with Soviet Consulates and diplomatic missions abroad to grant visas, on presentation of the official identity card issued by the Group to the following:

All delegates of National Groups wishing to participate in the Conference, as well as to members of their families.

Special arrangements will be made for the issuance of visas to citizens of those countries with which the USSR may not have diplomatic relations.

The agreement, having been duly signed by the interested parties, was received at the conference in Mallorca in April 1967, and the delegations started their preparations for the plenary conference in Moscow.

On May 3, 1967, the Secretary General addressed the following letter to the President of the Soviet delegation of the IPU:

[Unofficial translation from Russian]

GENEVA,
May 3, 1967.

MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of my letter to you dated April 20, I have the honour to inform you that my attention has been drawn to a communique issued by the Tass Press Agency in Moscow on April 15, of which you will find an unofficial translation attached.

You will realize that this statement has occasioned some surprise to certain National

Groups which have asked me for an explanation of this matter.

This is why I shall be most grateful if you could let me know how this Tass statement is to be interpreted by the members of the Union in the light of Article 5 of the Agreement concluded between the Soviet Parliamentary Group and the Inter-Parliamentary Union for the organization of the 56th Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Moscow.

I await your reply before May 15 to the question raised above, as well as to my letter of April 20 regarding the arrangements foreseen to ensure that delegations from countries where there is no Soviet diplomatic representation at present will be able to obtain entry visas to the USSR so that they may participate in the 56th Inter-Parliamentary Conference.

I have the honour to be, Mr. President,
Your obedient servant,

ANDRE DE BLONAY,
Secretary General.

STATEMENT ISSUED IN MOSCOW ON APRIL 15 BY THE TASS NEWS AGENCY

Some foreign press agencies reported that the Soviet delegation, during the Council meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union at Palma, had invited the South Korean Inter-Parliamentary Group to participate in the 56th Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union which will take place in Moscow in September.

Tass is authorized to state that these reports were untrue. During the Council meeting in Spain, the Soviet delegation did not extend any invitation to the South Korean Parliamentary Group for the Moscow Conference and has no intention of doing so.

The reply from Mr. Spiridonov was not received until May 24 in a very lengthy cable in which he stated that the South Korean delegation would not be received by the U.S.S.R., and that they would not be issued visas. One paragraph of the cable will suffice to present the argument:

As you know, the Soviet Union neither recognized nor recognizes the lawfulness of the South Korean regime which claims to represent the entire Korean people. The USSR Parliamentary Group cannot but draw your attention to the fact that, in the examination of the application of the South Korean Group for membership in the Union in Copenhagen in 1964, serious violations of the rules of procedure of the Union were perpetrated.

The rest of the cable is long and involved, and full of specious arguments. The Secretary General answered under date of May 26, stating in part:

I have received this morning the cable by which you informed me that the Inter-Parliamentary Group of the USSR had in fact no intention of inviting the South Korean Group to the 56th Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Moscow. This fact will be brought to the attention of the Union's Executive Committee which, at the request of two of its members, will meet in Geneva on June 3 in extraordinary session.

This meeting of the Executive Committee was held on June 3, 1967, and the United States was represented by Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois, in place of Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut, who was unable to attend on account of illness in his family.

The Executive Committee passed a resolution by a vote of eight in favor and one abstention, this last being the vote of the U.S.S.R. representative, not to hold the plenary session in Moscow unless the U.S.S.R. reconsidered the agreement of November 11, 1966, and abided by the terms of the same. The U.S.S.R. did not recede from its position and for that reason the plenary session had to be canceled and the Geneva meeting was substituted.

The Secretary General stated in his report that this was the first time in the long history of the Union that a plenary session had to be abandoned in peace time.

It was against this background that the delegations assembled in Geneva for a session confined to meetings of the Council and the Executive Committee. This prevented conference action on the agenda prepared for Moscow. Regretfully, it also eliminated what promised to be a very stimulating and informative television roundtable discussion on "The Member of Parliament and His Constituents." This program was scheduled for two evening periods at Moscow and I was to have been one of six participants. It would have afforded an opportunity of outlining the many aspects of constituent contact in a free society.

More than 50 countries of the 66 now eligible to participate were represented at Geneva. The nations not qualified to sit due to parilamentary conditions in their respective countries were: Burma, Dahomey, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Iraq, Monaco, Nigeria, Syria, Republic of Vietnam, Argentina, Sierra Leone, and Greece. It should be noted that Mali, Mauretania, and Niger were accepted at the spring conference in Mallorca and Singapore and Malawi were admitted at Geneva.

No sooner had the Council meeting convened than it was apparent that the Middle East crisis had replaced Vietnam as the dominant issue. Attacks were launched on Israel, sparked by a resolution of condemnation introduced by the Soviets. The Israelis countered with a proposal that the Executive Committee be dispatched as a delegation to all countries involved in the recent hostilities for the purpose of exerting influence in behalf of the Union "toward a stable, just and lasting peace in the interest of all people in the region." The Spanish delegation filed a resolution, temperate in tone, calling for withdrawal by the Israel forces and an end of the state of belligerency. After debate which was long and heated, it became very apparent that any substantial agreement was impossible. The Eastern bloc supporting the Arab position was unwilling to modify their demand that Israel be branded the aggressor. Further, there was no admission of Israel's existence as a nation. Realizing that agreement on a meaningful resolution was impossible in this state of mind, the decision was reached to refer the resolution to the Committee on Political Questions, International Security, and Disarmament for further study and debate during the spring conference at Dakar. Favorable action on this proposal was aided by the timely and most effective speech of Senator HART of the U.S. delegation:

TOWARD A DURABLE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(An address by Senator PHILIP A. HART)

The question before us yesterday was whether resolutions on the Middle East should be debated by this Council. Some of us were skeptical that such debate could advance or contribute to the cause of peace; some of us were concerned that such a debate might damage constructive efforts now under way to bring a permanent peace to that troubled region. The Council took the decision to bring the subject to debate. I think we must recognize that the discussion thus far has been of value.

Certainly, I want to make explicit that our apprehension less debate on this issue damage the cause of peace did not reflect a desire to obscure the United States' position. The position of the United States has been stated repeatedly and consistently. It is that all concerned in the Middle East crisis must work toward a durable peace and must refrain from steps which would encourage a renewal of hostilities or would aggravate present dangers.

As we see it, this broad objective can be achieved only if there is recognition of certain principles. Let me list those principles briefly but specifically:

1. There must be recognition of the right to national life for all states in the area.

2. There must be faithful observance of political independence and territorial integrity for all states in the area.

3. There must be justice for the Arab refugees.

4. There must be assurances of innocent passage through international waterways—waterways, plural.

5. There must be limit on wasteful and destructive arms race.

Each of us who believe these principles are relevant must now ask himself what the proper role is and should be for the Interparliamentary Union. What action of this Council, consistent with these principles, would contribute toward a goal which I believe each of us seek—a just and a stable peace in the Middle East?

As each of you considers and decides what your own answer is as to the role the Council should play, let me suggest the course which I feel would be constructive.

The Council should not undertake to condemn; to fix blame for the war or to assign responsibility for the conditions from which war developed. For me, this would be neither wise nor possible. Just from listening to previous speakers, nothing could be clearer, and I suspect I would have this feeling even if I were a Ph.D. in history, which I am not.

I suggest the IPU should neither assume nor complicate the tasks of the United Nations, where the parties immediately concerned are trying to work for peaceful settlement—the United Nations, organization with the authority and the facilities and the mechanisms to play effectively this specific role.

The U.N. Security Council has succeeded in bringing about a cease-fire. The issue is before the United Nations. Summit talks have been had among various interested groups as at Glassboro and Khartoum. A special emergency session of the General Assembly has met and will pass its work on to the regular session of the General Assembly beginning next week, just a few days from now.

Each of us recognizes that none of these efforts so far has achieved dramatic success. It is apparent by now that no quick, rapid solution is possible in so complex a situation. But these efforts must be continued.

It seems to me that the function of the IPU, in our formal debates and our informal relationships, should be to seek some detachment from immediate and detailed concerns of our respective governments.

If this is so, we should direct our energies, concentrate our thoughts, in support of and facilitating efforts under way at this hour to seek a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and, equally, to minimize contention within this Council over resolutions which might prejudice peace efforts.

In conclusion, Mr. President, it seems to me that no resolution presently before us—however acceptable some of them may be to specific delegations—comes close to reflecting any kind of consensus in this greatly divided Council group. While at this point I would not make any specific comments on the several texts before us, I do suggest that our actions on them, our resolves with respect to them be within the principles I have attempted to describe. Only by acting in this fashion could this Council contribute constructively to the goal which is shared by all of us—a Middle East where peace is secure; secure not through force or arms, but by recognition of rights and assertion of duties.

The second major debate was triggered by the resolution on "universality" submitted by the Czechosolvak group. This subject had already been raised by the Soviets to cover their arbitrary action sabotaging the plenary conference. The debate which ensued demonstrated that this concept of "universality" was more a creature of expediency than of principle. It was clear that the advocates of universality were not prepared to apply it to all areas, nor were there any guidelines set forth. Accordingly, no resolution was adopted. Instead, the subject was referred to the Parliamentary and Juridical Committee for appropriate action at Dakar.

The subjects causing the most discussion were added to the agenda immediately prior to the session, while the resolutions adopted at Mallorca were not discussed. It was determined that they should be remanded to the respective committees at Dakar for decision whether they should be submitted to the plenary conference in Lima.

The Council confirmed the dates and places for the 1968 meetings of the Union. The spring conference will be held in Dakar, Senagal, April 15–21, and the plenary conference in Lima, Peru, September 5–13. Further, it reached the conclusion that under the constitution only a plenary session had authority to elect a new President to fill the vacancy in that office developing from the disqualification of Mr. Ranieri Mazzilli, of Brazil. Accordingly, Mr. Abderrahman Abdennebi, of Tunisia, was continued as Acting President until the next plenary conference. In a spirited election, three vacancies were filled on the Executive Committee by the choice of Mr. Wende, of Poland, Mr. Aranegui, of Spain, and Mr. Velaerin, of Finland. Senator Cotton, of Australia, lost out by the narrowest of margins as the candidates struggled through four ballots before the successful three candidates each received the required majority.

Many items of administrative concern were considered during the meeting. One of the most significant was related to the International Centre for Parliamentary Documentation, housed in the headquarters of the Union in Geneva. Its 1968 budget was adopted after approval of the excellent report submitted by Mr. G. Codacci-Pisanelli, of Italy, President of the Governing Board. All delegations were urged to strengthen this effort in all ways possible.

Throughout the tiring sessions of the Executive Committee, we were represented by Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut, who, together with Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, actively participated in all sessions of the Council. They injected into the debates a note of moderation which did much to give objectivity to the deliberations. With quiet firmness, they set forth the American positions with clarity and persuasion.

Although in some aspects the meeting of 1967 in Geneva was a real disappointment, it was not without areas of encouragement. True, there had been every reason to believe that holding the session in Moscow might promote better relations and contribute to progress in troubled areas. This opportunity the Soviets chose to toss away, forcing last minute adjustments in the agenda and imposing a format for the deliberations which undeniably restricted their character. Yet, we should remember that it was surely better to meet and discuss world problems, even though acrimoniously, than not to meet at all and thus perhaps encourage resort to arms. We encountered the same difficulties and frustrations that plague the United Nations and it is not surprising that we could not work miracles in so few days when that body is finding itself so beleagured after several months.

In the area of personal contacts, the session was most rewarding. Many fine friendships are possible although viewpoints differ and the value of personal exchanges has been frequently demonstrated. This potential your delegation kept constantly in mind.

As we look ahead to 1968 it is my hope that the Union will become less occupied with controversial issues and bloc alinements. It was founded to advance the cause of parliamentary government and much remains to be done in this field.

The legislative process of the member nations still varies between the creative and deliberative approach and automatic ratification of Executive requests. The role of Parliament in the preparation and refinement of legislation deserves greater study and application. Development of this objective within the Union could strengthen representative government throughout the world.

EVISCERATION OF THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 of this year I spoke on the floor of the House about rumors that the then-proposed organization of the Department of Transportation would include proposals for the dismembering, dismantling, denuding, and disemboweling of the Bureau of Public Roads. At the close of my remarks, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 23, beginning on page 7829, I inserted a copy of a letter I had written to the Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd, asking for specific information about the proposed reorganization.

In subsequent correspondence, Secretary Boyd assured me that the Bureau of Public Roads would be preserved, as the Congress specifically said it intended. He said, among other things, that—

I believe the FHWA organizational structure I have outlined is in keeping with the spirit and letter of the Department of Transportation Act. * * * It assures that the Bureau of Public Roads, as a major operating element, will continue to serve the Nation with even greater distinction in the future.

Mr. Boyd's words were comforting, but not too persuasive, based upon the record. Since that time, however, I have had the opportunity to analyze the organizational structure of the Federal Highway Administration and the Bureau of Public Roads, and the various delegations of authority.

It is clear that, despite the expressed will of Congress and Mr. Boyd's assurances, the Bureau of Public Roads has been almost completely eviscerated.

The field offices and personnel no longer report to, or are responsible to, the Director of Public Roads, but instead to the Federal Highway Administrator. About the only functions remaining in the Washington office of the Bureau of Public Roads are, first, supervision and control over the regional office engaged in direct Federal construction in the eastern United States and the Inter-American Highway regional office in Central America; second, development of policies, procedures, and standards, but subject to control of higher officials, and without control over the field offices applying such policies, procedures, and standards; and, third, providing technical program guidance and assistance, with respect to the location, design, construction, and maintenance of highways.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is developing the finest highway network in the world. The primary reason for this is the Federal-aid highway program which, since its inception over half a century ago, has been a State-Federal partnership. The Bureau of Public Roads, representing the Federal partner, has, over the years, done an outstanding job.

The Congress fully recognized this, and clearly expressed its intent that the Bureau be preserved, when it provided in section 3(f)(4) of the Department of Transportation Act that—

The Director of Public Roads shall be the operating head of the Bureau of Public Roads, or any other agency created within the Department to carry out the primary functions carried out immediately before the effective date of this Act by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Under the new organization and delegations of authority, the Director of Public Roads is not the "operating head of the Bureau of Public Roads. The Federal Highway Administrator has assumed the position of "operating head," and has relegated the Director of Public Roads to little more than a figurehead, presiding over a few scattered remnants of the Bureau's prior functions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Congress should sit idly by and watch its

expressed will being violated, and an effective, capable Bureau eviscerated. I am inserting at the close of my remarks copies of my exchange of correspondence with Secretary Boyd, and an analysis of the organization and status of the Bureau of Public Roads. My colleagues can see for themselves the difference between what Mr. Boyd says he is doing and what he has actually done.

I urge my colleagues to join me in trying to restore to the Bureau of Public Roads all of those important functions which the Congress intended it to keep.

The analysis follows with the correspondence attached:

ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATION AND STATUS OF THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

By letter dated May 17, 1967, Congressman William C. Cramer asked Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd several questions concerning the organization and status of the Bureau of Public Roads. Secretary Boyd replied to that letter under date of August 3, 1967. Mr. Boyd's letter is very persuasive in outlining his understanding of the Congress' intent in establishing the Department of Transportation and his efforts to comply with that intent. His letter closes with the statements, "I believe the FHWA organizational structure, as outlined, is in keeping with the spirit and letter of the Department of Transportation Act. * * * It assures that the Bureau of Public Roads as a major operating element will continue to serve the nation with even greater distinction in the future."

Analysis of the organizational structure and delegations of authority reveal, however, that the Bureau of Public Roads has been severely weakened and fragmented. Such analysis discloses that:

1. Several important functions, previously delegated by the Secretary of Commerce to the head of the Bureau of Public Roads, have been reserved to the Secretary of Transportation or to the Federal Highway Administrator.

2. Important staff and support functions previously vested in the head of the Bureau of Public Roads (including but not limited to legal, personnel, policy planning, public affairs, audits and fiscal and management services) are reserved to the Federal Highway Administrator or his delegates.

3. Previous delegations of a number of authorities from the head of the Bureau of Public Roads to regional and division engineers are perpetuated, with modification or revision subject to the approval of the Federal Highway Administrator.

4. Bureau of Public Roads regional engineers have been redesignated "Regional Federal Highway Administrators". Bureau of Public Road division engineers report and are responsible to the Regional Federal Highway Administrators, while they, in turn, report and are responsible to the Federal Highway Administrator. The Director of Public Roads is not in the chain of command.

5. The extent to which the Federal Highway Administrator intends to control the internal operations of what little remains of the Bureau of Public Roads is illustrated by the fact that an order describing the organization and general functions of a subsidiary office within the Bureau of Public Roads was issued by the Federal Highway Administrator—*not* the Director of Public Roads.

DISCUSSION

Delegations of authority

Prior to enactment of the Department of Transportation Act, the Secretary of Commerce, by Department Order No. 109 (revised), delegated directly to the head of the Bureau of Public Roads the authority to perform the functions vested in the Secretary of Commerce under Title 23 U.S. Code, Highways, the Act approved June 14, 1960, relating to National Driver Register Services, and the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. The only authority specifically reserved to the Secretary of Commerce was the authority to apportion Federal-aid highway funds among the states and the promulgation of regulations. (Although the reservation of authority to apportion funds specified only Federal-aid funds, as a matter of practice the Secretary also apportioned forest highway funds and public land funds.)

Under the reorganization resulting from the Department of Transportation Act, much of the authority previously delegated by the Secretary of Commerce to the head of the Bureau of Public Roads has been reserved to the Secretary of Transportation or the Federal Highway Administrator.

Department of Transportation Order 1100.1, dated March 31, 1967, delegated to the Federal Highway Administrator much of the Secretary's authority under various laws. In delegating such authority, the Secretary specifically reserved to himself the authority to:

Approve systems of administrative control to restrict obligation of expenditures.

Apportion funds for Federal-aid highways and forest highways.

Issue, modify or revoke proposed or final rules or regulations under several specified laws.

Withhold or suspend Federal-aid highway funds on a statewide basis, and the waiver or compromise of such withholding or suspension.

The portion of DOT Order No. 1100.1 reserving authority to issue, modify, or revoke rules and regulations specifies the statutes with respect to which the Secretary reserves the authority. This is an improvement over prior delegations of authority which did not so specify. However, the list of specific statutes includes section 109 of Title 23 U.S. Code, Section 109 makes no reference to rules or regulations, but relates only to standards for the construction of highways on the Federal-aid systems. The promulgation of such standards is an engineering matter, and is not a proper exercise of authority at the Secretariat level.

With respect to the reservation of authority to withhold or suspend Federal-aid highway funds on a statewide basis, this would apparently include authority to withhold funds under section 116 (Maintenance), section 126 (Diversion), section 127 (Vehicle Weight and Width Limitations), as well as section 131 (Control of Outdoor Advertising), section 136 (Control of Junkyards), and section 402 (Highway Safety Programs). It apparently would also include withholding or suspending Federal-aid funds as an administrative action in cases of irregularity in a particular State. None of these authorities were previously reserved to the Secretary, although obviously the head of the Bureau of Public Roads conferred with the Secretary before taking such drastic action.

By FHWA Order 1-2, dated July 27, 1967, the Federal Highway Administrator redelegated certain authorities to the Director of Public Roads. The following authorities were *not* re-delegated to the Director of Public Roads, but were specifically reserved to the Federal Highway Administrator:

Staff and support functions, powers, and duties vested in the Administrator (including but not limited to legal, personnel, policy planning, public affairs, audits and fiscal and management services).

Approving the general location and control areas of the Interstate Highway System.

Approving the specific locations and intermediate control points on sections of the Interstate Highway System which contain toll facilities and approaches thereto.

Approval of toll facility agreements.

Allocation of Public Land funds.

All of these authorities were previously delegated by the Secretary of Commerce to the head of the Bureau of Public Roads (although, as noted above, the Secretary of Commerce allocated Public Land funds and Forest highway funds as a matter of practice).

With regard to the reservation of staff and support functions, powers and duties, this results in the transfer of 3 of the 8 former offices within the Bureau of Public Roads: the Office of General Counsel, the Office of Audits and Investigations, and the Office of Administration. In addition to this, the former Office of Highway Safety has been severely reduced in responsibilities and personnel largely as a result of the Highway Safety Act of 1966, and has been redesignated as the "Office of Traffic Operations". The Bureau of Public Roads is left with only an Office of Engineering and Operation, Office of Right-of-Way and Location, Office of Planning, Office of Research and Development, and Office of Traffic Operations.

It is pertinent to note that, although the legal office of the Bureau of Public Roads has been officially transferred to the Office of the Federal Highway Administrator, and substantial numbers of key personnel and files and material have been physically transferred, the Federal Highway Administrator had not decided upon an organizational structure as of September 30, 1967, six months after official transfer of the Bureau of Public Roads from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Transportation.

Field offices

A number of authorities previously delegated to the head of the Bureau of Public Roads have, over the years, been redelegated to regional and division engineers (see Administrative Memorandum 1-10.2, dated June 17, 1964, as amended). It appears that these delegations of authority are to be perpetuated, and that the head of the Bureau of Public Roads, acting on his own, will have no authority to withdraw or modify the delegations.

Section 3(d) of FHWA Order 1-2 states that "The Regional Federal Highway Administrator *will* perform the functions and exercise the authorities formerly delegated to the Regional Engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads * * *" (emphasis added).

Section 3(e) of the Order specifically states that further redelegations of authority will be issued subject to the approval of the Administrator.

In addition to the reduction in authority delegated to the head of the Bureau of Public Roads, and the restriction of his authority to withdraw or modify delegation of authority he has previously made, it also appears that the head of the Bureau of Public Roads will no longer have supervision and control of the personnel carrying out authorities delegated to them by him.

FHWA Order 1-2 specifically states that "Each Federal Highway Administration Regional Office is headed by a Regional Federal Highway Administrator who reports and is responsible to the Administrator". Under previous organizational arrangements which are to be continued, B.P.R. division engineers report to and are responsible to the regional engineers, who have been redesignated Regional Federal Highway Administrators. It thus appears that the head of the Bureau of Public Roads will have no direct supervision or control over the Bureau's field offices.

Administration of the Bureau of Public Roads

There are also indications that the Federal Highway Administrator intends to severely restrict the head of the Bureau of Public Roads in the exercise of his judgment and discretion in administering what little is left of the Bureau of Public Roads.

FHA Order 1-3.1, dated May 4, 1967, de-

scribes the official functions of the Office of Traffic Operations within the Bureau of Public Roads. Both the order and the attached "Organization and Functions Supplement," were signed by the Federal Highway Administrator alone. The table of organization of the office, which is also attached to the Order, is signed by the Director of Public Roads. However, the Director signed only as recommending the organizational structure, and the Federal Highway Administrator signed as the approving official. Since the functions and organizational structure of offices within the Bureau of Public Roads have heretofore been approved by the head of the Bureau, this indicates that the Federal Highway Administrator intends to act as the operating head of the Bureau, superseding the Director.

CONCLUSION

Although Secretary Boyd's letter of August 3, 1967, is persuasive, it appears that the Congressional intent to preserve the Bureau of Public Roads and its functions as they existed in the past has been violated.

Because of unprecedented reservations of authority, control of modifications or revisions of previous delegations of authority, and the anomalous organizational structure (where officials exercising delegated authority neither report to nor or responsible to the official delegating the authority) and the transfer of important offices out of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau has been converted into an ornamental appendage whose real function is uncertain.

It appears that under the Washington Office of the Bureau of Public Roads will be only the following limited functions:

Supervision and control over Region 15, which is engaged in direct Federal construction in the eastern part of the United States, and the Inter-American Highway Office (Region 19), which administers construction of the Inter-American Highway in Central America:

Development of policies, procedures and standards governing Federal and Federal-aid highway research, planning and construction (but subject to control of higher officials, and without control, over field offices applying such policies, procedures and standards);

Provide *technical program guidance and assistance* to Federal Highway Administration Regional offices, other Federal and State agencies, and certain foreign governments with respect to the location, design, construction and maintenance of highways.

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: I am very much concerned over your letter of March 23, which informed me about rumors pertaining to one of the key organizations of the Department of Transportation, the Bureau of Public Roads. I would be even more concerned if these rumors were true. Since they are apparently based on lack of information and understanding, I would like to present my philosophy on the Department of Transportation and how the Bureau of Public Roads can best contribute to its over-all mission.

The goal Congress has set for the Department of Transportation is to build the fastest, safest, most efficient and economical transportation that can be devised in an atmosphere of providing a major means whereby the local, regional, and national environment can be enhanced. The means to accomplish this goal are those that are currently in existence. Prior to April 1, they were scattered throughout all levels of the government. Today we are in a position to realize the maximum results by directing the diversified efforts toward the common goal. There is no easy way such as a "technical breakthrough." We must achieve our success by making better use of our existing capabilities and techniques.

The Federal Highway Administration is proceeding along the same path as the Department. Its primary interests are limited to those of the highway mode. It includes the Bureau of Public Roads, the National Highway and Traffic Safety Bureau, and the Office of Motor Carrier Safety.

I have specifically charged the Federal Highway Administrator with the task of producing much greater results than the total produced by the components when they operated as independent agencies. Further, we have specifically discussed and agreed that the present Bureau of Public Roads capability far outweighs the capability of the other Federal Highway Administration components. One of the primary reasons it has this capability is that its field office structure enjoys such a good relationship with the State and local governments.

In order to preserve the Bureau of Public Roads capability but at the same time increase the capability of the other components, the field office structure is not only being retained, but strengthened and expanded. The field organizations with their knowledge, their concepts, and their relationships will then be able to insure the success of not only the Public Roads programs, but all others that must be carried out at State and local level. Just as a matter of interest, although no permanent assignments have been made in the Federal Highway Administration, except those executive level positions provided by statutory authority, all of the regional directors of the Bureau of Public Roads have been given interim appointments as Regional Federal Highway Administrators. This action allows them to control and direct the programs of all Federal Highway Administration components.

You mentioned that rumor had it that of the eight primary functional offices in the Washington Headquarters, only two would remain under the direction and supervision of the Director of Public Roads. This is incorrect. In accordance with Section 3(f)(4) of the Department of Transportation Act, those offices that I consider to be primary functional offices relating directly to the primary functions carried out by the Bureau of Public Roads will remain under the direction and supervision of the Director of Public Roads. I do not contemplate a change in this policy now or in the future. The primary functional offices are the Office of Engineering, the Office of Right-of-Way and Location, the Office of Planning, the Office of Research and Development, and a new Office, Traffic Operations. The other offices, which include the Office of Audits and Investigations, the Office of Administration, the Office of the General Counsel and the public relations function provide services and support and will now report to the Federal Highway Administrator. Again, this was done to provide the best possible attention to the needs of all components of the Federal Highway Administration.

I wish to emphasize the role of the offices and the functions that have been transferred to the staff of the Federal Highway Administrator. These office heads do not exercise supervision over the Director of Public Roads. On the contrary, they respond to his needs for services and support, leaving him free to devote his full attention and energies to the operating functions. The Director of Public Roads is now in a position to perform the increasing responsibilities within the Bureau of Public Roads in accordance with statutory requirements and also provide invaluable assistance in carrying out the goal of the Department. It is mandatory that he and his staff not only continue the direct communications to the field offices but strive to increase it by direct participation.

I have given you my concept and philosophy on the Department of Transportation and how I visualize the role of the Bureau of Public Roads. I have reserved for myself specific authority to insure that Departmental plans continue to be developed along these lines.

Sincerely,

ALAN S. BOYD.

MAY 17, 1967.

Hon. ALAN S. BOYD,
Secretary of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOYD: Thank you for your letter of April 24, 1967, replying to my letter to you of March 23, 1967, relative to my concern over rumored reorganization of the Bureau of Public Roads.

I take it from your letter that much of the rumored reorganization will, in fact, take place. Of the eight primary functional offices of the Bureau of Public Roads, charged with the responsibility of carrying out functions of the Bureau before the effective date of the Department of Transportation Act, you advise that only four will remain under the direction and supervision of the Director of Public Roads. You state that the Office and Audits and Investigations, the Office of Administration, and the Office of the General Counsel, as well as the public relations functions, will not report directly to the Federal Highway Administrator and will not be under the supervision and direction of the Director of Public Roads.

You do not disclose in your letter what disposition has been or will be made of the Office of Highway Safety, which prior to the effective date of the Department of Transportation Act was one of the eight primary functional offices of the Bureau of Public Roads. Since the Office of Highway Safety is not among the four pre-existing primary functional offices you identify in your letter as remaining under the direction and supervision of the Director of Public Roads. I assume that the Office of Highway Safety has been or will be transferred to or absorbed by some other agency. It is requested that I be informed of the action being taken with respect to the transfer of the functions of the Office of Highway Safety and of the personnel that formerly staffed that office.

It appears from your letter that four of the eight primary functional offices of the Bureau of Public Roads are being transferred out of the Bureau. You further advise that a new Office of Traffic Operations is being established in the Bureau of Public Roads.

I am greatly concerned over the reorganization of the field offices of the Bureau of Public Roads, as pointed out in my letter. You advise that all of the regional directors of the Bureau of Public Roads have been given interim appointments as Regional Federal Highway Administrators. I assume that these are the same individuals who have previously been called regional engineers. Your letter, however, does not shed any light on the organizational relationship between the interim or permanent Regional Federal Highway Administrators and the Director of Public Roads. Apparently, the Regional Federal Highway Administrators will be under the direction and supervision of and will report to the Federal Highway Administrator rather than the head of the Bureau of Public Roads, as was the case before the enactment of the Department of Transportation Act.

I wish to be advised of the nature and extent of the direction and supervision which the Director of Public Roads will exercise over the former Bureau regional engineers who have been designated as Regional Federal Highway Administrators. In this regard I am particularly interested in the authority to be delegated to the Director of Public Roads by the Federal Highway Administrator and the nature, extent, and manner of the delegation of authority to the Regional Fed-

eral Highway Administrators with respect to functions performed by the Bureau of Public Roads. I wish to know whether such delegation is directly from the Federal Highway Administrator to the Regional Federal Highway Administrators, thereby bypassing the Director of Public Roads, or if such delegation of authority goes from the Director of Public Roads to the Regional Federal Highway Administrators, thereby leaving the Director of Public Roads in the direct line of supervision and control where he should be.

I am also interested in the organizational relationship between the Bureau of Public Roads' division offices in each State, the Regional Federal Highway Administrators, and the Director of Public Roads. How and by whom is authority delegated to the division engineers? Who exercises supervision and direction over the division engineers, and to whom do they report?

It would appear that the reorganization of the Bureau of Public Roads will reduce the Bureau to an operational agency, limited solely to engineering considerations, and that the Bureau will no longer develop policies and make policy decisions in carrying out its responsibilities under the provisions of title 23, United States Code. I will appreciate being advised as to whether or not this is true. If the Director of Public Roads is to retain any policy making or policy decision authority, I would like to be advised of the specific areas in which he may exercise such authority and any conditions or limitations thereon.

It is also requested that I be furnished copies of the delegations of authority from the Federal Highway Administrator to the Director of Public Roads and the delegations of authority from the Federal Highway Administrator and the Director of Public Roads to the Regional Federal Highway Administrators and the Bureau's division engineers.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is in reply to your letter of May 17, concerning the organization of the Federal Highway Administration within the Department of Transportation, and particularly the operations of the Bureau of Public Roads. While I would have preferred to give you an earlier reply, the delay does enable me to provide you with the delegations of authority (copy enclosed) which you requested and which I feel, contain the answers to many of your questions.

These delegations of authority will provide for an effective highway program within the context of the overall mission of the Department of Transportation, consistent with the Department of Transportation Act and with the philosophy of the Department outlined in my previous letter of April 24.

To briefly reiterate my position: In creating the Department of Transportation it was the purpose of Congress to improve and coordinate our total transportation system and to provide the fastest, safest, most economical and efficient transportation attainable within the framework of our social and economic objectives. To this end, Congress brought together existing transportation programs from all levels of the Government and provided for them to be administered through a number of modal administrations responsible to the Secretary.

Responsibility for pursuing the departmental goals with respect to the highway mode rests, of course, with the Federal Highway Administration. This Administration, as you know, has three operating units, the Bureau of Public Roads, the National Highway Safety Bureau, and the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety, whose programs were assigned to it by the Act. Under the concept of the Department, however, its responsibilities go beyond the specific programs of these formerly separate agencies to include the development of national highway policies and the promotion of highway transportation as part of the total transportation system.

In meeting this overall responsibility, the Federal Highway Administrator and I recognize that the Bureau of Public Roads, with its capabilities, resources and well-deserved reputation for successful cooperation with State and local governments, is the key operating unit within the FHWA and the major source of support and expertise for the other components and the total FHWA program.

Accordingly, the Administrator has drawn on the supporting functions of the Bureau of Public Roads in administration, legal services, auditing, and public affairs to create central support offices able to serve not only BPR, but the two safety bureaus and his own office as well. In addition, the BPR field staff is being retained and supplemented by the modest field staff of the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety and new personnel of the National Highway Safety Bureau. This expansion will enable the field staff to carry out all program responsibilities of the FHWA at the State and local levels.

Regional Federal Highway Administrators head the 10 regional administrations which correspond to the regional offices formerly established within BPR. The Regional Administrators are responsible to the Federal Highway Administrator. They receive redelegations of authority over appropriate field functions from the Bureau Directors, subject to the approval of the Administrator. Delegation of program authority proceeds from the Secretary to the Administrator, to the Bureau Directors, to the Regional Administrators. The Regional Administrators then supervise the regional and division staffs in carrying out the programs of the FHWA.

In regard to your specific interests in the Bureau of Public Roads, the Administrator has authorized the Director of Public Roads to exercise the functions, powers and duties relating generally to highways, as enumerated in Section 6(a)(1) of the Department of Transportation Act, PL 89-670, and previously delegated to the Administrator by the Secretary. (A copy of DOT Order 1100.1, containing this delegation to the Administrator is enclosed.)

Furthermore, the Bureau of Public Roads is responsible for developing policies, procedures, and standards governing Federal and Federal-aid highway research, planning, and construction and for proving technical program guidance and assistance to the FHWA regional offices, other Federal and State agencies, and certain foreign governments with respect to the location, design, construction and maintenance of highways.

In addition to these policy responsibilities, the Director of Public Roads is a member of the FHWA policy planning council and participates in the development of plans for the entire highway program. The Bureau of Public Roads, therefore, continues to exercise the basic functions it has in the past with respect to the Federal highway program. Organizationally it carries out this program through five functional offices, the Office of Engineering and Operations, the Office of Right-of-Way and Location, the Office of Planning, the Office of Research and Development, and the Office of Traffic Operations.

The latter, in response to your inquiry, represents a redesignation of the former Office of Highway Safety. The new designation reflects the transfer of some elements of its program to the National Highway Safety Bureau and the assignment of new functions to this office in the traffic operations area. With the repeal of the 1965 Baldwin Amendment, the transfer of the Driver Register to the Safety Bureau (pursuant to the Highway Safety Act of 1966) and the staffing of the Safety Bureau, some of its personnel accepted offers of positions with the Safety Bureau. Those who chose to remain with BPR, however, are currently assigned to the Office of Traffic Operations. The Office presently has an employment ceiling of 59 positions with 8 vacancies. Of this number, eighteen positions were transferred July 1 to the Driver Register. Twenty new positions were in our Fiscal Year 1968 Budget request now before the Congress. I am enclosing a copy of the order describing the organization and functions of the Office of Traffic Operations.

I believe the FHWA organizational structure I have outlined is in keeping with the spirit and letter of the Department of Transportation Act. I am confident it will provide the most effective machinery for meeting the many challenging responsibilities of the Federal Highway Administration. It assures that the Bureau of Public Roads, as a major operating element, will continue to serve the Nation with even greater distinction in the future.

Sincerely,

ALAN S. BOYD.

TOBACCO CRISIS

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been extremely disappointed that Senator ROBERT KENNEDY of New York has been unwilling to meet with me to discuss the current tobacco problems.

Last week Mr. KENNEDY launched a vicious and cynical attack on the more than 3 million persons who depend on tobacco for their living.

Even more dangerous than his statements, however, are the three antitobacco bills that Senator KENNEDY introduced. I consider his proposals as unwarranted interference with the American free enterprise system, and as just one more way of giving the Federal Government more control over the tobacco industry.

In Senator KENNEDY's statement, he said the tobacco industry has shown "total inattention to public responsibility." The truth is that BOBBY KENNEDY showed total indifference to facts. Far from total inattention, the tobacco industry has taken many praiseworthy steps that demonstrate their concern with smoking and health questions.

The industry has given, for example, more than $22 million, totally without strings, to independent researchers working in smoking and health. Industry leaders in tobacco have repeatedly and publicly said that if more funds are needed, they will be made available. This does not sound like inattention to me.

The industry has also voluntarily subjected its advertising and promotion to a stringent code that strives to eliminate all health claims and appeals to youth. Breaking a code rule can cost a company up to $1 million for each infraction.

Despite BOBBY's rabid and ill-informed statements, the industry has made major

changes in cigarette advertising and I would remind the Senator that these changes were made voluntarily, without Government interference, and in the best traditions of responsible free enterprise.

Further, the cigarette companies have cooperated with the Federal Trade Commission in setting up the Commission's laboratory to test tar and nicotine content. The industry's cooperation with the Commission was acknowledged publicly last March, when Paul Rand Dixon appeared before the House Commerce Committee and lauded the industry for its excellent cooperation.

Senator KENNEDY's irresponsible statements have already had a very damaging effect on the tobacco industry in North Carolina, and his refusal to discuss the facts concerning the tobacco industry only points out his total lack of concern for those involved in one of our major industries.

I intend to do all that I can to point out the inaccuracies in Senator KENNEDY's statements, and his very dangerous assault on the free enterprise system.

I call on all of my colleagues in Congress to join with me to fight for the millions of our citizens who depend on the tobacco industry for their very livelihood.

PRESIDENTIAL "E" AWARD FOR BEECH AIRCRAFT CORP.

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure last week of attending a ceremony in the office of Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge, at which the Beech Aircraft Corp. received President Johnson's "E" Award for its success in expanding exports. Beech Aircraft Corp. is headquartered in Wichita, Kans., but it has manufacturing and research facilities in the State of Colorado.

During the past 5 years, this dynamic and progressive aircraft company increased its exports from about $9 million to almost $25 million. The firm has been in the export business for 35 years, and sells light utility and executive planes in 100 foreign countries. Throughout the world, Beech airplanes are widely used in mapping unexplored jungle, mountain, and desert areas, as well as in other private and commercial applications.

I should like to read the citation for the "E" Award presented at the ceremony:

Exporting since 1932, Beech Aircraft Corporation now sells its light utility and executive planes throughout the entire world. This was accomplished by engineering modifications to fulfill customer needs, establishment of a worldwide service network with foreign language training programs, as well as extensive indigenous advertising and promotion. The direct and well-planned international marketing program of Beech Aircraft has fostered increased export sales on a sustained basis, and reflects credit on management, employees and the American free enterprise system.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, because of serious illness in my family, it was necessary that I make the trip to Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., over the recent weekend, returning Tuesday, September 19, 1967.

Because of my necessary absence under these circumstances, I missed rollcalls:

On rollcall No. 257, to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4451, PELLY of Washington, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 258, to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1657, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 259, on the passage of House Resolution 838, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigation relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction, I would have voted "yea."

DANGEROUS FISCAL CRISIS

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the free-spending extravagances of the Johnson administration, our country is deeply entrenched in a dangerous fiscal crisis. We are facing a national deficit close to $30 billion with the accompanying problems of inflation, high interest rates, and an unfavorable balance of payments.

Since the Democrats took over in 1960, annual Government expenditures have increased 83 percent with nondefense spending nearly doubling. Despite warnings by the Republican minority and leading economics experts, the administration seems to feel we can finance an increasingly expensive war and lavishly hand out funds to new and expanded domestic programs. When the voters become aroused and demand solutions, the President gives only token promises to cut spending and persists in building up one of the largest deficits in the Nation's history.

It is already too late to avoid inflation and high interest rates, but it is not too late to attempt to cut the country's awesome deficit, thus paving the way for a more sound fiscal policy in the future.

In the absence of administration leadership to straighten out this fiscal mess, Congress apparently must take the initiative by enacting an expenditure ceiling on nondefense spending. By this action we can give the President the direction he obviously lacks toward a sensible economic policy. In order to meet our current fiscal crisis, we cannot continue to ignore the necessity to keep a reasonable relationship between revenues and expenditures.

FEDERAL PROTECTION FOR SOLDIERS AND FEDERALIZED NATIONAL GUARDSMEN ENGAGED IN ANTIRIOT OR OTHER FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT DUTIES

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide Federal protection for soldiers and federalized National Guardsmen engaged in antiriot or other Federal law enforcement duties. Under the present United States Code, a National Guardsman or member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties is not protected by Federal law from the forcible assaults or intimidations of criminals or rioters, even though he is enforcing Federal law under orders of the President. I believe that this bill would correct the oversight in the present law.

With adoption of this bill, the weight of Federal law would be put into effect when guardsmen are federalized for law enforcement duty by the President. I do not think that it is too much to ask that these men who are called into Federal service to protect the lives and property of our citizens be given the full protection of the law of the land. Where those laws are insufficient, they must be changed. This bill would remedy that defect.

CONVERSATIONS WHILE THE CROPS ROT

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of the Congress when we were belaboring the bracero program—which provided supplemental farm labor for perishable crops during the peak harvest seasons—the big city Congressmen, unfamiliar with the problem of row crop agriculture, decried the little help which the bracero program afforded the grower in preventing crop spoilage.

While I am fully aware that reinstate-

ment of a bracero-type program is a moot question, I do believe that my colleagues should be apprised of the fact that the action taken on the bracero program in the 89th Congress may be coming back to plague us.

A big city radio station—KNX in Los Angeles—is beginning to hear from its listeners. There are two serious developments for city people.

One, the cost of food is going up fast. Crops rotting in the fields contribute greatly to these rising costs. The poor who can least afford it, are affected the most.

Two, the very structure of row crop farming is being jeopardized. City people know that when the farms deteriorate, when crops are allowed to spoil, they, too, will suffer from hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I include a transcript of this KNX editorial of September 14, 1967. Each Member can think this through with profit.

The editorial follows:

CONVERSATIONS WHILE THE CROPS ROT

Today, there are a lot of people standing around talking while California crops rot in the fields. One of the bitterest controversies to swirl around California agriculture came to a head about two years ago with the end of the bracero program. Farmers in certain crop areas such as melons, strawberries and tomatoes used these Mexican farm workers extensively. Under union pressure, the Johnson Administration halted the importation of these workers. The cry was that this would give American workers more jobs.

It will take a longer perspective than we now have to assess the results of this termination with complete validity. So far it seems clear that ending the bracero program did not help our foreign relations with Mexico . . . it did not produce significantly more jobs for Americans . . . it drove farmers to more intensive mechanization which permanently eliminated many jobs . . . it hurt the small farmer who can't afford expensive harvesting equipment . . . and, it appears to have helped increase some food prices.

A few weeks ago, it became clear that several of our crops were in trouble because of a shortage of harvest labor. Governor Reagan asked special permission to bring in 9,625 braceros to save these crops. After some delay, Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz approved. However, a domestic labor group stalled any action by getting a restraining order from a San Francisco court.

Day before yesterday, U.S. District Judge Robert Peckham dissolved this restraining order. His ruling followed an agreement made that day between the domestic labor group and the Department of Labor. All the parties involved are to meet tomorrow afternoon to discuss the situation, and, hopefully, iron it out.

Meantime, crops are rotting in the fields. KNX believes this argument should have been settled long ago, worked out during the off-season—not when the fate of a crop hangs in the balance.

This kind of loss jeopardizes the existence of our farmers. It could hit every family budget with higher food prices. KNX calls upon the State and Federal government, the courts, and domestic farm labor organizations to put a stop to it.

COMMUNITY OPINION: WMAR–TV ASKS "TONIGHT'S BIG QUESTION"

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, public opinion polls have become commonplace throughout America. Yet until recently, it was still possible for most citizens to remark, "Nobody ever polls me."

This gap is now being filled by an exciting public service, the community poll conducted daily or weekly by a television or radio station. Through these surveys, questions are broadcast at peak hours, and the audience is invited to telephone responses to special numbers, where individual votes or preferences are recorded for later tallying and broadcasting. Although the slice of public opinion obtained through such surveys cannot be scientifically declared as "representative," such polls do provide a wide cross-section of community opinion and provoke audience discussion of important National, State, and local issues.

One of the pioneers in such audience surveys is television station WMAR–TV, of Baltimore, which began conducting daily polls on May 8. The immediate success of "Tonight's Big Question" has encouraged many other stations to initiate similar surveys, with equally positive results.

The questions posed on WMAR–TV have covered local issues, such as juvenile curfews; State questions, such as taxes, lotteries, and racing; and many national issues, including Vietnam, firearms control, strike legislation, and the space program. The responses have been extremely interesting, and in some cases have corresponded quite closely to the nationwide results of other polls on the same subjects.

Mr. David V. R. Stickle, the news director of WMAR–TV, has written me a full summary of the development of "Tonight's Big Question," its success as a stimulant for public discussion, and the rapid growth of such programs in many cities. He has also provided a list of the results of their polls on many questions of particular interest to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate WMAR–TV and all the other stations who have begun such public-service polls. These stations' investments, in time and funds, should bring significant returns to the media, to public officials, and to the communities they serve, and should greatly enliven discussion of important problems.

I include Mr. Stickle's letter in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

WMAR–TV,
Baltimore, Md., September 26, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MATHIAS: As a means of involving this Station ever more closely with the thought and activity of our community, WMAR–TV, Baltimore has developed a nightly (Monday through Friday) survey of the opinions of the people of this area on a wide variety of timely and controversial topics, and some of the answers are extremely interesting.

In the period since May 8th, when we began this inquiry, our viewers have "voted" some 300,000 times on these topics, several of which are listed herewith, together with the percentage of the vote for and against each question.

This survey is accomplished by means of special telephone equipment installed in these premises which records each call or "vote". Each question, selected from the news of our time and phrased so as to be answerable simply "yes" or "no", is posed on our nightly 7 O'clock News. Those wishing to vote in the affirmative are asked to telephone a number in the PLaza exchange in downtown Baltimore; those favoring a "no" ballot call a different number in the LExington exchange, also in downtown Baltimore. Receipt of each call is acknowledged by a recorded reply as it is registered, and banks of telephone lines arranged sequentially provide maximum receptivity.

This Station had long sought a means of ascertaining the consensus of this community on questions of debate and discussion. When an obscure mention in a trade magazine of a similar project in Philadelphia had been begun by Station WFIL–TV there in February, it was instantly recognized here as the answer to this long-sought method for almost instant surveying.

Thankfully, Baltimore efforts met with understanding cooperation by officials of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company in Baltimore, and the project was quickly begun. Comments were numerous and usually complimentary. The Attorney-General of Maryland spoke of it as a notable public service; and the Chairman of the constitutional convention at Maryland asked that he be kept advised of results of questions which might affect consideration of Constitutional provisions. This has been done.

Station WMAR TV found public acceptance so favorable that a full page advertisement was inserted in Broadcasting Magazine's July 31 issue, and this advertisement has launched a veritable avalanche of similar projects across the nation. Station WMAR TV has provided the necessary information and guidance for about thirty stations, in as many cities, to begin similar projects. We have also received numerous inquiries from telephone companies as to the problems encountered and the solutions therefor.

That first evening of May 8th the first question was "Should Maryland abolish capital punishment?" and the answer, based on nearly four thousand votes showed 74 percent of the recorded votes in favor of retaining this traditional punishment as a crime deterrent.

While no claims of scientific impeccability are made for these surveys, and the results are announced in percentages simply as the votes are recorded, there have been some interesting parallels. For example, a statewide referendum in November of 1966 rejected a bridge parallel to the present one across Chesapeake Bay; and when the question was put via Tonight's Big Question on WMAR TV May 10th, the result was within 2.3 percentage points of the statewide result the previous Fall: Our "voters" registering a negative reaction by 56 percent to 44 percent in favor. The statewide vote was 53.7 percent negative.

The Gallup Opinion Index made a nationwide survey in which one question was "If your party nominated a woman for President would you vote for her if she were qualified?" Gallup showed a positive vote of 57 percent. Tonight's Big Question tried a similar query; The result was a positive vote of 56 percent.

A few other questions with results, which might interest your constituents, are:

Date (1967)	Question	Percent yes	Percent no
July 5	Should the Attorney General be appointed instead of elected?	36.0	64.0
7	Should Maryland legalize dog race tracks?	67.0	33.0
10	Do you think our part in the Vietnam war is morally justified?	37.0	63.0
14	Do you approve of the way Agnew is handling his job as Governor of Maryland?	23.0	68.0
17	Do you consider the new State and city income taxes fair?	19.0	81.0
18	Should social security taxes be increased to provide medical benefits for all?	39.0	61.0
24	Should Maryland have a lottery?	83.0	17.0
26	Should Maryland require inspection of all meats sold in the State?	86.0	14.0
27	Should juvenile loitering in public places be prohibited?	59.0	41.0
31	Would you vote for a woman for President if she were qualified?	56.0	44.0
Aug. 2	Should Mayor McKeldin seek reelection in 1968?	27.0	73.0
3	Should U.S. foreign aid be restricted to nonmilitary uses?	58.0	42.0
Aug. 7	Do you approve of the way Dean Rusk is handling job as U.S. Secretary of State?	43.0	57.0
9	Should the mail order sale of firearms be restricted?	66.0	34.0
14	Is it worth $23,000,000,000 to put an American on the moon?	47.0	53.0
15	Should the United States stop bombing North Vietnam?	50.4	49.6
25	Should narcotics be made legally available to addicts?	44.0	56.0
30	Should labor unions be active in politics?	35.0	65.0
31	Do you believe there are unidentified flying objects from outer space?	83.0	17.0
Sept. 6	Should all election days be legal holidays?	79.0	21.0
11	Should the United States give the Panama Canal to the Republic of Panama?	24.0	76.0
12	Should the U.S. troops be unconditionally withdrawn now from Vietnam?	64.0	36.0
14	Should Federal limitations be put on strikes that affect the public interest or convenience?	69.0	31.0

National attention is being attracted to this and similar projects in many cities. In Cincinnati, for example, three stations are engaged simultaneously in such surveys. There are two in Minneapolis and two in Albuquerque and Miami.

We have been encouraged in fostering the proliferation of these polls by comments to the effect that such projects not only reveal the way people feel about topics of common interest in various parts of the country, but that such "elections" also foster interest in, consideration of and debate over important matters about which the public is all too often apathetic.

Thank you for your own kind interest in this matter, and we sincerely hope the above has been informative.

With all best wishes, I am

Cordially,

DAVID V. R. STICKLE,
News Director.

PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR 10-PERCENT TAX INCREASE SERVES A USEFUL PURPOSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the President's request for a 10-percent tax increase is serving at least one very useful purpose. The big business monopolies and combines in their effort to placate the administration by endorsing the proposal tell us a whole lot. The 455 big business people tell us more by what they did not say than by what they did say.

For instance, we are told that freight rates are too high—small business and the consumer are being "taken." If the treasury of the Pennsylvania Railroad were not overflowing with excessive profits they would not endorse the increase. It would seem, too, that the Pennsylvania people could just do without the $11.5 million subsidy they are to receive for the Washington-New York demonstration project of improved rail passenger equipment and service from the Department of Transportation.

We know too, that American Airlines, Braniff, and Pan American Airways no longer need the various subsidies inuring to their benefit for they have excess funds—enough to want to pay an extra 10 percent in surtax charges. Maybe we should let them build their own airports, and so forth.

Then, too, our telephone people have been screaming about a recent FCC ruling on their rates—but it must not only have been correct—it must not have cut them enough because the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. say they have too much money in their treasury and want to pay an extra 10 percent in taxes.

Every year we hear talk of steel price increases—and the realistic dialog that accompanies such talk about the highly inflationary effect steel increases have on our economy. The price increase takes place—prices rise—and the consumer is caught. By their own admission, United States Steel, Inland Steel, and several smaller steel companies should reduce their prices because they have so much extra profit that they want to pay an extra 10-percent tax.

Then too, it is obvious that interest rates can be reduced substantially because the Bank of Amcrica and 94 other banks say they are making too much money—and want to pay 10 percent more in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, 42 life insurance companies including "The Man from Equitable" admit that their policyholders are not getting a fair shake—that their profits are so excessive that they want to pay more taxes. If they want to pay more taxes, we could accommodate them by repealing the Life Insurance Tax Act of 1959.

Obviously, the Government is paying too much for the aircraft they purchase from Lockheed, Douglas, and Boeing because they, too, admit to excessive profits.

Several private utility companies—electric and gas—should have their rates checked by the various State public service commissions—maybe public power is not as bad as they say it is—if they are "picking" the consumer so much that they want higher taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the Ford Motor Co. indicates that labor is demanding too much in the current strike—and I do not suppose to know all the facts—but I do know that Ford is obviously shortchanging someone or they would not have so much extra money to want to pay this extra 10 percent surtax. The same is true also of General Motors who "signed in" for the tax increase—and the tire people—B. F. Goodrich. May I say that if Ford is so anxious to pay taxes—their tax-free Ford Foundation is a good place to start.

I wonder too, Mr. Speaker, if we could not let the D-X Sunray Oil Co., and the other oil companies pay that extra tax that they desire by removing the depletion allowance they now have.

Yes, it is fairly obvious to me—Raytheon televisions, Campbell Soup, Westinghouse, and General Electric appliances, Gillette blades, Zenith radios, telephone rates, interest, gas and oil, tires and autos are all too high because these people want their taxes increased.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, of the 455 business people who signed for our tax increase—there is an answer—let them reduce their profits by cutting their prices, lowering their interest and relieving the general taxpaying public of the excessive prices and government subsidies that these business houses receive.

Mr. Speaker, not one of these "big boys" expects to pay the tax increase—they expect to pass it on to the consumer and to use it to "choke out" the small business man. The consumer pays twice, his own surtax and the surtax added to the price by the company.

I suspect, too, that someone has been around with a "little persuasion" and reminded most of these tax increase proponents of their vast Government contracts and/or their reliance on the Government one way or another for their existence.

TRIBUTE TO AN OUTSTANDING ALL-AMERICAN WOMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read about the honor recently bestowed upon one of Washington's most charming, ablest, and most beloved ladies, Liz Carpenter.

I refer to the ceremony at which her home town of Salado in central Texas, named her to a select company by proclaiming her an Outstanding Texas Woman, and designated her childhood home, the Col. Sterling C. Robertson Plantation, as an official Texas historic landmark.

Liz Carpenter richly deserves this honor. Actually, I feel the title should transcend the geographical boundaries of Texas for, indeed, she is one of the outstanding women of the United States.

Nobody who keeps abreast of national affairs need be told that Liz Carpenter is the First Lady's press secretary, the first woman and the first working newspaper reporter ever to serve in that important capacity.

When she spoke at the ceremonies in Salado, Mrs. Johnson summed up much of what is good, able, and charming about this outstanding woman, when she said:

> I want to tell you how we see Liz: Creativity, laughter, speed, and kind and thoughtful deeds.

Her love for home, and for the real and meaningful things of American life were exemplified in a heart-warming way, when she inspected the works of home-State craftsmen which were on display

during the affair in Salado. As related by the Austin American-Statesman:

Mrs. Carpenter led reporters and friends around the plantation home grounds to visit the booths of skilled Texas craftsmen whose work was on display.

"Isn't this great!" she would say.

"Isn't this beautiful!

"Doesn't this real Texas art beat those tacky rattlesnake ashtrays and things that most tourists have been remembering Texas by?"

Liz Carpenter performs her vital functions with zest, dignity and skill, and a complete sense of fairness. She has admirably fulfilled the difficult role in which she serves. More than that, she presents to the world a picture of the American career woman of which all of us can well be proud.

Texas is fortunate to have such a daughter, but America can claim her as a daughter too. Mr. Chairman, I propose that Liz Carpenter be designated as an outstanding all-American woman.

LESSENING BANK CRIMES

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements and articles which make suggestions for dealing with the problem of bank crimes. The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, 4 years ago made a study of bank crimes and what the Federal Bank Supervisory Agencies should do to attempt to lessen them. That study resulted in Committee Report No. 1147, entitled "Crimes Against Banking Institutions."

It would be very gratifying to me if I could report that there has been a dramatic lessening in the number of holdups, burglaries, and embezzlements since that report was issued, but the fact is, there has continued to be a general increase in these crimes. The September 25, 1967, issue of the American Banker contains a very informative article by Ralph L. Zaun, who is—among other things—chairman of the Federal Legislative Committee, Independent Bankers Association of America. Mr. Zaun recounts the growth in attempted bank holdups, and estimates on the basis of experience that in the first half of 1967 there were twice as many as there were in the first half of 1966. He suggests that not everything possible has been done by the banking agencies or by the banks themselves to lessen such crimes. His suggestions are worthy of all who are connected with the banking industry, and of the attention of every Member of the House.

In the June issue of Banking magazine the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation discusses some of the precautionary measures that bankers should take, both as preventative measures and as aids in apprehending the criminal.

The article follows:

CRIMES, CRIMINALS, AND PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES

Here are some questions that were recently asked of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by Banking. And here are the answers he gave.

Q. Much is reported these days about the volume of criminal attacks against financial institutions. How serious is the problem?

A. The postwar years have seen a steady rise in the number of robberies, burglaries and larcenies committed against banking institutions. The incidence of these crimes has become a matter of grave concern to law enforcement officers and to banking institutions in the United States. The number of robberies, burglaries, and larcenies committed against financial institutions protected by Federal law increased from 450 in 1956 to 1,871 in 1966.

A rise in any type of crime is, of course, ample cause for alarm. In violations of the Federal Bank Robbery Statute, the property loss in itself is serious. The real seriousness of the crime, however, lies in the potential for physical danger to employees, customers, and to innocent bystanders during the commission of the crime or along the getaway route. All too often, the general public regards bank robbery in terms of a crime against property and the threat to human life is overlooked. The potential for violence and death, however, is inherent in substantially all assaults upon financial institutions.

Perhaps the most significant changes might be seen in the number of violations investigated by the FBI in 1965 and 1966. While robbery violations increased only slightly from 1,154 in 1965 to 1,164 in 1966, burglaries showed a much greater frequency with 551 reported during 1966 as opposed to 395 during 1965. Larceny violations decreased from 200 in 1965 to 156 in 1966.

Q. What factors contribute to this situation?

A. One of the contributing factors to the steady rise in crimes against financial institutions across the nation is the rapid growth of suburban areas which has greatly increased the number of branch banks and savings and loan institutions. By the very nature of their locality, such facilities are considerably more vulnerable to attack than regular banking establishments. Generally, suburban or shopping area buildings have fewer security features and are easier to rob and burglarize. Such locations usually have less police protection. These branch offices are also choice sites inasmuch as they can be cased and carefully scouted prior to the actual violation with a minimum of exposure and attention. Escape routes in suburban areas are generally more accessible and better concealed; hence, financial institutions in these areas appear more inviting to the would-be burglar or robber.

A recent survey of some 2,220 bank robberies which occurred during the last two fiscal years revealed that more than half of the robberies were of branch offices located in the fringe downtown or suburban areas.

Q. What protective devices have helped?

A. Crimes against banking institutions can never be completely eliminated, even where the bank is equipped with protective devices. The use of such devices, however, has resulted in the capture of bank robbers or burglars in the act of committing such offenses or has assisted in identifying the criminal involved. Indeed, many banks which otherwise might have suffered huge monetary losses owe their escape to the protective devices employed.

For example, three bandits who attempted to rob a bank in Illinois were thwarted when they discovered that the bank was completely protected by four-inch bulletproof glass and automatic locks on the three doors leading to the work area. One of the robbers attempted to push his gun through the teller's cage opening and found this was also secure since it was angled to a degree to completely protect the teller.

In another case, the teller had opened the bulletproof glass window in front of the cage in order to give a customer a bag of coins. As the customer left, a would-be robber stepped up and, with his left hand, thrust through the opening a plastic bag and a note which read, "Put money in bag and don't make a sound until I'm gone." The teller promptly slammed the bulletproof window shut catching the bag and note in a vise. The bandit fled.

Q. Every banking establishment, of course, knows the basic protective measures which may be taken to insure the safety of the institution. What are some of the newer techniques being used by some banks to deter or thwart attacks against their institutions?

A. Many institutions have recognized the value of installing automatic photography systems, and cameras are increasingly being used to take pictures of check cashers and robbers and burglars "in action." The preservation of actual bank robbery scenes on film has led to the capture, identification, and conviction of many bandits. Cameras placed in a bank lobby, at exits, vaults, and other strategic points can be activated with an alarm system, or by a button or other tripping device. Some operate continuously as motion picture cameras or take pictures at regular intervals, such as one a second.

In addition, closed-circuit TV systems are being employed in some banks for observing activities in the work and customer areas. In some institutions, the TV monitor is also in radio contact with armed guards, thus making the odds against a successful robbery much greater.

One-way mirrors which appear on one side to be mirrors, but which are transparent from the other side have also proved of great value. A bank in New Mexico has employed these mirrors extensively in its banking facilities and in its main lobby, covering almost the entire front of one of the executive offices with these mirrors, which provide an excellent view of the interior of the bank by the officer in case of robbery or other trouble. Looking through the mirror, the bank official is in an excellent position to get a good view and description of the robber, while at the same time contacting the police or other law enforcement officials by telephone.

Even ordinary mirrors have proved of assistance. When the night depository of a Midwestern bank had been burglarized of $61,000, the bank went to work to forestall any further such burglaries. Spotlights are now installed on all the night depository safes inside the branch banks, and in those instances where the night depository is not in view from the outside of the bank—which is true in most cases—large mirrors have been hung so that police can observe the night depository from their cruisers by glancing at the mirrors as they pass by.

Q. Naturally, it is up to banking management to provide for proper protection of the bank's facilities, but what is the role of the bank's personnel?

A. Of course, it is not possible to prevent all violations against financial institutions. No thinking person could expect that. Employees, however, should be security conscious—trained to be alert to loiterers and suspicious-looking individuals who seek to obtain change or attempt to open small savings accounts. There is little doubt that every employee of a financial institution is eager and willing to do his part in the prevention of such crimes or in the identifi-

cation and apprehension of robbers and others who prey upon the institutions by which they are employed. The fault then lies in the fact that the personnel of some of these organizations have never been properly instructed on the measures they can take to assist in this connection.

It is not wise for banking personnel to attempt to resist a bank robber during the commission of his crime, since there is no way of knowing in advance if his weapon is real or if he would actually use it in the event of resistance. Nevertheless, there are ways in which robbery victims can be of assistance to law enforcement authorities in their efforts to locate and apprehend these often vicious and dangerous criminals.

In the event you should be the victim of a bank robbery, here are a few things to remember which can be of inestimable aid to investigating law enforcement officers:

(1) Protect the premises after a robbery has been committed. Do not permit other employees or customers to handle articles which may have been touched by the bandits in order that any latent fingerprint impressions may be preserved;

(2) Be observant. Impress upon your memory a complete description of the robber or robbers. Note particularly their speech, mannerisms, and any apparent scars, marks, or tattoos. Do not attempt to gauge the height of the robbers in feet and inches. It is better to compare the bandits with physical objects such as door jambs, windows, or the tellers' cages;

(3) Try to obtain a complete description of the car used by the bandits, with particular reference to the license number, model, make, and color;

(4) If the robbery is committed by a gang, pay particular attention to its apparent leader. Carefully observe the manner in which he dispatches the members of his band during the course of the robbery;

(5) Take careful note of the firearms used by the bandits. What type of weapons were used? Automatic pistols, revolvers, rifles, shotguns, or machine guns?

(6) Above all, refrain from having any general discussion of the robbery among yourselves until each has been questioned by the investigating officers. Independent recollections of each witness are of more value to the law enforcement officer. Indeed, if possible, each witness should write down pertinent details observed during the course of the robbery in order that they will not be forgotten.

Q. Those are, indeed, all excellent techniques. Could you give us an example of an instance in which photos taken by a concealed bank surveillance camera were helpful in the solution of a case?

A. The effectiveness of the use of movie cameras to photograph bank robberies in progress has been demonstrated many times. One youthful bandit whose photograph was taken during an Ohio bank robbery and was publicized on television turned himself in to local authoritise. In his own words, "Where can you go when you're on TV all the time!"

Nearly five years after this incident, the same Ohio bank was again struck by bandits and, once again, the hidden movie camera paid off. Three armed, unmasked males entered the bank and at gunpoint held up five bank employees, escaping with about $13,000. A teller who had become suspicious as soon as the three men entered the bank had immediately pushed the bank alarm which also activated the hidden movie camera. The resulting films were of excellent quality and wide dissemination was made by local police to newspapers and TV stations. Several television viewers—after seeing on television the motion pictures taken during the robbery—contacted police and reported several suspects in the robbery. These suspects were subsequently arrested by Missouri State Highway patrolmen at a roadblock.

[From the American Banker, Sept. 25, 1967]

ARE WE AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH IN WAR ON BANK CRIMINALS?

(By Ralph L. Zaun)

To a part of the lawless and individually desperate elements in our country, the approximately 13,500 banking offices in the United States represent an irresistible magnet to acquire easy and ready cash. Crimes against banks unfortunately share the disgrace of an ever-increasing crime trend in our society.

That we have not been immune is no surprise. Attempted hold-up statistics (among others) bear this out. In 1964 there were 793 holdups; in 1965, 848, and in 1966, 865. The first half of 1967 figures are not complete, but indicate that hold-ups are nearly double those in the like period of 1966.

Most attempted hold-ups are successful, and the apprehension rate of the criminals perpetrating these crimes is far less than it should be.

The Independent Bankers Association of America has shared the concern of bankers and some bank trade groups with the alarming trend of crimes against our institutions. It is joining with other associations to alert bankers to responsibilities to their employees, and the trust which the public places in them.

We have met with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other enforcement agencies to analyze the emerging picture and to explore means to combat it.

It is not my intention in this brief article to analyze the cause, effect, or prevention of bank crime in any great depth, but some observations gathered from meetings with a number of local police departments and the FBI are pertinent. A group of bankers queried have also contributed facts and opinions on the subject.

Categorically, public safety officials evinced the following:

Extreme interest in the problem of bank crimes.

Sincere concern with prevention of such crimes and apprehension of those responsible for them.

Considerable frustration with the problems facing them in the performance of their duty.

A deep desire to cooperate with the banking industry in preventive measures, and evidence of some wonderment at apathy on the part of bankers.

The concern for adequate preventive measures was centered primarily in the areas of hold-ups and burglaries. There was less emphasis on embezzlements, defalcations and frauds which seemingly constituted more of an internal problem to be dealt with through education and audit.

Officials explained their problem as follows: They must first capture and then help convict the criminal. The police encounter immediate difficulties in that they are nearly always involved after the fact. Their job involves pursuit, which has to be based upon whatever facts are available.

It was emphasized over and over again that these facts, or the lack of them, lead to a hot trail or a cold one, and that here the banker and public disinterest present a major roadblock.

Following a hold-up, for example, the following vital information may not be available:

License plate number or description of a get-away vehicle.

Good descriptions of the bandits involved. (Sometimes even the number of criminals taking part in a hold-up is not accurately reported).

"Bait" money is either not passed with the hold-up loot, or is poorly identified as to serial numbers, series year, and Federal Reserve district.

Defensive measures, such as photographic equipment and alarms, were not used or were inoperative.

Possible fingerprints were obliterated or obscured.

In the absence of positive leads and help from within the bank, the problem of early apprehension of criminals is rendered most difficult. In spite of the handicap of a paucity of information, enforcement officials still do a remarkable job of tracing those committing bank crimes—but the persistent penalty of poor information compounds the important task of conviction. Lack of fingerprints, positive identification or possession of known identifiable stolen currency results in acquittals.

Tougher rules of evidence in today's courts, coupled with conflicting or insufficent identification, must certainly turn loose hardened and experienced criminals who very probably will try their luck again.

Is bank crime the other banker's problem, or is it truly one that should concern you and me? I believe that we ought to share a fraternal belief that a crime against any bank is a crime against all banks. Certainly the premiums of our blanket bonds represent a composite assessment of the cost of these crimes.

As individuals and as institutions, we share the increased burden of law-enforcement in our present society. Every one of us must shudder and decry the shame of ruthless criminal activity which results in death to bank officers, employees, and customers.

Are we doing enough to make a real contribution toward prevention; apprehension; conviction of people who prey on our banks? A considered judgment would indicate we are not.

We are notably deficient in the installation of complete protective devices and alarm equipment. We do not avail ourselves of booklets and films for employee information and training, which are available from law agencies and insurance companies. The advisory help from the FBI and other agencies is not drawn upon by individual banks or groups of bankers for instructional and informational purposes.

Even when an education and hold-up drill program has been instituted in our banks, personnel "refreshers" are not frequent enough to keep pace with employee turnover.

Comparative statistics prove that, where an aggressive crime prevention program has been introduced in a given area, the incidence of bank crime—particularly hold-ups—diminishes dramatically. The individual bank and the banking system are direct beneficiaries whenever your bank and mine intelligently use known preventive measures and protective devices against the crook who wants to "do business" with our banks.

MIDDLE EAST REFUGEES

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic consequences of the brief but bloody war in the Middle East has been the desperate plight of the hundreds of thousands of refugees made homeless by the fighting.

Those displaced by the recent war are adding yet another dismal chapter to the tragedy of over 1 million people who now live in the Middle East without permanent shelter, any sources of livelihood

or any dependable food supply. The United Nations' Relief and Works Agency estimates that the recent fighting added more than 330,000 new refugees to the pre-war total of one and a quarter million refugees then in the area.

Ever since the inception of the United Nations, the United States has stood ready to aid that organization in its efforts to relieve the suffering of refugees from wars, political strife, and natural disaster. The United States has contributed substantially to refugee assistance programs to help displaced persons from many countries including India, French Indo-China, present-day Vietnam, Chile, Turkey, the Congo, China, Hungary, and East Germany. In my own area of south Florida the United States has contributed substantial assistance to aid refugees from Communist Cuba.

In addition, since the end of the Second World War, the United States has made some substantial contributions both through the United Nations and unilaterally to aid tremendous numbers of refugees throughout the Middle East area. Following the end of hostilities in the Middle East last June, the United States immediately took steps to provide assistance to hundreds of thousands of new refugees in that area. I am sure that many in the House of Representatives are interested in the tremendous effort which this country is making in that area of the world, and for that reason, I quote the text of a note from the U.S. Mission to the United Nations to the U.N. Secretary General which was made public on August 30, 1967:

The Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honor to reply to his note of July 10, 1967 drawing attention to operative paragraphs 8 and 9 of General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) dealing with humanitarian assistance and requesting information on the measures taken by the United States Government in the light of this resolution.

The United States Government responded immediately to the basic needs of the persons displaced by the recent conflict by airlifting an initial 5,000 tents to Jordan to provide temporary shelter for the homeless. In addition, the United States has airlifted to Jordan 5,000 more tents and offered blankets, household utensils and stoves to help relieve the hardships in the are. The offer of blankets and household utensils have not yet been accepted and these items have not yet been furnished. The total cost of the tents and other items and their transport to Jordan by air is estimated at approximately $1,675,000.

It will be recalled that the United States pledged for the support of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency a contribution of $22.2 million for the year ended June 30, 1967. The pledge included $13.3 million in cash and $8.9 million in foodstuffs. At the time of the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East, the last shipments of these foodstuffs were on the high seas enroute to the Middle East. In some cases vessels were forced to discharge their cargo in Mediterranean ports because of the inaccessibility of Middle East ports. The United States Government arranged for the onward transportation of these cargoes destined for use by UNRWA and bore the extra costs of storage in transit and trans-shipment.

As the Representative informed the Secretary-General in his letter of June 29, 1967, the United States made a special contribution of $2 million in cash to UNRWA to help meet the emergency needs of victims of the conflict. Subsequently, the United States informed the Commissioner-General of UNRWA that it would provide 24,000 metric tons of wheat flour and 1,200 tons of vegetable oils for use in UNRWA's relief services during the next several months. The world market value of these commodities, including transportation to Middle Eastern ports, amounts to approximately $4,284,000. The United States Government expects shortly to make a second allocation of commodities to UNRWA of about the same magnitude.

In late June, the United States Government transmitted $100,000 to the American Red Cross for contribution to the International Committee of the Red Cross for the latter organization's activities on behalf of the victims of the recent hostilities.

The United States Government also provided funds estimated at $40,000 for the shipment, by air, to the Middle East of medical supplies (antibiotics and vitamins) donated by the American Red Cross to the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The United States Government is also continuing to donate, at rates prevailing prior to the outbreak of hostilities, foodstuffs to American voluntary agencies for their programs of assistance to needy persons in the Gaza Strip and on the West Bank. The value of such commodities at world market prices, exclusive of transportation cost, is approximately $1,779,000 annually.

The United States is keeping the emergency needs of those persons affected by the recent hostilities under constant review and will cooperate fully with intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations now at work in the area as well as with the governments directly concerned.

THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION'S ACHIEVEMENTS FOR URBAN AMERICA VERSUS THE REPUBLICAN VOTING RECORD

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in each of the four messages on the cities he has submitted to Congress during the past 4 years, President Johnson has warned that we cannot become two people—the suburban rich and the urban poor.

He urged us to begin planning and building today to keep pace with an urban population that will double in the next 40 years; and he emphasized that while we do not possess all of the answers to urban problems, we must move quickly "to make right what has taken generations to make wrong."

I would remind my colleagues that when Lyndon Johnson assumed office 3½ years ago, efforts in the poverty program were sporadic, unorganized, and undernourished. Since that time, the Johnson administration's efforts in the war on poverty have steadily mounted.

This year alone we are spending over $25 billion on jobs, health, education, housing, and other urgent programs for the poor

The record will show that 2 million Americans, as a direct result of these Government programs, have been moved over the poverty line.

Four million slum dwellers have obtained needed assistance from neighborhood centers.

Four million older Americans have received hospital care under the social security amendments—in 1 year alone.

In short, during its first 2 years, the war on poverty has benefited more than 9 million Americans. And this is just the beginning.

In addition, nearly 1 million Americans have participated in the Manpower Development and Training Act programs to develop new skills that leads to new job opportunities.

There was no such program under the last Republican administration. There was no poverty program either. And there is simply no comparison over the efforts made by the Republicans to help our cities with that of the Kennedy and Johnson years.

Those Republicans who are now charging that this administration is reneging on its commitment to the urban poor have obviously neither consulted the record nor conferred with their colleagues in the House.

The record is clear: No administration in American history has created more sound and effective programs for the cities than has the Johnson Administration.

And the record will show that the Republicans in the House have voted overwhelmingly against each and every one of these proposals.

Just in this session, the Republicans in the House have voted to eliminate all funds sought for continuing the rent supplements program. They have voted to reduce by two-thirds the funds requested for model cities. And it has cut by $5 million the President's request for research in urban technology.

This is the party now criticizing the President for not doing enough? The American people must be forgiven if they are slightly incredulous.

All told, some 30 legislative proposals for the urban poor have been enacted by Congress over the past 3½ years. All of them have been strongly opposed by the House Republicans.

This is the record. And those Republicans seeking political advantage from the tragic events of this summer cannot be allowed to bury the bones of their party's dismal voting record on the cities in the Democratic backyard.

At this very moment, Congress has under consideration 14 pieces of major legislation to help our cities build a brighter future.

Let us see how the Republicans in Congress will vote on these measures. Let us measure the degree of Republican support in the House against some of the criticisms voiced by a few Republican Senators that the administration is not doing enough. I think the evidence will be conclusive about which party is the doers for urban America and which is the haven for the perennial obstructionists.

If the Republican Party wants to pose as the city dweller's best friend, let them

match their voting record with their alleged commitment.

In the meantime, Lyndon Johnson's record of achievement to help the American city remains unmatched and unrivaled by any group or faction.

The record speaks louder than any political words.

ANOTHER ESCALATION BY REAGAN

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, Governor Reagan is at it again. Instead of concentrating on the problems of his State and his own administration, the "fastest gun in the West" is hysterically trying to set foreign policy from Sacramento.

In his latest scenario, the hair trigger Governor, after threatening to use nuclear weapons to bring about a final solution to the Vietnamese war, tells us he favors expanding the war with an American invasion of North Vietnam, if only the military will give the green light.

Governor Reagan acts upon impulse while reasoned men recognize the dangers of a wider war. The Governor acts from frustration, while calmer men realize President Johnson is attempting to achieve a just solution without irrationally provoking Chinese entrance into the war. Mr. Reagan acts from ignorance of, or indifference to, our basic foreign policy goal—not to destroy North Vietnam and provoke world war III, but simply to insure the independence of South Vietnam.

The Governor should stop making rash and irresponsible foreign policy statements and content himself with bailing out his own ship in California. The last thing we need are policies which would blow us all back to "Death Valley Days."

HOW GIANT CO-OPS PRESSURE TAXPAYING BUSINESSES

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, during my ad hoc hearings into the activities of farm organizations, testimony was presented by a number of people which shed light on the business activities of farm organizations. Many of these businesses operate as tax-exempt cooperatives and, over the years, have undergone tremendous expansions into new fields—fields which are only partially related to agriculture. The regulations under which these tax-exempt cooperatives operate gives them a great advantage over the private taxpaying businesses that they compete with, and is putting them under tremendous economic pressure. Many are being driven out of business.

On August 31, Mr. Frank Silkebaken, an independent oil jobber from Iowa, delivered testimony which provided an illuminating insight into the problems that the expansion-minded cooperatives are creating for independent businessmen. Under unanimous consent, I present at this time the statement of Mr. Silkebaken:

STATEMENT OF FRANK M. SILKEBAKEN, BELLE PLAINE OIL CO., BELLE PLAINE, IOWA

Mr. RESNICK. These hearings will now come to order.

We will hear from Mr. Silkebaken.

Is there anybody with you that you would like to identify as being here with you?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Yes. I refer to a gentleman, a fellow Iowan, E. F. Bock from Garner, Iowa. I also have with me representatives of the National Oil Jobbers Council here in Washington, Mr. Wilfred H. Hall and Mr. Charles Hartman. I have as a personal guest of mine my son, Dennis.

Mr. RESNICK. Thank you.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Good afternoon, gentlemen. My name is Frank M. Silkebaken, and I am an independent oil jobber from Belle Plaine, Iowa. I am here representing the 700 independent oil jobbers in Iowa, under the auspices of the Iowa Independent Oil Jobbers Association. As oil jobbers we are wholesale distributors of gasoline, heating oil, other petroleum products, and tires, batteries and accessories to various businesses and retail customers within our State. With me today is another Iowa oil jobber, Mr. Ed Bock, who is a past president of our Iowa association.

Mr. RESNICK. What is your position with the Iowa Independent Oil Jobbers Association?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I am a member, sir.

Mr. RESNICK. You are officially representing them?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RESNICK. Please proceed.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. This testimony is made in the context of today's needs by the Federal Government to collect additional tax revenues. Our President has suggested a 10 per cent surtax on individuals' and corporations' income taxes this year. We feel strongly that if the Government needs additional revenue to finance its programs, it should first explore our contention that cooperatives who have outgrown the reasons for their initial tax-free status should be taxed at the same rate as those businesses with whom they regularly compete.

The total amount of revenues that could be realized by taxing these cooperative corporations like other corporations are taxed is probably over $100 million a year. Thus, we suggest there is a double-barreled reason for consideration of this problem by the Congress at this time, the first being to provide needed tax revenues and the second to bring much needed equity to the marketplace in order to restore a more fair measure of competition between those engaged in the marketing of non-farm produced products.

The tax-exempt status for cooperatives was originally designed to assist business units composed of farmers themselves, aimed principally at allowing them to buy feed, fertilizer and farm implements at terms and under conditions which would bring benefits to them.

The first Income Tax Act in 1913 granted tax exemptions to certain organizations, including agricultural groups, and at that time the number of small farms in the United States and the amount of products they produced made such a plan appear equitable. However, we have now witnessed a reduction in the number of farms in this country and the centralization of production into ever larger agricultural business units. Thus, the farmers, like other types of businesses, have had to grow in size.

Heavy reliance on farm implements have of course helped to create the situation where the farmer must be fair-sized to afford the hardware necessary to operate today. The successful farmer, therefore, is one who runs a fairly large farm and is one who has a substantial investment in land and can not be compared except by profession with his counterpart in 1913.

With the decline in the number of small farms in the Nation, the cooperatives' originally envisioned role was discarded in favor of entering into the sales of nonagricultural materials. This has extended to the point where a visit to many of the local cooperatives can be likened to going to a hardware store, a service station or even a supermarket, rather than to a grain and feed dealer. This has been occasioned by the fact that the farm itself has changed from one which was essentially a relatively small unit into being a fairly large landholding business operation. The exempt cooperative at that point should have been phased out of operation since its need was evaporating. However, at this time they have altered their operations into nonagricultural items and now compete with a host of other businesses.

The problem of course is that the tax-free cooperative can either sell at lower prices, or advertise more, or acquire more assets because of their tax-free status, but are actually virtually the same as other businesses with which they often compete. However, I should like to dwell exclusively on how their petroleum operations affect me and others like me. This Ad Hoc Committee can draw similar conclusions from my remarks for a wide variety of products other than petroleum, because the same situation undoubtedly exists in regard to many other products.

Two very interesting sentences appear on page 1 of the Internal Revenue Service Report issued in December of 1966 on Farmers' Cooperative Income Tax Returns for 1963, and I quote:

"In getting agricultural products flowing from farmer to consumer, cooperatives are found supplying such transportation services as shipping, trucking and storing; such manufacturing services as canning, winemaking, ginning, and other operations needed to produce finished goods for sale; such selling activities as acting as agent or broker.

"In providing mass purchasing power for the supplies needed for farming operations, cooperatives often will be found operating petroleum bulk stations and even refineries; manufacturing chemical fertilizers; and hiring, housing and transporting farm laborers. In other words, cooperative activities are nearly as varied as to function, as wide in scope and diversified in line as any other type of business enterprise."

Gentlemen, that is a pretty accurate description of how cooperatives are today—"as wide in scope and diversified in line as any other type of business enterprise." And I think they should be taxed like any other business enterprise.

As a matter of fact, a chief competitive weapon is the co-op's ability for cash flow in the form of patronage dividends from the giant super co-op to the regional co-op down to the local co-ops. What this amounts to is that local cooperatives, whom we compete with directly, can actually operate at a loss on the local level. But with cash in the form of patronage dividends coming down from the top through super and regional supplying co-ops, they can show a net "saving" or profit at the end of the year. But by the same token, if I showed a loss over an extended period of time, I would be out of business.

Mr. RESNICK. I would like to interrupt you right there. We also heard testimony here yesterday that very often these so-called

patronage dividends instead of coming down as cash, would be in better form if it comes down, no certificate or stock is ever cashed in.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I believe this is true, sir.

Mr. RESNICK. Now we heard this about the Ohio Landmark Farm Bureau Co-op. Now is the same done in Iowa?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Well, the one that I have personally knowledge of of course they issue a dividend at the end of the year. I am speaking now of the local retail co-op. In the revenue Act of 1962 they were required to pay at least 20 percent of it in cash which they now do, and the remaining 80 percent is given as a form of a script note redeemable at some unknown future date.

Mr. RESNICK. Have you heard or know of any instances where they refuse to redeem these notes or script or paper or whatever you want to call them?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Well, I have had some farm customers that have told me they have had stock in various co-op creameries and so on that were unredeemable.

Mr. RESNICK. How about in the farm services, the Farm Bureau?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I have no knowledge as to that, sir.

Mr. RESNICK. I think that is a very important point, one that I plan to look into.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. The farmer cooperative service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, as a result of its annual survey in 1965, reported there were 8,847 marketing and purchasing cooperatives serving farmers, handling a total of $19.3 billion in goods and services for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. So when we talk about cooperatives as being businesses, we are talking about big business, totalling in the billions.

I would also like to bring to your attention the Federal income taxes paid as a percent of their net income by exempt cooperatives in 1963. This again from the Internal Revenue Service Report mentioned above. They noted that income tax after credits as a percent of net income, by size of net income, in 1963, for exempt cooperatives was as follows: for those with net income of up to $100,000——

Mr. RESNICK. Excuse me. Net income, now, this is after patronage dividends? Is this before patronage dividends or after? The statements I have seen of co-ops usually it is after they have paid out, they charge off their dividends as an expense, the patronage refunds.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I would have to get out that report and study it, sir. You have asked me something I am not certain of.

For those with net income of up to $100,000, the tax was 7 per cent; from $100,000 to $250,000 net income, the tax was 5 per cent; for net incomes over $250,000 the tax was 2 per cent. If independent jobbers, whom I represent, or any other corporate business paid taxes at that rate, they too could sell their products cheaper and expand their operations without worrying about where they were going to get the money.

Also, according to this Internal Revenue Service Report, of all cooperative income tax returns in 1963 reporting a net income, or profit, 32 per cent were non-taxable—20 per cent of the non-exempt returns and 42 per cent of the exempt returns. Of all taxes collected from farmers' cooperatives in 1963, the exempt cooperatives, which comprise ⅔ of all cooperatives and do ⅔ of the business, contributed only 14 per cent of the Federal income taxes that were collected. Exempt cooperatives, as a whole, paid income taxes of less than 7 per cent of their net income. Those in my State, Iowa, paid on the average of 7.5 per cent.

For example, one cooperative in Iowa, Del-Que Farm Service Company, and I have here a copy of their 1964 annual report which I will give to you gentlemen, notes that for total sales of $2,113,000, and net "savings" or profits of $184,000, provisions—and I underline that word provisions—for income taxes amounted to $20,022. Assuming this provision for taxes was the Federal income tax, this amounts to only 10.8 per cent of their net income.

Now at this point I would like to depart from my prepared statement to say that in that provision, that $20,000, if they were under the tax laws there would have to be State income tax considered also in that figure.

Mr. RESNICK. You would also like to add that Del-Que Farm Service Company is a Farm Bureau co-op, it is part of the Farm Service, FS is the Farm Bureau co-op.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Forty per cent of this cooperative business was in petroleum products, over half of that for gasoline alone. This cooperative's gross sales from 1954 to 1964 more than doubled, from $1,026,000 to $2,113,000. These local co-ops are our competitors. To say that this competition for the small, independent oil job is tough because of their great tax advantage, where their retained earnings can be used to increase their activities and expand their business at an alarming and what we feel an unfair rate, would be the understatement of the year.

Mr. RESNICK. If I could interrupt you a moment again, who is your Congressman?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Congressman John Kyl.

Mr. RESNICK. Are you aware of the statement by Congressman Schwengel of Iowa put in the record, and he stated in the record that as an independent businessman and as an independent farm insurance man that he had felt that there was no disadvantage to the independent businessmen?

I thought you might be interested in that. He stated that for the record, that he had been in business all of his life, in insurance and I believe one other business, I have forgotten right now but he stated for the record that his Congressman, Fred Schwengel, I don't recall now which District of Iowa——

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. He is in the Southeast part, taking in Davenport, Iowa City.

Mr. RESNICK. That is in the Congressional Record, you might want to look that up.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Yes, I shall.

Mr. RESNICK. That is in direct contradiction to your statement. August 7.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I compete with a local cooperative, similar to the one I mentioned above. It is the Farmers 4-County Co-op Association, a Farmland Industries Association. This co-op started in business in early 1963 and apparently was financed by Farmland Industries. This local cooperative now, in four short years, has passed us in total petroleum sales to farmers. I have been in business over 12 years, and now this cooperative is selling more petroleum products to the farmers than we do.

Mr. RESNICK. Do you know the size of Farmland Industries.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Yes, they are substantial. I refer to them later on here.

Their growth comes about through patronage dividends from the parent affiliate down through the local co-op to the farm customer, in dividend payments. The farmer is typically given an additional discount at the end of the year of which 20 per cent is paid in cash and the remaining 80 per cent in a note redeemable at some unknown future date.

Mr. RESNICK. Do these notes carry any interest or dividends?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. To my knowledge they do not. I have no direct knowledge one way or the other but it is my information that they do not.

Naturally, I am in no condition to compete with such benefits to the farmer because I have no favorable tax position.

There are some 6,500 corporate jobbers in the United States. 91 per cent of these do less than $2 million in total sales annually. Most of these jobbers are in areas where they compete directly with these cooperatives. These jobbers, with average profits of 3.3 per cent before taxes last year, are hard pressed enough as it is. Something must be done to alleviate this particular problem of the cooperatives' unfair tax advantage. It is a common problem for jobbers all over the country, and for many other businesses, too.

I would like to go over briefly the petroleum operations of 19 major regional cooperatives handling supplies in 1964 and 1965 as reported by the Farmer Cooperative Service, a part of the Department of Agriculture, in their General Report No. 140. These co-ops, incidentally, had a total of 7,727 retail outlets of various types in 1965.

Petroleum products were their second largest commodity group and accounted for 26.3 per cent of their total sales of $1.3 billion in 1964, and 26.5 per cent of $1.4 billion total sales in 1965, an actual increase in total petroleum sales of 5.4 per cent. Their largest commodity group, feed, decreased as a percent of sales of 4.4 per cent. However, the third largest commodity group, fertilizer, did increase by 12 per cent, but the fourth largest group, seed, decreased 7 per cent.

Sales of tires, batteries and accessories increased 8.4 per cent. Their total increase in sales for 1965 over 1964 was 4.6 per cent. So their sales of petroleum products and TBA increased faster than sales of all commodity groups. Since two of the three largest agricultural commodity groups' sales decreased, this indicates to us greater emphasis by these so-called "farmers" cooperatives in sales of products that while they are used on farms, they are used by everyone else and every other business, for that matter.

Six of these 19 regional farmer's cooperatives own 9 oil refineries. Eight of them own 27 petroleum storage terminals. Six own an undisclosed number of crude oil properties. The Farmer's Union Central Exchange, for example, notes in their 1966 Annual Report they have leases on 18,000 acres surrounding a wild-cat oil well they brought in in 1966 in Montana, which brings their total lease holdings to 385,000 acres of producing and potential oil-bearing land. Petroleum sales accounted for 52 per cent of the total sales volume of $137 million of this co-op last year. Co-ops in general own hundreds of miles of pipelines.

I would like to depart from the prepared statement. I have something else here I would like to show. This is the cover of a brochure of the 1966 Annual Report of the Farmers Union Central Exchange, and when you look at it I am sure you will agree with me that this is a brochure like a major fully integrated major oil company would put out.

Mr. RESNICK. We have seen them, we have some of our own.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. You have your oil wells, refineries, transportation, trucks, everything.

Mr. RESNICK. Is there a farmer on that cover?

I would like to point out at this point for the record, and for your information, that while this Farmers Union Central Exchange bears the name of a farmers organization, the National Farmers Union, there is no financial connection between the Farmers Union and the Farmers Union Central Exchange. This is one of the things that a lot of people have misunderstood, that they own no stock and this is not controlled in any way by the National Farmers Union. This is not true of other co-ops such as FS Services which is owned and controlled by the Farm Bureau. I don't know if you are aware of that or not.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I was not aware of that.

Mr. RESNICK. I just would like to point that out, that neither the county nor the State units of the Farmers Union control or derive any income in any way. This is ac-

cording to a statement by Mr. Tony Dechant, President of the National Farmers Union.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I see.

Mr. RESNICK. That they gave at these hearings yesterday.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Three of these "farmer's" cooperatives are in Fortune Magazine's list of the 500 largest corporations in the United States last year. These three are Agway, Inc., of Syracuse, New York, which, with sales of $462 million is 17th in size. Farmland Industries of Kansas City, Missouri, formerly CCA, with sales of $316 million, is 248th in size. And the one I mentioned earlier, Farmers Union Central Exchange is 477th with total sales of $137 million, and I repeat, over half of those sales were for petroleum products. And, gentlemen, in 1960 Farmers Union Central Exchange also organized a wholly-owned subsidiary, Cracca Libya, Inc., primarily for exploration, discovery and production of crude oil in the Kingdom of Libya. I guess they weren't satisfied with just looking for it here.

Is this what was visualized in 1913 when the cooperative movement really began? Was it the intent of Congress to allow some of these cooperatives to become among the largest corporations in America, and still retain their tax-exempt status, while directly competing with private business in nonagricultural products.

I would like to quote Mr. Mortimer Caplin, a former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, from an interview he had with the Senior Editor of Dun's Review, which appeared in their February 1965 issue. Mr. Caplin was asked a question regarding the problem of tax-exempt corporations that engaged in activities in competition with tax-paying businesses. Mr. Caplin's reply was, and I quote: "This has become a very serious thing over the last fifteen years and certainly must be faced up to in a broad tax reform. For example, organizations that are cooperatives are competing actively against stock corporations. These are not the little farm organizations of a generation ago, when the cooperative idea was the only answer to the farmer's economic plight. Some of these cooperatives now own an entire vertically integrated operation from production and distribution that is actively competing against tax-paying businesses. This is certainly unfair competition . . . . . ."

We also feel it is unfair competition and hope that the Congress can do something in the near future to put an end to this discriminatory cooperative tax problem.

Summing it all up, I would like to make the following points:

Back in 1913 when farmers' cooperatives began, farms were small, unmechanized units, price supports were unheard of, and therefore some justification for these tax exempt organizations. This justification probably lasted through the 30's. However, this justification does not exist today.

These exempt cooperatives today compete against tax-paying businesses through government sanctioned tax favoritism. This is simply unfair. These cooperatives not only compete against oil jobbers like myself in the sale of non-agricultural products, but scores of other businesses as well. This situation we feel is now out of hand.

The Federal Government today needs additional revenues. Taxing cooperatives the same as other businesses would bring tens of millions of dollars into the Treasury. Businessmen like myself, already paying regular corporation taxes, are probably going to get hit with an additional 10 per cent surtax. This just makes our position worse, as it widens the advantage for those who pay little or no taxes at all.

For three of the largest 500 corporations in the United States to pay little or no taxes on gross sales of $137 million, $316 million and $462 million respectively, in 1966, is just plain inequitable.

These super co-ops are no longer "farmer's" cooperatives in any sense of the word. They are giant corporations, they are run like giant corporations, and they should be taxed the same as any other corporation.

My remarks are on the record. I hope that Congress does not consider and study a general tax reform measure. I hope at that time which is soon, this statement may be of some assistance.

Gentlemen, now if I could ad lib for just a few minutes to give you a very personal view. First of all, and I feel I can speak for every other Iowa oil jobber that I am representing here today, I was born and reared in Iowa, I come from farming people. Many of my relatives, uncles and cousins, are farmers.

Mr. RESNICK. In other words, you are not a city slicker.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. That is right. There is not anyone in the State of Iowa that wants the farmer to prosper more than I do.

Mr. RESNICK. They are basically your customers.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. That is right, a big chunk of them, and I think they are the finest people in the world. We do not have any personal dislike whatsoever for any farm organization or any personal dislike for any cooperative, they are just another competitor. We regard them the same as we would Standard Oil, Texaco, Mobile, Shell, X-Y-Z, any other competitor.

We do feel very strongly, however, that in this football game of competition that everyone should play under the same rules. When the league-leading White Sox came to town and were knocked off by the Washington Senators, everybody only got three outs each inning, there was no favoritism. We feel that everybody has a basic responsibility to support our Government with tax dollars. The revenues have to come from some place and I do not feel that I as an oil jobber or if I was a farmer or a grocery store operator or an ordinary wage earner should have any special privileges in meeting what I feel is a basic responsibility to support our way of life.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. RESNICK. Well, I could not agree with you more. This is one of the areas that disturbs me. My father belonged to a co-op many years ago and it was the same type of co-op that you described; it is still in existence and it is still based on the theory of one man, one vote. No matter how much stock one might own, he still had the one vote, which I think is the base of any cooperative venture.

I was amazed to learn that co-ops were bought and sold and controlled by these what we call the super regional co-op chains and the super co-ops, and so on.

Now let me ask you this: Are you aware that exempt co-ops must sell 85 per cent of all their products to farmer members?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I believe I have read that, sir, yes.

Mr. RESNICK. In their case you feel they are not selling to non-farmers?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I believe this is correct.

Mr. RESNICK. You know, for example, that Agway sells to Montgomery Ward, they sell them gas now. Montgomery Ward may be classified as a farmer as they sell a lot of stuff to a lot of farmers but this is one of the areas that we want to look into. I agree with you in that the tax advantage is most unfair especially in the area of the so-called patronage dividends which are not dividends at all. I think one of the points that was touched upon but we ought to think about is being a small businessman myself once I know it is not only a question of profits but it is also a question of getting together enough capital to expand your business.

Now you and I want to go out and get capital, we have to pay for it, either borrow it and pay interest or sell some of our equity. The co-ops method of getting capital is simply taking the profits which are not taxed, giving people pieces of paper which are not redeemable, and I understand this is fairly widespread and it is again another area that I would like to look into and I plan to.

I would add that in your list of companies you ought to put down Farm Service. They too would wind up in the top 500 because I believe if I remember your figures correctly they do something like $160 million, so that they would be well within Fortune's top 500 corporations.

I think you have covered the area quite well. I myself plan to introduce tax reform legislation. It is going to be a very basic piece of legislation and it is going to simply say that any tax-free organization or foundation will not be permitted to operate or control a profit-making operation.

Now I believe that if this legislation is passed, and I can only hope for your support on legislation like this, that this would alleviate a lot of these problems.

I would also suggest that you make your views known to your respective Congressmen and Senators. Too often the minute you start saying anything about a farmer's co-op that is supposed to label you automatically as anti-farmer. The farmers are your customers, you certainly need the farmer to prosper if you are going to prosper with them. That is my feeling, that these are no longer farmer-owned or managed or anything else, they are just simply giant corporations that are masquerading as co-ops.

I would like to ask you one further question: Are you aware of the 27½ per cent depletion allowance on oil?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Yes, I have read of that in the newspapers.

Mr. RESNICK. Do you get that as an oil jobber?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. No, sir. As an independent oil jobber I do not know of any benefits that I receive from it.

Mr. RESNICK. Are you in favor of that continuing? Do you feel that the oil companies ought to pay their fair share of the oil taxes as well as the rest of us?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Well, I would say this, Congressman, and I am not trying to dodge the issue. I do not believe I am enough of a student of that thing to say whether it is fair or unfair. I have heard that there are 50 some products of a mineral extractive type deal like steel, copper, lumbering, iron ore, coal, what-have-you, sand, gravel that receive some sort of a depletion allowance. This is a pretty complex subject and the only thing I can say is that as a small town independent businessman I do not receive any benefits from this that I am aware of.

Mr. RESNICK. Do you know of any farmers that might want to say, Yes, let these destructive industries continue to get their 27½ per cent tax-free.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Well, I could not speak for what I don't know, although I think it is fair to say that it is also my understanding that these large super and regional co-ops that own these oil wells and explore, I assume they receive the benefits, if any, from this depletion thing.

Mr. RESNICK. Oh, yes.

Are you familiar with the National Cooperative Refinery Association in McPherson, Kansas?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Yes.

Mr. RESNICK. If I recall the figures correctly, they did something like $60 million. They are jointly controlled by the Farmers Union Central Exchange, Farmland Industries, and the Farm Services which is a Farm Bureau, they earned some $8 million last year and didn't pay a dime in taxes. That is not bad. And you as an independent oil jobber have to compete against these people.

Do you also get into liquid petroleum as well?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. No, we are not in LPG.

Mr. RESNICK. You are aware that the same problem exists in LPG?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Yes, in LPG.

Mr. RESNICK. Completely integrated, they do the whole job selling to your customers and so on.

Well, I think that we are basically in agreement. For your information, for what it is worth, I plan to continue this probe of farm organizations that have built their economic and political base based on the money and the jobs that they generate through these co-ops.

Have many of your colleagues, the independent oil jobbers, been bought up by co-ops?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I have no knowledge as to how many. I know many of them have suffered some rather severe losses in sales. Not particularly to change the subject but I want to make crystal clear for the record and for everybody that the oil jobbers of Iowa are not trying to eliminate a competitor by calling for equal taxation. We welcome competitors.

Mr. RESNICK. I don't think that you could eliminate them if you wanted to.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. They are big boys, they are multimillion dollar deals and we welcome them in the marketplace. We just want everybody to play by the same ground rules and we will scrap with the best of them and may the best man win.

Mr. RESNICK. I understand that. I just point out that many independent businesses such as oil jobbers, feed mills, poultry processing plants, and so on are being bought up by the so-called co-ops and are taken off the tax rolls. This is an increasing trend.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I think this is very true.

Mr. RESNICK. And the old story that it is easier to join them than fight them. We are fighting a multi-million-dollar organization and when you are a small businessman it becomes very attractive to stop scrapping around with Farmland Industries.

Do you know any connection between the Farmland Industries and the Farm Bureau?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. No, sir, I do not.

Mr. RESNICK. Other than the Farmers Union Central Exchange.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I know of none, sir. I have no direct knowledge of any. It is entirely possible they could have joint ownership of some refinery or oil well.

Mr. RESNICK. There is no question about that, that is fact. This is like if A&P, Safeway and Food Fair were all partners in a meatpacking plant. I think the Federal Government would step right in on antitrust. That is exactly what happened out there at this National Cooperative Refinery Association, that they were all, you might say, eating out of the same pot and working together.

Again I want to thank you for appearing. I would hope that you would follow this up, remind your Congressmen that you are tax paying citizens and you would like to keep paying taxes, and that if the co-ops take over pretty soon the only ones that are paying taxes are the Congressmen.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Thank you, sir.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT RULES THAT COMMERCIAL BANKS CANNOT ENTER THE MUTUAL FUND BUSINESS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for years I have been concerned about the increasing trend toward nonbanking businesses engaged in by commercial banks. Today we find these institutions engaged in personal property leasing, professional accounting, the travel agency business, insurance, credit cards and other businesses. It is my view—a view I know is shared by a good many of our colleagues—that banks should only be in the business of banking and should perform only such other activities directly related to banking.

The Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which I have the honor to chair, held hearings on this matter in the 88th Congress and in the 89th Congress. Substantial testimony was heard each time concerning the unfair competitive advantage enjoyed by banks when they enter into competition with, in many instances, their own customers.

The trend, however, is perhaps being reversed. I note with particular interest the opinion handed down on September 27, 1967, by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

Judge Joseph C. McGarraghy ruled that the regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency authorizing national banks to enter the mutual fund business are illegal and in violation of the Glass-Steagall Act and beyond the fiduciary powers which the Comptroller can grant to commercial banks. Similar suits with respect to banks operating travel agencies, computer services, and selling insurance are presently being litigated.

Judge McGarraghy's opinion, together with relevant correspondence on this subject, was placed in the RECORD of September 28, 1967, at pages 27271–27281, by our colleague WRIGHT PATMAN, the distinguished chairman of the Committeee on Banking and Currency.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE NATIONAL IMMIGRATION ACT ON OCTOBER 3, 1967

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago on this day, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the National Immigration Act. This was an historic event not only because it was performed in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty on Liberty Island in New York Bay, but because it marked the end of an era of prejudice and bias in our relationships with the peoples of many countries. The signing of this great act impressed the whole world as a symbol of American freedom and justice to almost the same degree to which they have regarded that great statue as the symbol of freedom.

The act for which so many of us here worked so ardently and for so many years marked a real milestone in this country's policy toward the admission of aliens for permanent residence. This act is now being widely referred to as the "Johnson Act," and rightly so, because it was enacted primarily as a result of the forceful and determined personal efforts of the President to secure its passage. No President in history has demonstrated greater interest in and compassion for the world's homeless people; no President has equaled having such appreciation for the rich gifts which immigrants of all nationalities have brought to this country; and no President has been more alert to the needs of having adequate, yet fair and equitable, safeguards established for the control of immigration than has President Lyndon B. Johnson.

I consider my more than 20 years of uninterrupted fighting for improved immigration legislation a most significant aspect of my service in Congress. I regard the passage of the immigration bill as one of the most rewarding achievements in which I played a part, and I look back with continued gratification not only to having been present at the act's historymaking signing ceremony, but it was my privilege to be present at the ceremony in Naples, Italy, when the first visa under the new law was issued to Salvatore Esposito and his wife Maria—now residents of my district in Brooklyn.

I still recall with unquenched feeling, hearing the President 2 years ago utter those truly significant words:

> This Bill that we sign today is not a revolutionary bill. It does not affect the lives of millions. It will not reshape the structure of our daily lives or really add importantly to either our wealth or our power.
>
> Yet it is still one of the most important acts of this Congress and of this Administration.
>
> For it does repair a very deep and painful flaw in the fabric of our American justice. It corrects a cruel and enduring wrong in the conduct of the American nation.

Mr. Speaker, let us now at the end of 2 years, take stock of the results of this legislation.

First, we have all been exceedingly gratified to witness the unifying effect which this act has had upon our citizens, both old and new. No longer are immigrants subjected to their erstwhile "second-class citizen" status. No longer must naturalized American citizens be subjected to the painful realization that because of race or country of birth their parents or their brothers or sisters are to be denied the opportunity to join them and reestablish a family unity. At no period of our history has this unifying process been of greater national interest and value than today.

Second, we read and heard with great gratification the praise heaped upon this country for the steps taken in removing the prejudicial and unfair barriers which were a virtual slap in the face to many of our otherwise friendly nations. Public officials and press all over the world heralded the signing of the act as a positive demonstration of our oft repeated tenets of freedom and justice for all mankind and still speak of it in glowing terms.

Thus, we can rejoice that the President's signature on the National Immi-

gration Act did much to create and restore an improved American image throughout the world.

Third, we can be gratified that, except for a large number of brothers and sisters of Italian Americans, all the admissible people who were on the long waiting lists 2 years ago have now been issued visas.

Mr. Speaker, with 2 years of experience in the administration of this law, some defects and shortcomings have been detected and must be corrected, such as the situation with regard to Irish immigrants, but the law as a whole has proven to be a marked improvement over the discriminatory immigration laws of 1952 and 1924 which it superseded.

Since the act provides for the abolishment of the national quotas in July 1968, the Congress should begin now to review those facets of the law which are in need of adjustments. Certainly this is true if President Johnson's interpretation of the bill which he gave at Liberty Island is to be truly meaningful:

> This bill says simply that from this day forth, those wishing to immigrate to America shall be admitted on the basis of their skills and their close relationship to those already here.

So long as almost 200,000 applications are backlogged, of which approximately half are Italian brother and sister cases, we must ascertain what remedial steps are necessary. The other half of the backlog represents a variety of professions, skills, and semiskills. The cause of the backlogging of these cases needs to be determined. Certainly, we in the Congress must review with the State Department visa office and the Immigration and Naturalization Service the complete administration of this law. Predicated upon the experience of the past 2 years, we must provide whatever adjustments are necessary.

One corrective measure should have immediate attention. Early in January, I again proposed in the pending bill H.R. 1, certain steps to be taken to recognize the contribution which young immigrants must make in the form of compulsory military service in the Armed Forces of this their newly adopted country after 1 year's residence.

This country was born of the struggle of our Founding Fathers against "taxation without representation." Today we are demanding of these young men that they subject themselves to the possibility of making the supreme sacrifice of their lives yet without recognizing them as citizens, and without affording them the same rights enjoyed by fellow veterans. They may not become officers, nor on separation from the service may they enjoy the veteran's preference in civil service job applications.

My bill would correct this unfair and undemocratic error, and would afford all aliens with honorable service on active duty the right to apply immediately for citizenship.

A speedy correction of this and other inequities resulting from provisions of the act is essential if the glorious words of Emma Lazarus appearing on the Statue of Liberty are to sound not as a hollow mockery on the ears of an already skeptic world.

Let this anniversary remind us once more of what that imposing statue and this great act represent:

> Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,
> With conquering limbs astride from land to land;
> Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand
> A mighty woman with a torch, whose flame
> Is the imprisoned lightning, and her name
> Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand
> Glows world-wide welcome; her mild eyes command
> The air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame.
> "Keep ancient lands, your storied pomp!" cries she
> With silent lips. "Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
> The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
> Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
> I lift my lamp beside the golden door!

It is incumbent upon the citizens of this country and most particularly upon us, the Members of Congress, to assure that once these "homeless, tempest-tost" people have been given refuge in our midst, we extend to them maximum opportunities to enjoy the fullest privileges of freedom and to assume a full share of the responsibilities which American citizenship entails.

POLICE-NATIONAL GUARD RIOT CONTROL TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our entire Nation is concerned about civil disorders and riots which have struck community after community this summer, an innovative step in preparing to combat such disorders has been taken in my own congressional district.

Police Chief Gerald M. Monahan, of Allentown, Pa., in cooperation with Col. William S. Greer, commander of headquarters and headquarters battery, 213th Artillery Group, Pennsylvania National Guard, have just completed a joint police-National Guard riot control training program.

It is believed this represented the first effort in Pennsylvania to coordinate police and National Guard training in riot control.

Chief Monahan has shown distinctive leadership in the training and administration of the Allentown Police Department. This unique training program is but one of his many accomplishments.

An 8-hour field exercise concluded the 32-hour joint training program. I insert at this point in the RECORD two articles published in local newspapers which elaborate further on this training exercise:

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Chronicle, Sept. 25, 1967]

RIOT CONTROL EXERCISE HELD BY POLICE, GUARD

Allentown police and a local National Guard unit yesterday morning participated in a riot control field exercise at the Police Academy in Lehigh Parkway.

Police Chief Gerald M. Monahan and Col. William S. Greer, commander of Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 213th Artillery Group, PNG, directed the program.

MAYOR ON HAND

Observers included Mayor Ray B. Bracy; Lt. Col. Irving S. Robinson, U.S. Army adviser to the PNG units; officers of the Allentown Auxiliary Police, the Lehigh County sheriff's uniformed deputies, and Lehigh County Civil Defense.

Yesterday's eight-hour activity culminated 32 hours of riot control training for the National Guard units. It was ordered last month by the U.S. Department of the Army.

Col. Greer said last night that to the best of his knowledge it is the only training in Pennsylvania where the PNG and local police organization joined forces to train for possible civil disturbance.

Morning hours yesterday were used for the study of the use and effects of riot control agents. The use of gas was particularly emphasized.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, Sept. 25, 1967]

COMPLETING SCHEDULED COURSE: POLICE, GUARD HOLD RIOT TRAINING

A field exercise on riot control was conducted yesterday by the Allentown Police Department with Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 213th Artillery Group, Pennsylvania National Guard, at the Police Academy on Lehigh Parkway.

The exercise was directed by Police Chief Gerald M. Monahan and Col. William S. Greer, commander of the 213th.

Observers included Mayor Ray B. Bracy, Lt. Col. Irving S. Robinson, U.S. Army adviser to the PNG units; officers of the Allentown Auxiliary Police, the Lehigh County sheriff's uniformed deputies, and Lehigh County Civil Defense.

Yesterday's eight-hour activity culminated 32 hours of riot control training for the National Guard units. It was ordered last month by the U.S. Department of the Army.

Col. Greer said last night that to the best of his knowledge it is the only training in Pennsylvania where the PNG and local police organization joined forces to train for possible civil disturbance.

Morning hours yesterday were used for the study of the use and effects of riot control agents. The use of gas was particularly emphasized.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which would amend the National School Lunch Act to provide expanded food service to children from poor economic areas attending day-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and recreation centers.

In this Nation's effort to provide much needed education and day-care to children whose families have a poverty level income, a number of exciting and innovative programs, such as Headstart, have been initiated. These programs provide an opportunity for the Nation to see that the children enrolled in them receive at least one nutritious meal or snack a day. At present, these educational and day-care programs either do not provide a meal or must pay for the food out of their scarce resources and hard-pressed budgets. The following table gives a good estimate of the number of children enrolled in day-care programs and the meals which should be provided:

Program	Number of children	Food requirements	
		Meals	Snacks
A. Education (preschool):			
1. Headstart, summer	480,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
2. Headstart, full year	160,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
Total	640,000	45,000,000	45,000,000
B. Day care:			
1. Headstart	55,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
2. Migrants	13,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
3. Title V	28,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Total	96,000	45,000,000	45,000,000
C. Total	736,000	90,000,000	90,000,000

The legislation being introduced today would provide institutions like day-care centers and summer camps the same type of food resources available to schools under the school lunch program, which is such an efficient success that 71,000 schools involving 18 million children are now participating in it. In light of the vital importance of these programs in breaking the circle of poverty, I would hope that this legislation will receive wide support and immediate attention. It is particularly important to make food resources available to such groups as inexpensively as possible, because the social security amendments recently passed by the House call for a vastly expanded title V work experience program as well as the establishment of day-care centers to care for the children of mothers undergoing training and obtaining gainful employment.

The legislation will also make inexpensive food supplies available to summer camps attended by children from low-income families. This summer, a camping experience was provided for a large number of children who have all their lives known nothing but the hard concrete sidewalks and the hot blacktop streets of center city ghettos. Camps were organized in the Los Angeles area, in Arkansas, and in my city of Cleveland, Ohio. In Cleveland, a total of 4,600 children who have never been to camp before, many of whom have never been out of the city of Cleveland before, attended camps financed by local groups and the Federal Government. The Federal Government alone provided about 1,900 children with a camp experience. Summer was better in Cleveland this year than was the case in 1966.

We in Cleveland are planning for an even bigger program next year, and I know that the idea is spreading to other areas. In many parts of the country, there is no reason that unemployed youth, dropouts from school, cannot be provided a "retreat" experience in which counseling could be provided, morale and drive boosted. Along this line, this year's economic opportunity amendments contained a title providing summer camps for disadvantaged children. The Senate will be considering this proposal as a separate piece of legislation warranting separate hearings.

All of these types of programs could be greatly assisted by the legislation I am introducing today. The bill would authorize $8 million in fiscal year 1968 and in each of the next 2 fiscal years to be disbursed to the states by the Department of Agriculture for the initiation, maintenance, and expansion of nonprofit food service programs for children in private, nonprofit institutions or public institutions which provide day care for children and young people from areas in which poor economic conditions exist.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall provide up to $50,000 to each State as a basic grant and from the remaining funds appropriate an amount which bears the same ratio to the total remaining funds as the number of children in that State between the ages of 3 and 17, inclusive, living in families which have incomes of less than $3,000 per annum bears to the total number of such children in the whole Nation. As an example, if the State in question has 100,000 children between the ages of 3 and 17 living in families with income of less than $3,000 and there are a million such children nationally, then that State would receive 10 percent of the funds available once the basic State grants have been made.

The funds shall be disbursed by the State's educational agency to the child-care institutions selected on a nondiscriminatory basis, to reimburse the service institutions for the cost of obtaining agricultural commodities and other foods. The disbursement per meal will be made at a rate of reimbursement per meal prescribed by the Secretary. The costs of obtaining food may include the cost of processing, distribution, transporting, and handling it.

In cases of severe need where the rate of reimbursement per meal is insufficient to carry out an effective program, the Secretary of Agriculture may permit financial assistance of up to 80 percent of the operating cost of the program.

If a State wishes, it may use up to 25 percent of the funds allocated to it to pay up to 75 percent of the cost of purchasing or renting equipment, other than land or buildings, for handling, transporting, and processing food.

As under the national school lunch program, the Secretary may set definitions of what constitutes an adequate and nutritional meal, and children who cannot pay all or part of the cost of the meal shall be served without charge, and without discrimination.

This legislation directs the institutions participating in the program to use, as much as possible, those foods designated as being in abundance, either nationally or in the institution area, or foods donated by the Secretary. This should enable the total cost of such day-care centers to be drastically reduced.

Expenditures by State and local sources for the maintenance of food programs for children shall not be diminished as a result of funds received under this legislation.

A copy of the bill is included below. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is a measure that will do much to provide better programs and cheaper programs to those who need them most.

The bill follows:

H.R. 13293

A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1752) is amended by striking out "section 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 11 and 13".

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1755) is amended by inserting "except section 13" immediately after "Act," where it first appears.

SEC. 3. The National School Lunch Act is amended by adding at the end of the Act the following new section:

"SPECIAL FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

"SEC. 13. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated $8,000,000 for each of the three fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, to enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out a pilot program to assist States through grants-in-aid and other means, to initiate, maintain, or expand nonprofit food service programs for children in service institutions. For purposes of this section, the term 'service institutions' means private, nonprofit institutions or public institutions, such as child day-care centers, settlement houses, or recreation centers, which provide day care for children from areas in which poor economic conditions exist.

"(b)(1) Of the funds appropriated for the purposes of this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve 2 percentum for apportionment to Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa shall each be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total of such reserved funds as the number of children aged three to seventeen, inclusive, in each bears to the total number of children of such ages in all of them.

"(2) From the remainder of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay to each State such sums as he deems appropriate, but not more than $50,000, as a basic grant. In addition, the Secretary shall allot to each State from the funds remaining after the basic grants have been made an amount which bears the same ratio to such remaining funds as the number of children in that State aged three to seventeen, inclusive, in families with incomes of less than $3,000 per annum bears to the total number of such children in all the States. For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'State' does not include Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

"(c)(1) Funds paid to any State under this section shall be disbursed by the State educational agency to service institutions, selected on a nondiscriminatory basis by the State educational agency. (A) to reimburse the service institutions for the cost of obtaining agricultural commodities and other foods and (B) for the purposes of paragraphs

(2) and (3) of this subsection. The costs of obtaining agricultural commodities and other foods may include the cost of the processing, distributing, transporting, or handling thereof. Disbursement to participating service institutions shall be made at such rate of reimbursement per meal as the Secretary shall prescribe.

"(2) In circumstances of severe need where the rate per meal established by the Secretary is insufficient to carry on an effective feeding program, the Secretary may authorize financial assistance not to exceed 80 per centum of the operating costs of such a program, including the cost of obtaining, preparing, and serving food.

"(3) Not to exceed 25 per centum of the funds paid to any State may be used by the State to assist service institutions by paying not to exceed 75 per centum of the cost of the purchase or rental of equipment, other than land and buildings, for the storage, preparation, transportation, and serving of food to enable the service institutions to establish, maintain, and expand food service under this section.

"(d) The withholding of funds and their disbursement to service institutions shall be carried out by the Secretary under circumstances comparable to those provided for in section 10 of this Act.

"(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, balances of funds appropriated for the purposes of this section and unobligated at the end of any fiscal year shall remain available for obligation during the first three months of the following fiscal year.

"(f) Service institutions to which funds are disbursed under this section shall serve meals consisting of a combination of foods and meeting minimum nutritional standards prescribed by the Secretary on the basis of tested nutritional research. Such meals shall be served without cost or at a reduced cost to children determined by the service institutions to be unable to pay the full cost. In making such determination, service institution authorities should, to the extent practicable, consult with public welfare and health agencies. No physical segregation or other discrimination against any child shall be made because of his inability to pay.

"(g) If any State cannot utilize all funds apportioned to it, or if additional funds are made available for apportionment among the States, under this section, the Secretary shall make further apportionments to the remaining States in the manner prescribed in subsection (b).

"(h)(1) The Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time the amounts to be paid to any State under this section of the Act and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State at the time or times fixed by the Secretary the amounts so certified.

"(2) Each service institution participating under this section shall, insofar as practicable, utilize in its program foods designated from time to time by the Secretary as being in abundance, either nationally or in the institution area, or foods donated by the Secretary. Foods available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431) or purchased under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), or section 709 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (7 U.S.C. 1446a-1), may be donated by the Secretary to participating institutions in accordance with the needs as determined by authorities of these institutions for utilization in their feeding programs under this section.

"(3) The value of assistance to children under this section shall not be considered to be income or resources for any purpose under any Federal or State laws, including laws relating to taxation and welfare and public assistance programs. Expenditures of funds from State and local sources for the maintenance of food programs for children shall not be diminished as a result of funds received under this section.

"(4) Authority for the conduct and supervision of Federal programs to assist service institutions in providing food service programs for children is assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture. To the extent practicable, other Federal agencies administering programs under which funds are to be provided to service institutions for such assistance shall transfer such funds to the Secretary of Agriculture for distribution through the administrative channels and in accordance with the standards established under this Act.

"(5) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to the Secretary for his administrative expenses under this section.

"(6) States, State educational agencies, and service institutions participating in programs under this section shall keep such accounts and records as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to determine whether there has been compliance with this section and the regulations hereunder. Such accounts and records shall at all times be available for inspection and audit by representatives of the Secretary and shall be preserved for such period of time, not in excess of five years, as the Secretary determines is necessary."

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1776) is amended by adding immediately before the period at the end thereof "and under sections 11 and 13 of the National School Lunch Act". The second sentence of such section 7 is amended by striking out "section 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 11 and 13".

CONGRESSMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS HAILS KEARNY, N.J., CENTENNIAL

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the town of Kearny in West Hudson County, N.J., was for 18 years a part of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey represented by our able colleague and good friend, the dean of the New Jersey delegation, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR.

Last year, this town was added to the 14th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent and I was suddenly faced with the problem of representing a large number of people whom I did not know well and who did not know me very well either. I can report to this House that I have found the people of West Hudson and their elected officials splendid in every way.

I have the great privilege of knowing Mayor Joseph M. Healey, of Kearny, for many years and I am well aware of his great popularity in all of Hudson County. In this day and age, however, the mayor who can maintain his popularity over more than two decades is rare indeed, and frankly I sometimes wonder how he did it. Having served with him very closely over the past year, it is very easy to understand. No problem is too small for his full attention and he is always looking for programs of benefit for Kearny and its people.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege and high honor to call the attention of all Members of this House to the town of Kearny and its able mayor as this great municipality celebrates its 100th anniversary. Because this is such a major event in the history of this town, I should like to tell this House some of the things that have happened in Kearny this year.

As the town of Kearny began to plan its centennial in 1967, Mayor Healey, who is past president of the New Jersey League of Municipalities, characteristically began doing something about it last year.

In October 1966, Mayor Healey appointed Dr. Edmund L. Tink, Kearny superintendent of schools, as chairman of the town's centennial commission. The mayor and Dr. Tink then began to discuss with other area municipal officials their experiences with centennial and other similar observances. Healey explained:

> We want to avoid the mistakes made in other communities and also wished to profit by the benefits gained in their celebrations.

Early in February, the Kearny Centennial Commission, consisting of 17 prominent citizens, was legally incorporated to conduct the business of the event. At this time, Mayor Healey was named honorary chairman. In addition to Dr. Tink, the general chairman, the commission appointed Ralph Borgess, secretary of the board of education as secretary, and William G. Davey, board chairman of the First National Bank of Kearny, as treasurer. Chairmen of the various committees were named representing patriotic, veterans, youth, women's, senior citizens, service clubs, recreation, civic, and fraternal organizations.

Committee chairmen were slated for historical exhibits, the commemoration of the first town meeting—which was held in the high school—industrial relations and industrial and business exhibits, tree planting and beautification, special school programs, centennial high school concert, centennial high school graduation, July 4th celebration, town departments and municipal exhibits, time capsule, historical art, scholastic sports and homecoming, recreation events, souvenirs and street decorations, centennial calendar and publicity record book, publicity, religious coordination, town of Kearny history, and parade. An official photographer, attorney, auditor, and recording secretary were appointed.

The local weekly, the Observer, has been most generous in granting space to the many centennial events. It carries an events calendar on page 1 of each issue. The area dailies have also been most cooperative with news and photo coverage of the various activities. These include the Newark News, Newark Star-Ledger, the Journal, and Hudson Dispatch, both of Jersey City.

The kickoff event was held in the high school in April and featured a reenactment, by a professional acting group, of the first meeting of the township com-

mittee which was held on April 8, 1867. Later that month a bus load of schoolchildren, teachers, and commission members journeyed to Trenton to witness the introduction of assembly and senate resolutions congratulating Kearny on its centennial. Mayor Healey spoke on the assembly floor, recounting some of the town's history and achievements of its legislators since the turn of the century. The group also met with Gov. Richard J. Hughes in his office.

A "patriots luncheon" was held June 2, to honor Gen. Philip Kearny, Civil War hero for whom the town is named. A noted historian and writer, Harold Latham, retired vice president of the MacMillan Publishing Co., gave the principal address. Descendants of the general were honored guests. Over 200 attended.

Also in June, the jaycees conducted a "centennial junior champs" track and field meet in the high school stadium and the local Rotary Club presented to the town and dedicated a centennial cherry blossom orchard.

June 11 marked the dedication of the John F. Kennedy Natatorium in Lincoln School. R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, representing the Kennedy family, was the principal speaker. I was very proud to be on the program that day.

July was marked by a visit of 800 townspeople by charter bus to Yankee Stadium to attend a professional soccer match held in honor of the town's anniversary. Mayor Healey kicked off the ball to start the game. Somewhat marred by rain, an Independence Day centennial program was held in the stadium.

Other centennial events scheduled were a bicycle race through the Kearny streets August 20 and the homecoming football game September 23.

A centennial time capsule will be buried on October 20. Manufactured by the local Monsanto Co., it will contain thousands of microfilmed items pertaining to the history of the town and other memorabilia including signatures of all the schoolchildren and historical matter relevant to the many service clubs and organizations of Kearny.

The centennial year will end on October 21 with a great street parade featuring floats, the centennial queen and occupying a special place of honor the 10 oldest residents will ride in open cars. Many of these are in their 90's.

Now—to some of the history of the town of Kearny:

Prior to the 18th century the area which is now Kearny was known to the American Indians as Mighgecticok. Among those who have contributed to the history of Kearny are the Indian Chief Tantaqua, plantation owner Arent Schuyler, the slave who discovered copper here, and Gen. Philip Kearny—after whom the town is named.

The pioneer settler of this section was Capt. William Sandford, who came here from Barbadoes, West Indies, in 1668. On July 4 of that year he purchased for the sum of 20 pounds sterling all the territory which is now Kearney, Harrison, and East Newark.

Captain Sandford also purchased from the Indians all their reserve rights and titles. A condition of the sale was that within 3 years of the purchase, Sandford had to settle eight families on the land. The deed drafted by Captain Sandford and Chief Tantaqua described the area as the tract lying between the Hackensack and Pasawack—now Passaic—Rivers. In 1670 the settlement was named New Barbadoes Neck, after Sandford's former home in the West Indies.

Nine years later, Arent Schuyler bought the Kingsland Plantation in New Barbadoes Neck. The purchase price was 350 pounds sterling—approximately $1,700.

Shortly after his purchase of the Kingsland Plantation, one of Arent Schuyler's slaves brought him a peculiar green stone picked up while plowing. The stone was sent to England for analysis and found to contain 80 percent copper. As a result of the discovery a copper mine was opened and the first steam engine used in the United States was employed in its operation. Until the steam engine and mine machinery were destroyed by fire in 1772, the mines produced and shipped to England 1,306 tons of rich copper ore.

During the Revolutionary War, the Battle of Schuyler Heights was fought here, and the area was temporarily held by British troops under General Clinton.

The name "New Barbadoes Neck" was changed to Lodi in 1825. In 1840 it was changed again, to Harrison.

The town was named "Kearny" in 1867 to honor the memory of Gen. Philip Kearny, major general of U.S. Volunteers. The general was killed in the battle of Chantilly, Va., September 1, 1862. His body was brought back to his home in Kearny where an impressive military funeral was held. For many years his castle, Belle Grove, a reproduction of a French chateau, stood as a Kearny landmark.

The Clark Thread Co., of Scotland, extended its activities to this country in 1875. It erected two large mills in Kearny, and by 1890 had added two others. Close on the heels of the cotton thread industry came that of flax spinning. In 1883 the Marshall Flax Spinning Co., of England, erected a large plant in Kearny which is operated today as the Linen Thread Co.

Just as the Clark concern brought thousands of Scottish immigrants, so did the need for experienced flax spinners lead to an influx of people from other parts of the British Isles. Families of those early textile workers were the nucleus of Kearny's present population. To that nucleus were added the families of businessmen whose enterprises were growing here, or who commuted to Newark or New York but settled in this section as an ideal suburban residential community.

Also dating from 1883 is the Arlington Co. factory, a plant of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co. The concern was a pioneer in cellulose field.

If Peter Clark can be credited with inaugurating Kearny's industrial history, another Scottish industrialist must be recognized as having contributed largely to its development. In 1887 Sir Michael Nairn established the Nairn Linoleum Co., in Kearny. A fluorishing firm from the very outset, its merger with Congoleum Co., of Philadelphia, in 1924 has placed Congoleum-Nairn of Kearny in the forefront of the world's linoleum industry.

Other important industries which have settled in Kearny and employed its townspeople are: Koppers Co., Inc., Swift & Co., Western Electric Co., Standard Tool Manufacturing Co., Wilkata Box Co., Coca Cola, and Monsanto.

Since the turn of the century, Kearny's industrial development has been marked by steady growth, with particular emphasis in the southern part of town. Scores of new plants have located there within the past two decades. The transportation picture in Kearny presents every element desirable to commerce. Waterways at the front door, railways at the back door, air service overhead, and well-maintained highways interlace the entire area. To meet the expanding needs of these new industries the town has established separate fire and police headquarters in South Kearny. It has extended its water supply system and provided a network of local streets to supplement the vital National, State, and county highways crossing the town.

Less than 5 miles from New York City, Kearny has two other metropoli as immediate neighbors. To the west lies Newark, site of one of the world's busiest airports. To the east lies Jersey City.

Under Mayor Healey's energetic guidance, a new deep-water facility, Port Kearny is developing in the southern part of the town. When dredging operations by the Corps of Army Engineers are completed, Port Kearny will provide access to the maritime world for the largest ocean-going vessels.

Kearny today is an incorporated town with a population of approximately 40,000. Located in the important northeastern section of New Jersey, it covers an area of 9.33 square miles. It occupies a peninsula bounded by the Hackensack and Passaic Rivers both of which are navigable by ocean-going vessels. The rivers converge in Newark Bay, at Kearny's southernmost tip, affording access to New York harbor and the Atlantic Ocean. The town's pleasant, well ordered residential streets, its fine, modern schools, progressive merchants, and thriving industries, under a program of constant development, are ample proof of its designation as "A good place to live, work, and shop."

With so much going for it, Kearny's future is bound to be as progressive and exciting as its illustrious past.

DOING MORE THAN TIME

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, last year

the Congress enacted, as a part of Public Law 89–792, an amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act, authorizing a program of skill training for inmates of correctional institutions. This new provision, section 251 of the act, was made a part of the act because of the splendid showing made in similar pilot projects in two Federal institutions.

This year the first budget requests for section 251 were allowed by the House, but the Appropriations Committee in the other body saw fit to delete them. I think it is unfortunate that a program which received the unanimous assent of both Houses of the Congress in 1966 should be even temporarily shelved in 1967 for lack of funds.

When one compares the small investment in training inmates, the good probability that pilot projects have indicated of rehabilitating them, and the very high annual cost of maintaining a prisoner who does not learn how to make an honest living on the outside, it seems to me that the amount budgeted for funding of section 251 is a very high return investment, indeed.

In a recent edition of Employment Service Review, there appeared an excellent article by Charles W. Phillips, of the Department of Labor, entitled "Doing More Than Time." I recommend this article, and particularly urge the conferees on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill to give it careful consideration in their deliberations:

DOING MORE THAN TIME

(By Charles W. Phillips)

Every year over 100,000 prisoners are released from State and Federal prisons. Sooner or later, one out of every three of these ex-convicts will be back behind bars, many for the third and fourth time. The costs involved in the apprehension, prosecution, and confinement of the 100,000 criminals released annually border on the astronomical, perhaps exceeding the budgets of most of our States.

Perhaps the old-time prison pictures overfictionalized a bit when they depicted the ex-convict leaving a jail as the big gate clanged shut behind him. There he stood in his ill-fitting prison-issued suit—friendless and jobless. However, the exaggeration wasn't too far from reality because the ex-convict of not too long ago actually had no place to go except, perhaps back to his old haunts, associations, and life of crime. Thus, in due time, chances were that he would be back "home," in jail.

Fortunately, modern methods of dealing with convicts, whether they be confined in reformatories, jails, correctional centers, work farms, or any other place where a human being is kept under lock and key, have been undergoing revolutionary changes. Modern thinking holds that from the day his incarceration begins a prisoner is attached to a processing line which will prepare him for release, but in a manner which returns him to society better equipped to withstand the rigors of everyday life.

Many of these newer ideas have been tested and verified in the experimental, demonstration, and research projects in prerelease prison training, funded by the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor. Notable among these have been the contract research program at Rikers Island, N.Y., and experimental and demonstration programs at the Draper Correctional Center in Alabama, the South Carolina Department of Corrections, and the Lorton Youth Center of the District of Columbia.

The number and types of programs which aim to train a man to be a better citizen when he is released are limitless. An inmate at an Alabama correctional institution perhaps summed up the value of the newer prerelease programs best by stating that he felt he was "doing more than time."

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Occupational training is being utilized as the major weapon from the arsenal of techniques being used to attack the problem of guidance of prisoners toward more useful lives outside prison walls. Unfortunately, job training alone probably is not the answer, but such training, combined with other factors, such as institutional attitude, counseling programs, job development and placement, and community support and followthrough, makes for practically a complete rehabilitation and prerelease program.

The Congress took cognizance of the importance of prerelease prisoner training when it amended the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) so as to enlarge the program. A total of 10,000 prisoners will be engaged under the act. This total is expected to build a base for more comprehensive future programs.

The initiative for establishing prerelease training programs under MDTA will, in most cases, come from the institutions working, most likely, through the Employment Service.

The disciplines and requirements for ordinary MDTA programs must also obtain for prereleased prisoners if the rehabilitative goal is to be attained. This calls for proper institutional attitude which must permit prisoners to become available for training for 35 to 40 hours per week, preferably 6 months to a year prior to release.

Offhand, it would appear that prisons would welcome such subsidized prerelease programs. However this attitude is not universally applicable, especially with respect to institutions which find themselves in a bind for funds and are hard pressed to do away with their prison industries. Besides, housekeeping duties alone keep most of a prison's work force busy; meals must be prepared, laundry cleaned, vehicles repaired, and buildings maintained. These chores entail full-time jobs for a sizable number of a prison's inmates, yet the training provided by these jobs is of minimal value on the outside. In fact, the training acquired in many prison jobs may be of negative value, since more workers are usually on a job than are needed and bad work habits often are acquired.

Directors of a prison training program cannot have antagonism toward the trainees. They can expel a student for absolute recalcitrance, but such instances have been extremely rare in the experimental and demonstration programs. The teachers are there to solve the problems of rebellion at school and of emotional blocks to learning. Of course, this is what every good teacher does. The point is, this is a special group. The teacher must maintain standards, while not becoming too harsh with those who do not respond easily.

The teacher must be equally acute to note and avoid entrapment in an opposite kind of problem—that of performance without learning. Students usually do not get into training programs unless they volunteer for them. Such trainees are not hard to obtain, for the training program itself is a kind of bonus. If a person is not in the program, he is likely to be working on the prison farm, in a road gang, or in some prison duty more distasteful than is involved in a training course. Training may also be a road to an earlier parole. But these built-in motivations to take on a training program do not prevent the deep-seated emotional objections and rebellions to it.

This situation raises the issue of the moral dimension of education and the relation of the training program to rehabilitation. The Socratic dictum that "knowledge is virtue" probably has few, if any, literal adherents. Likewise, few persons, especially educators, will be content to have education concern itself only with means and not ends; to serve only techniques and not values. More colloquially, the purpose of teaching welding is not to make better safecrackers, or by virtue of teaching literacy, to develop a capacity for check forging. Thus, a high premium is placed, in an effective prison training program, on the teachers, counselors, shop instructors, therapeutic staff (if it exists), and prison authorities, to function as a genuine team, as opposed to an aggregate of individuals.

Programed instruction has been attractive to those responsible for prison programs and has been effective. Its value in permitting individual pacing, in permitting slow learners to close the performance gap between themselves and others, and in eliminating invidious public grade comparisons has seemed to work well. The Draper Correctional Institution (in Elmore, Ala.) has done a considerable amount of development of these materials for the occupations in which it trains. The Federal prison at Petersburg, Va., has used the Du Pont programed texts for the courses where they apply. A special evaluation study of this usage by the Federal Bureau of Prisons showed a considerable benefit.

The experimental and demonstration projects involving theories of "Contingency Management" also bear watching. A simple illustration of this is when a parent contracts with a child to raise the child's allowance contingent on his bringing home a better report card. Prisoners are engaged formally in negotiating contracts to complete certain work in a specified time. If they do it, they earn certain rewards. This management of the learning contingencies, involving elaborate "menus of choice," is a growing part of the experimentation at Draper and is a major area of experimentation in Project CASE, funded by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency at the National Training School for boys.

Not to be neglected either is the work of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. For more than 10 years, it has been working with the Federal Bureau of Prisons. They have established apprenticeship programs in about a dozen institutions. Joint Councils of Apprenticeship set up and approve the programs and register them for continuation on the outside. Perhaps these can be expanded in the State systems. Also, the coupled institutional on-the-job program, in which MDTA now has considerable involvement, may have a place in new training designs for prisoners.

COUNSELING IN THE TRAINING PROGRAM

Just as the teacher or vocational instructor in a prison setting must adopt special teaching methods and techniques, so also must the counselor come to grips with special problems with respect to prison trainees. In addition to the usual counseling problems involving discipline, motivation, and adjustment, the counselor must deal with subsidiary problems attendant to people separated from society and undergoing social deprivations. These problems are bound to have adverse effects on a prisoner's emotions and habits. Thus, the counselor becomes an important link between the prisoner and the training program, prison administration, and, perhaps, the prisoner's potential employers upon release.

Many counselors are making excellent use of volunteers and subprofessional persons. The Lorton project (outside of Washington, D.C.), for example, has made good use of VISTA volunteers, and college student interns have been used at Draper as educational aides.

JOB DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT

A prisoner at the Danbury, Conn., prison goes to work daily at a nearby manufacturing plant and works as a hearing aid repairman. He was trained to do this work by the company while doing his "time" in jail. Thus, he is able to support his family and is assured of a job upon release.

Modern prison work-release plans are certainly a far cry from the lash and the hole. What is happening at Danbury and other places like it is a tribute to modern penal thinking. The record of job development and placement by these institutions borders on the fantastic.

In most of these projects, cooperation with the Employment Service has been excellent, even though there are a number of unique factors involved in the task of placing prisoners in jobs. First of all, the labor area served by a prison is usually much larger than the immediate vicinity of the jail. A State prison, for example, serves inmates coming from all parts of the State, and most prisoners usually return to their home communities upon release. A Federal prison serves even a larger area, in most cases an entire region.

Jobs for about-to-be-released convicts must be developed prior to discharge. Fortunately, many State Employment Service agencies cooperate with parole boards and usually assure jobs for ex-prisoners.

A vital factor in the job-getting process is community cooperation, whereby churches, civic groups, unions, trade associations, and others have worked out programs for dealing with ex-convicts. In many cases, halfway houses and other transitional centers have been established for released prisoners.

CONCLUSION

Dealing with those in our society who must be incarcerated for breaches of the law is indeed a vexing problem. The task involves walking a tightrope between lax, country-club-type treatment on the one hand and ineffectual, harsh punishment on the other. During the past several decades, more and more balance has been achieved with respect to authority-prisoner relationships, and newer techniques are constantly being devised. The newer methods seem to cry out to the convict: "Look, this prison life is no bed of roses, but if you participate in our programs you'll be a better man when you are free."

President Johnson touched base with all the issues, as he added the urgency to serve criminal offenders to the vision and imperative of the Great Society. In his address to Congress on February 15, 1965, he said:

"The problems run deep and will not yield to quick and easy answers. We must not weaken in our resolve to identify and eliminate the causes of criminal activity. . . . Correctional agencies charged with responsibility for those who have been found guilty of a criminal offense face enormously complex problems. Some of the time-honored methods are proving to be inadequate. Many new ideas are being developed and applied, with still uncertain results. We cannot wait until they are certain new ideas are being developed and endless, self-defeating cycle of imprisonment, release, and reimprisonment which fails to alter undesirable attitudes and behavior. We must especially find ways to help the first offender avoid a continuing career of crime."

VISITING CHAPLAIN, REV. ALEXANDER GEORGE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, today, the House of Representatives is honored to have as its visiting chaplain the Rev. Alexander George, pastor of St. John's Eastern Orthodox Church in Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Father George's presence here today gives recognition to the important role which orthodoxy plays in our society, as a community of Christians which numbers nearly 7 million in the United States.

Father George himself is a symbol of his church's role—as a pastor, an active community leader, and a former clergyman in Latin America as well.

He is also a symbol of religion freedom in this Nation. As a man who was born in Berlin at the height of Nazi power and raised in Communist Hungary after World War II, he remarked to me after the opening ceremonies in the House this noon that only in America could an immigrant stand in the halls of government to lead the Nation's lawmakers in prayer.

Unfortunately, those of us in America who have always enjoyed this fundamental freedom too often take it for granted, and we are indebted to Father George for reminding us of it today.

Father George was born in Berlin in 1937 and received his early education in Austria and Hungary. In 1953, he came with his parents from Hungary to the United States where he attended high school in New Jersey and college in Los Angeles. On December 25, 1959, after seminary studies at Orthodox Trinity College in Jordanville, N.Y., he was ordained by the late Archbishop Antony Bashir in St. Nicholas Orthodox Cathedral in Brooklyn.

Following his ordination, Father George served parishes in New York and California, before going to South America, where he served in the dioceses of Buenos Aires. São Paulo, and Rio de Janeiro from 1962 to 1964.

Since February of 1964, Father George has been pastor of St. John's Eastern Orthodox Church in Cedar Rapids. And in the past 4 years, he has come to be known and respected in Cedar Rapids and throughout Iowa, not only as a religious leader, but as a lecturer, executive director of the Citizens Committee on Alcoholism, and an adviser to the Cedar Rapids Teen Club.

He has been active in the ecumenical movement in eastern Iowa, and in the statewide program to deal with the problem of alcoholism.

Mr. Speaker, Father George's appearance today is an appropriate occasion to reflect on the question of proper recognition of Eastern Orthodoxy in the United States. Traditionally, in this country we consider three major faiths—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish. There are legitimate arguments which the Eastern Orthodox Christians pose as to why their faith should be recognized separately.

Considerable notice has been given to the separate identity of Eastern Orthodoxy. Legislatures in nearly 80 percent of the States have enacted resolutions which designate it as a separate major faith, and last May Iowa joined in that recognition.

The Armed Forces use the letters "EO" on dog tags to identify Eastern Orthodox Christians.

Representatives of the Eastern Orthodox faith have been invited to participate in recent Presidential inauguration ceremonies, as Father George has been invited here today.

But in spite of these steps, there are still serious situations which members of the church consider to be discriminatory and about which they are justifiably concerned.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Father George for being with us, and to offer my own respect and admiration for the outstanding work which he is doing, for his parish, his church, and his community.

NASA'S LANGLEY RESEARCH CENTER: 50 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE NATION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, this Monday I had the privilege of visiting once again the Langley Research Center, NASA's advanced research and technology facility in my district in Hampton, Va. Although I have visited that remarkable installation many times—both before 1958, when it was a major cog of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and over the past 9 years when it has been part of the space agency—this visit had particular significance. For this week has been chosen to mark the 50th anniversary of Langley's establishment; 50 years of service to the Nation.

It was my good fortune to be joined on this visit by several able members of the Science and Astronautics Committee—Mr. MILLER, chairman, Mr. CABELL, Mr. PETTIS, and Mr. ECKHARDT—and by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD. And it was my distinct honor to be accompanied by a great lady, Mrs. Hugh L. Dryden, whose late husband rendered service of incalculable value to the Nation and the world over many years, culminating in his service as Deputy Administrator of NASA.

Mr. Speaker, I was struck on this visit, as I have been often impressed before, with the outstanding record of accomplishment of the Langley Center. Indeed, it would take me a full day just to list those accomplishments, let alone discuss them. Suffice it to say that every airplane, every missile, every spacecraft this country builds has benefited from Langley work. And although many fail to realize it, today our highways are safer, our hydroplane boats are swifter, our everyday electronics and materials are

better, and our lives are richer in many ways because of research done at Langley.

What a wise decision it was for the United States to establish this first research capability 50 years ago; and how wise we have been to nurture and support it over the years since 1917.

I would like to make one more point, Mr. Speaker. Impressed as I was with the laboratories, the test stands, the experimental rigs, and all the other hardware at Langley, I was far, far more impressed with one point made quite convincingly by Dr. Floyd L. "Tommy" Thompson, the Langley director, and a close adviser of Administrator James E. Webb. He reminded us that research is not facilities, not buildings, not lasers, computers wind tunnels, or test tubes, but people. Scientists and administrators like Hugh Dryden, laboratory directors like Tommy Thompson, and total managers like Jim Webb, together with thousands of able, self-sacrificing Americans of thorough education and noble purpose go together to make a center like Langley.

And whether we celebrate its 50th or its hundredth anniversary, this Nation can be proud today and always of the system that maintains the Langley Research Center.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, the Vice President, who is Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and the Royal Aircraft Establishment of Great Britain joined in this celebration, along with many others. I include their commendatory messages in the RECORD at this point:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 26, 1967.

Dr. F. L. THOMPSON,
Director,
NASA Langley Research Center,
Langley Station,
Hampton, Va.

DEAR DR. THOMPSON: I am happy to join with those honoring the Langley Research Center on the occasion of your fiftieth anniversary.

For half a century, your Center has demonstrated how the Federal Government, assisted by universities and private industry, can meaningfully contribute to the peaceful use of aeronautics and space for the benefit of all mankind.

On this milestone year in your record of national achievement, I salute the entire Langley staff and wish you Godspeed in the crucial course ahead.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

Dr. FLOYD L. THOMPSON,
Director, Langley Research Center,
NASA Langley AFB, Va.:

The aeronautic aerospace age is highlighted by your outstanding ceremonies at the 50th anniversary of Langley Air Force Base. I convey warmest congratulations to you personally on the superb contributions you have made, particularly to America's manned space program. What a debt our people and all the world's people owe to pioneers of the skies who have made possible our epic achievements in realms never before within man's reach much less travel.

As chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, I extend personal regards to the many distinguished guests, public officials and private citizens, leaders in every walk of life in Virginia and throughout the nation who share these happy hours with you.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

From: RAE Farnborough.
To: NASA, Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va., U.S.A.

For Floyd L. Thompson Director from Sir Robert Cockburn Director. The Royal Aircraft Establishment congratulates the Langley Research Center on their fifty years of continuous contribution to aeronautical advancement. Your institution has had a far-reaching influence on the development of aviation, not only in the United States of America but throughout the world. Of all the modern technologies, aviation has surely been the most international since its inception. Your work has contributed to the defense of our countries, and to the evolution of a great system of world transport; we are pleased and honored that during the last fifty years there has been such a close relationship between our establishments. As early aviation pioneers ourselves, we know the difficulties that have been surmounted, and understand the feelings of Samuel Pierpoint Langley who wrote in 1891 quote a great many scientific men treated the whole subject with entire indifference, as unworthy of attention, or as outside of legitimate research, the proper field of the charlatan, and one on which it was scarcely prudent for a man with reputation to lose to enter unquote. This we have changed. There have been a few developments which, measured in terms of their impact on human affairs, have progressed as rapidly as has aviation in the last half-century. The aeronautical links between us are well known, but there are geographical and historical links as well. Your town of Hampton was named for the Earl of Southampton, whose ancestors were also responsible for giving their name to the county to Hampshire, in which the RAE is situated. It remains for us to wish you continuing success in meeting the challenges of the future, which are every bit as great as those which our predecessors helped to bring to achievement.

UNITED'S NEW CARGO TERMINAL AT FRIENDSHIP

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, United Air Lines' $1 million air cargo terminal at Friendship International Airport was officially dedicated last month and it was my pleasure to tour this excellent facility. It represents a major improvement in air cargo service through Friendship, which is so centrally located for millions of residents and businesses in the Baltimore-Washington area.

United plans to use the terminal as an interim cargo facility until a cargo complex that will serve all airlines is readied at Friendship. Such a cargo complex is under study by airport planners. I am convinced that United has shown great foresight in choosing Friendship for this vast cargo operation. Despite the interim designation, United's new terminal can handle 12 million pounds of cargo per month. I was tremendously impressed with the efficient manner in which this volume of freight can be handled, which represents six times United's current monthly average of cargo business.

The terminal is now being served by DC-6A propeller cargo planes, but is designed for cargo operations by jet freighters. United officials announced at the dedication that the airline will double its propeller all-cargo service at Friendship before the end of the year and introduce jet freighter service next spring. As you know, Friendship is in a unique position to offer this room for expansion and I am delighted that United has taken advantage of Friendship's unusual planning.

The jet service will be provided by the 727 Quick Change (QC) aircraft that can be converted from passenger plane to cargo aircraft in 30 minutes. Under a typical schedule, a 727QC passenger flight would arrive at Friendship in the evening hours and deplane passengers at the main terminal building. It would then be moved to United's cargo terminal for the conversion process.

The DC-6A cargoliner is a four-engine aircraft with cargo capacity of 30,710 pounds while the 727QC has a cargo capacity of 40,000 pounds.

Local United executives said at the dedication that air cargo in the Baltimore-Washington area is growing at a very fast rate. The terminal, they said, reflects the company's confidence in Friendship and its prime location for serving the two communities and I am sure that United's business will continue to grow and prosper.

The cargo terminal is designed to handle the company's growing cargo business in the area for at least the next 5 years.

It is interesting to note that in 1964 United's cargo business out of Friendship totaled 16.1 million pounds. In 1965, this reached 21.3 million and last year, despite, the 43-day strike that halted United's operation, 21.4 million pounds were carried. Currently, United is carrying about 2 million pounds a month from Friendship.

A POSITIVE PROPOSAL—A NEGATIVE RESPONSE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson yesterday proposed a major test program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed. Today, we have heard a vicious and unfounded attack on one aspect of this new program. Accusations of "bribery," "corruption," and "clandestine deals" have been made.

The problem of unemployment in our central cities and our rural areas is too

important for honest attempts at solution to be slandered in this manner. Accordingly, I would like to set the record straight right now. The target of the irresponsible attack today is a proposal that ghettos in urban centers, as well as small pockets of rural poverty would be designated as labor surplus areas so that businesses willing to locate or to do business in these areas would be entitled to bid on the "set aside" portions of Government contracts designated for labor surplus areas. Under the "set aside" policy, a portion of Government contracts is given special consideration for allocation to firms located in or performing some of their work in labor surplus areas. This practice has been followed for more than 15 years, and has been of immeasureable assistance to these disadvantaged areas, while at the same time adequately meeting the legitimate procurement needs of the Federal Government. To characterize this practice as "bribery," "corruption," and "clandestine deals" is the grossest distortion of the facts. No responsible people or groups have ever suggested that this practice be done away with, and I am sure that such a step backward would be resisted wholeheartedly by the Members of this body. Because the lack of jobs is at the very heart of the problems of our central cities and rural poverty areas, it is encumbent upon all of us to examine, critically, but positively, every proposal put forth for the solution of the job problem. The President's proposal surely deserved that kind of a response. Statements such as we heard today by the Member from Illinois contribute nothing but confusion, negativism, and partisan poison. I ask all Members to examine the President's proposal in its entirely, and to evaluate it against the needs of the Nation and of its people.

AMERICA'S PRESENCE IN VIETNAM

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Gosport, the well-written publication of the Naval Air Station at Pensacola, had in its September 29 issue a letter from Chaplain G. P. Murray, U.S. Navy, in which he speaks impressively about the war in Vietnam and the necessity for America's presence there.

I submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

SIR: I have had it!

I am getting weary indeed of the many articles and letters submitted concerning Red China and the war in Vietnam. They are written, I'm sure, by people who have never been ashore in the combat area.

This pains my heart, because the things they are saying are just not so. I spent eight months in the combat zone with a group of men who literally worked themselves to death on humanitarian projects. We built roads, a hospital, dug water wells, and did countless acts of civic improvement, such as working in Catholic and Protestant orphanages.

Then, returning to the good old U.S.A. I find criticism, bickering, and questions like: "Are you still burning innocent villages and shooting civilian women and children?" I find that patriotism is suspect, military obligation is something to be avoided, and to almost kill yourself trying to rescue a man is now a sin.

I wish that the critics of the war, and those who are always clamoring about Red China, would shut up and listen once in a while to those who have been there. Please excuse my phraseology, but I mean it. I'm sick to death of battlefield experts who have never left home, and of mushy Christians who have never been to an area where to believe in Christ means torture and death. Let them spend their time under fire, then I'll listen. Let them go over and talk to the refugees from China and North Vietnam, then I'll talk with them. May God have mercy on these political and military experts who debate in a classroom and never get more than a hundred miles from home. May God have mercy on us all, for condemning so easily and commending so slowly.

When I ask these people back in the States if they have been to Asia, if they have talked to any refugees from North Vietnam lately, or questions of that nature, they say, "No, but it doesn't make any difference!" Can you imagine that?

I hear continual criticism of our presence in Asia and continual harping to withdraw. North Vietnamese to get out of South Vietnam? Why isn't there more condemnation of the raping, looting, burning, and the hell the Communists are spreading south of the demilitarized zone? I think the thing that burns the soul of every soldier is to come home and hear some fat, comfortable preacher in his clerical garb denounce our country's policy, and spout off about a war he hasn't fought in and discuss issues he has no firsthand knowledge of. I know this has been true since "Willie and Joe" came back from World War II, but for heaven's sake we ought to learn something by now.

How stupid can we get?

I know that this war is a terrible thing. I know that there is a lot of feeling about "political policy," and "foreign affairs," and that it is not a simple thing. Oh, Lord, how will I know this—as does anyone who has been there for a few months.

There is no doubt in my mind that this is the "Good-Samaritan-Parable War!" We've got a bruised and bleeding South Vietnamese desperately in need of help. And a lot of Americans fear getting involved by stopping to help. The thing that breaks my heart is, that having been one of the many who did stop and try to help a little, I straighten up, and turn around looking for our Church to help—and I don't find it! What's wrong with being on the side of freedom? What's wrong with helping a brother who is hurt badly and calling for help? What's wrong with speaking out against the godless ruthlessness of Communism? Nothing, you say? Then why don't we do it?

I loved the Reformed Church of America, and I hope I'm Christian in the matter of speaking to the Red Chinese, and working for peace. The only trouble is the last Red Chinese I saw tried to mortar me to death.

Now, brother, if you want to speak with him, and discuss the issues of peace with him, go right ahead! Be my guest. I have had it. You try it for a while. Then, after you come back, let me know how you made out.

Fraternally,

G. P. MURRAY,
Chaplain, USN, Naval Shipyard,
Boston, Mass.

THE INEVITABLE RACE WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, open hostility between the Negro and white races is now being spoken of as inevitable. An alarming number of men who call themselves religious leaders are preaching the "desirability" of black power, urging the Negroes into civil disobedience, riots, and bloody confrontations with authorities.

A tiger has been loosed in the streets; an animal that threatens to destroy civilized men. Instead of searching for ways to undo the mischief they brought about by setting this inevitable conflict into motion, too many leaders are egging it on by speeches suggesting, even advocating, increased violence.

In recent days, churchmen from all over the Nation gathered in Milwaukee to launch further street demonstrations against the city's housing laws or lack of them. This attack upon constituted authority, this challenge to the police is a deliberate effort to provoke violence. How terrible that it should be led by men of the cloth, men of God, men of peace.

Here in Washington, a retired Episcopal bishop compares the vile, hate-ridden scavenger Rap Brown to the prophet Isaiah. I can only call down upon them both the Lord's own admonition in the Book of Isaiah:

> Wash yourselves; make yourselves clean; remove the evil of your doings from before my eyes.

And I would recall to the Bishop and the man he fawningly admires, the further caution of the Lord in that same chapter:

> You shall be devoured by the sword.

One man who is of national reputation has dared to stand up and speak some of the much-needed verities is sociologist Daniel P. Moynihan. In a frank address to the leftwing ADA. Mr. Moynihan laid the blame for fomenting this black revolution squarely at the door of the liberal cranks. It is a revealing address and I urge every Member of the House to study it, to commit it to memory.

If men of Mr. Moynihan's perceptiveness had been at the helm 10 or 15 years ago, this Nation would not be on the brink of another civil war. Hear his words well:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 24, 1967]

MOYNIHAN CHIDES LIBERALS ON NEGRO VIOLENCE

Sociologist Daniel Patrick Moynihan yesterday told his fellow liberals the time has come for them to stop "sticking up for and explaining away everything, howsoever outrageous, which Negroes individually and collectively might do."

In an address to the national executive board of Americans for Democratic Action, Moynihan warned: "The time for the confrontation of the realities of black and white has come in America. It will not be pretty."

Moynihan, director of the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Affairs and a former assistant secretary of labor, also told the ADA leaders that liberal Democrats must:

1. Recognize that "their essential interest is in the stability of the social order" and promote that goal through "much more effective alliances with political conservatives who share that concern."

2. Abandon "the notion that the nation, especially the cities of the nation, can be run from agencies in Washington," and instead place more emphasis on local programs.

FAMILY STRUCTURE BLAMED

Moynihan became the center of a controversy two years ago when he prepared a Labor Department report arguing that the real cause of the American Negro's problems was not so much segregation or the lack of voting power.

Instead, he said, Negroes had failed to gain equality because their family structure was "highly unstable, and in many urban centers . . . approaching complete breakdown."

Yesterday's speech was as sharp a critique as advanced by any liberal Democrat in the wake of the summer's urban violence.

Moynihan told the ADA members that the summer riots had brought into focus two related sets of problems:

"On one hand, the problems of the conditions of life and social behavior of the vast Negro underclass that has somehow grown up in our Northern cities; a disorganized, angry, hurt group of persons easily given to self-destructive violence.

"NIHILIST YOUTH"

"And along with them, another group of radical nihilist youth, not themselves members of this underclass, but identifying with it, able to communicate with it, and determined to use it as an instrument of a violent, apocalyptic confrontation with a white society they have determined to be irredeemably militaristic and racist."

Moynihan added:

"I do not believe we have yet realized the depth and intensity of the feelings of this second group, nor of the extent to which they have succeeded in politicizing the always existing torment of the urban masses, and in persuading them both of the inevitability and the desirability of a nihilistic solution.

"All the signs, such as they are, declare that the violence is not ended. What is more, a new set of signs tells us something that is painful, even hateful to have to hear, namely that we must prepare for the onset of terrorism.

"Indeed it may already have begun. How widespread and how successful remains to be seen, but the probability is so great that it would be an act of irresponsibility or of cowardice not to face it."

"THEIR COURSE IS SET"

Moynihan said, "There is nothing whatever to be done to change the minds of the Negro nihilists, nor of their white associates, that have been so much in evidence of late. Their course is set. The only option for the nation is to deprive them of the Negro underclass, which is the source of their present strength."

Moynihan told the ADA leaders, many of them opposed to President Johnson's policies in Vietnam, that:

"President Johnson will almost certainly be re-elected in 1968 . . . Moreover, the war in Asia is likely to go on many more years, although possibly in different forms. And most importantly, the violence in our cities, tensions between racial and ethnic groups, is just as likely to go on and, if anything, get worse."

To promote what he called "the politics of stability," Moynihan called on the liberal Democrats to abandon "the rhetoric that Republicans don't know anything about the social problems of the nation, or, in any event, don't really care."

Pointing to New York City Mayor John Lindsay and New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller as examples, Moynihan called for a new alliance between GOP leaders and Democrats.

ASKS NEW ALLIANCE

Moynihan said the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. and many other liberals "are no doubt correct in holding that the war in Vietnam has brought a stalemate to government efforts on behalf of Negroes at home, but they are wrong, I would think, in their proposed solution, which is for the government to get out of Vietnam."

He explained: "An American government in this age will always give priority to foreign affairs. A system has to be developed, therefore, under which domestic programs go forward regardless of what international crisis is preoccupying Washington at the moment. This, in effect, means decentralizing the initiative and the resources for such programs."

On Tuesday, September 26, following Mr. Moynihan's remarks, the Washington Star endorsed his position in an editorial, "The Liberal Dilemma." It, too, is worthy of our attention.

THE LIBERAL DILEMMA

Daniel Patrick Moynihan is a man dedicated to the proposition that the truth should be heard, regardless of whose sacred cow is scarred in the process. And this fact alone sets him apart from the majority of those whose function it is to think aloud in public today.

Two years ago, Moynihan—then assistant secretary of labor—was asked to study the root causes of the Negro problem. His report, arguing that the basis of the trouble was the instability of the Negro family structure, resulted in his being labeled a racist by the people who make a practice of basing their conclusions on emotion rather than facts.

Now, he's done it again.

Moynihan, who is now director of the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Affairs, undertook to tell the executive board of the Americans for Democratic Action what the proper role of the liberal should be today. As a result, there are bound to be demands that his credentials as a liberal be canceled.

The core of Moynihan's argument is that the major international and domestic crises that face the nation today cannot merely be the targets of liberal political wrath. The liberals, he said, should face up to their responsibility by seeking solutions to the problems, and should stop preaching against what is happening, because "it is they who have been in office . . . and in large measure presided over the onset of both the war in Vietnam and the violence in American cities."

It is time, he said, to recognize that "getting out of Vietnam is a matter not just of summoning the will, but also of finding a way."

It is time for liberals to approach the domestic crisis with an understanding "that their essential interest is in the stability of the social order" and to form "much more effective alliances with political conservatives."

Liberals should "divest themselves of the notion that the nation . . . can be run from agencies in Washington" and should work toward a decentralization of government power.

And finally "liberals must somehow overcome the curious condescension which takes the form of sticking up for and explaining away anything, howsoever outrageous, which Negroes, individually or collectively, might do."

Pat Moynihan does not have all the answers. But here is a man who thinks, who cares, and who has the courage to speak his mind. And he has put his finger on an essential truth.

This is a time of choice for the liberals of this nation. It is a time of division between those hopelessly enmeshed in the politics of opposition and change, and those who are truly liberal enough in their thinking to realize that the nation is indeed in a major crisis at home and abroad. It is a time when the only sane reaction is to stabilize the ship and to start bailing, not to drill more holes in the hull.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. McDADE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. WATKINS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SNYDER for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS of California), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SNYDER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 20 minutes, on October 4.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRYOR), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WAGGONNER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, for 15 minutes, on October 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BOW, to include extraneous matter with remarks made in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RYAN, to include certain tables and extraneous matter with remarks made in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. DICKINSON.

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

Mr. ULLMAN.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. HOWARD.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 4, 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:

1132. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of congressional alternates authorized to be nominated for each vacancy at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1133. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a contract relating to drainage and minor construction work on the Roza division of the Yakima project, Washington, pursuant to 70 Stat. 274; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1134. A letter from the Federal Cochairman, Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, transmitting a copy of a resolution recommending the establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1135. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the second report on the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965 made pursuant to section 10(a) of the act approved September 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 895), as amended by the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 931); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1136. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1137. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1138. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order suspending deportation, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1139. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of list and orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1140. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 8, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Pithlachascotee River, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 7, 1961; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 780. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize planning grants to air pollution control agencies; expand research provisions relating to fuels and vehicles; provide for interstate air pollution control agencies or commissions; authorize the establishment of air quality standards, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD: Committee of Conference. H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 729). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 13270. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 13271. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to work schedules of annual rate regular employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13272. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 with regard to definition of the term "nationals of the United States"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MAILLIARD and Mr. MOSHER):

H.R. 13273. A bill to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, to extend the period of time within which the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources is to submit its final report and to provide for a fixed expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 13274. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. POFF, Mr. MOORE, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. ROTH, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. BETTS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. MATHIAS of California and Mr. ERLENBORN):

H.R. 13275. A bill to prohibit electronic surveillance by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DENT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KEITH, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 13276. A bill to extend the tariff quota treatment for certain stainless steel table flatware; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 13277. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rates of duty on certain billets of iron or steel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 13278. A bill to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 13279. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 13280. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 13281. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 13282. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13283. A bill relative to age discrimination in employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13284. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement research and regulation, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13285. A bill to amend the National Firearms Act to impose special (occupational) taxes with respect to engaging in the business of importing, manufacturing, and dealing in destructive weapons such as bombs, grenades, rockets, missiles, bazookas, and antitank guns, to impose taxes with respect to the making and to the transfer of such weapons, and to increase the rates of special (occupational) tax, transfer tax, and making tax imposed by the act, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13286. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 13287. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 13288. A bill to amend title 38 of the

United States Code to prevent loss of veteran pension benefits as a result of increases in social security benefit payments resulting from enactment of the Social Security Amendments Act of 1967; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13289. A bill to amend section 620, title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of a higher proportion of hospital costs in establishing amounts payable for nursing home care of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13290. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13291. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain service-connected disabled veterans who are retired members of the uniformed services to receive compensation concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 13292. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 13293. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.J. Res. 864. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.J. Res. 865. Joint resolution in opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.J. Res. 866. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WYATT:

H. Con. Res. 518. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Con. Res. 519. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13294. A bill for the relief of John S. Avagelou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 13295. A bill for the relief of John Papadatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 13296. A bill for the relief of Lo Wing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 13297. A bill for the relief of Evangeline Yinwan Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 13298. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Awad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 13299. A bill for the relief of Aviva Stavisky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 13300. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col Burdon L. Davidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13301. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. John R. Aneli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We Need Stepped Up Action To Combat Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the President has asked this session of Congress to act for cleaner air for our Nation. The need for action is great and the time for action is now.

Air pollution is not a new problem. It is an old problem which is usually identified with our large cities.

Yet, air pollution is not a problem of our cities only. It is a problem for every American, no matter where he lives, because everyone directly or indirectly must eventually pay the price for dirty air. Polluted city air is not contained within city limits. It is carried by the winds to our suburbs, towns, and farms. And the sources of air pollution are to be found not only in the city but wherever people work or are transported.

A look at projections of future levels of population, industrial production, electric power generation, use of heating fuels, automobiles produced, and gasoline consumed can lead to only one conclusion: that we are going to have to run fast just to stay where we are in terms of air quality.

To go further and clean up the befouled air that most city dwellers now breathe requires sharply increased antipollution efforts involving cooperation among the Federal, State, and local governments.

The proposed Air Quality Act provides for planning, for control on a regional basis, between and within the States. It assists the States to take the initiative and develop programs in cooperation with the counties and cities interlocking this effort with the Federal program. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge enactment of S. 780, so that the interests of the American people in clean air may be adequately protected.

Statement in Honor of the German-American People on the Occasion of German-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 284 years ago, the good ship *Concord* docked at Philadelphia, disembarking the first German settlers in America. It was a major event in our national history, ushering in the force and the spirit of a people who have served our country's cause to remarkable effect.

The primary German contribution to America is in the form of human resources constituting about one-fifth the total white population of the United States today. Another major contribution has been an enduring belief in the democratic process. The German Quakers of Germantown, Pa., immortalized themselves by formally protesting the existence of Negro slavery in America, in 1788. Another deed of imperishable fame was the position adopted by Peter Zenger, a German immigrant and a printer and publisher, who gambled everything in the process of establishing the great American freedom of the press, in 1735. Eight years later another German printer, Christopher Saur, published the complete Lutheran Bible in the German language. It was the first Bible printed in a European language in the American Colonies. Another eminent German printer and publisher was Henry Miller, subsequently the printer of Congress, who announced the signing of the Declaration of Independence, in the form of a news release, a day ahead of all other newspapers in America.

Technological improvement in this country also has been tied to German immigration. The industrial history of 19th century America reveals the German presence in the forefront. German technical schools produced an extraordinary number of talented students who fled the country following the abortive revolution of 1848, and settled in America. Of these, perhaps the best known were engineers. John A. Roebling, a German immigrant, built the first great suspension bridge over the Niagara River, and then built the Brooklyn Bridge. Charles C. Schneider, also German, built the first successful cantilever railroad bridge of any considerable size. Gustav Lindenthal was the architect of the Hell Gate bridge, spanning the Hudson. The great tunnel under Virginia City, Nev., was constructed by Adolf Sutro. Among

electrical engineers, the outstanding German-Americans were George P. Steinmetz and George Westinghouse.

When American undergraduate colleges began expanding into universities, toward the close of the 19th century, the German university served as a model.

And three of the major churches in America were founded by Germans: The Lutheran, the German Reformed, and the United Brethren.

The names of outstanding Americans of German birth spread out across almost three centuries of American history. Those in the limelight of history and those in the obscurity of the masses of immigrants integrated themselves into the rhythm of the new country and did their share to help it in the struggle for national preeminence.

Today, all America salutes Americans of German heritage. They are, indeed, outstanding contributors to our national way of life.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1967

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, October 1 marked the observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, 1967. The employment of the physically handicapped is good business as well as a means of extending a helping hand to those persons who are willing and eager to become a productive part of the economy. At this time, I insert in the RECORD the proclamation of President Lyndon B. Johnson, designating National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week:

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK, 1967

(A proclamation by the President of the United States)

Millions of American families know, firsthand, the painful and frustrating limitations of physical disability.

Those handicaps, cruel as they are, need not be totally disabling. Our society should not be deprived of the skills and talents of disabled men and women. Many of those men and women have a remarkable capacity for achievement despite their disability.

It is part of America's promise that every citizen should have the opportunity to escape from perpetual dependence, make the most of his capacities, and take a full part in community life.

Government and private organizations have long worked to reduce the consequences of disability. Research, health conservation programs, and medical and rehabilitation facilities have all combined to lessen the residual damage of disease and injury.

The Federal Government is assisting States and communities in training the handicapped for jobs in a continually changing job market. It offers leadership to business and industry to increase the range of job opportunities for the handicapped. It encourages voluntary organizations to create the necessary climate of acceptance for the full admission of the handicapped into the mainstream of everyday life.

Yet pockets of prejudice still exist, particularly against certain categories of the more severely disabled.

We must continue to educate our citizens—employers and workers, healthy and handicapped—about the benefits of developing and using every person's skills.

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, in consonance with the joint resolution of Congress approved August 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 530), designating the first full week of October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, do hereby call upon the people of our Nation to observe the week beginning October 1, 1967, for such purpose.

During this 20th anniversary year of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, I urge all public and private organizations and all citizens to renew their dedication to this volunteer effort to further job opportunities for the handicapped. Let us work together for their meaningful participation in the world of work, and in a life of dignity.

I urge all the Governors of States, mayors of cities, and other public officials, as well as leaders of industry, educational and religious groups, labor, civic, veterans', agricultural, women's, scientific, professional, and fraternal organizations, and all other interested organizations and individuals, including the handicapped themselves, to participate in this observance.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-eighth day of August in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Congressman Jack Edwards Comments in a Letter to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1967

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, Congressman JACK EDWARDS, representing the First Congressional District of Alabama, is this week sending a letter to his constituents highlighting and commenting on several current and important legislative issues. I think the letter will be of interest to the Members and I include the text of his letter at this point in my remarks:

NEWSLETTER OF CONGRESSMAN JACK EDWARDS, OF ALABAMA

ON THE BRIGHT SIDE

With so many troublesome issues facing the country at home and abroad it often seems difficult to point to any news that is optimistic and hopeful. But there have been some developments on the bright side in these past few weeks.

1. The Congressional demand for cuts in federal spending is making headway. The House Ways and Means Committee is holding back action on LBJ's tax increase bill, asking some solid assurance from the President that he will make substantial cuts in non-essential spending. While Mr. Johnson has refused so far to make these specific assurances, some form of spending reduction may be forthcoming. Never before in the past seven years has the matter of deficit spending and irresponsible fiscal management been so clear in the minds of Americans.

2. Both House and Senate have approved a proposal similar to mine, providing for studies and recommendations on ways to limit the distribution of pornographic materials. The final version now being worked out gives special attention to the need to protect children from the effects of the growing and lucrative pornography racket.

3. On Sept. 11 the House of Representatives approved a bill providing benefits to local law enforcement officers (or their families) who are killed or injured while on duty apprehending persons in connection with violations of federal law. This is the least the federal government should do for policemen whose work is being made more difficult because of decisions made in Washington.

4. The Organization of American States has asked all nations to stop trading with Cuba until Castro halts aggression against other countries. This is the major result of Venezuela's call for OAS action following last May's Cuban infiltration of guerrillas onto a Venezuelan beach. While I have no illusions that this new move will solve the Communist Cuba problem, the OAS action was stronger than some had predicted.

IT'S FAIR TIME AGAIN

Again this year there will be a Jack Edwards booth at the Greater Gulf States Fair in Mobile from October 16th to 21st. I hope you will be able to come by.

BULLETINS AVAILABLE

I can send you, at no charge, booklets providing useful information on many aspects of home, garden, and farm care. Write me for a list of booklets available.

NEW DELAYS IN MARITIME POLICY

With U.S. Merchant Marine strength going steadily down hill over the past few years there has been rising concern in Congress, in maritime labor and industry. Despite assurances going back several years the Johnson Administration has failed to provide a working policy and program for rebuilding the U.S. merchant fleet. Positive suggestions put forth by many in Congress, including myself, have gone unheeded while U.S. shipping capability falls further and further behind.

Early last month, after Congressional leaders implored LBJ for action, it seemed that a real program was finally about to be presented. But none has been. And now, even if the Administration does announce proposals, it is too late for any real forward progress to be made until next year.

FAIRNESS IN FEDERAL TAX COLLECTION

You may recall that last January I introduced a proposal to set up a small claims tax court. The idea was to give help to the taxpayer who becomes involved in a dispute with the Internal Revenue Service over a tax claim of less than $2500. The way it is now, when the taxpayer defends his position as fully as he can, and the IRS still says he owes more taxes, his only recourse is long and costly court action even if he is in the right. My bill would give him a chance to defend himself before an impartial third party—the small claims tax court—at minimum cost.

Unfortunately, there is no sign that the Edwards bill will be given consideration in Congress very soon. And yet reports of unfair and even illegal activity of federal tax agents continue. Nearly every Congressman receives complaints from taxpayers. The *Reader's Digest* magazine published an article in August detailing several cases.

Tax payments are such a big expense item for all of us that the public must be assured of legality and fairness in tax collections. The charges and countercharges must be heard if confidence in government is to be retained. For this purpose I have made a formal request for Congress to hold public

hearings on the issue. I made the request of the chairman of the subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of which I am a member. With all sides in the controversy presenting their cases, it should then be possible for us to enact legislation protecting the rights of taxpayers. Unfortunately, my request has just been turned down. But I shall keep trying.

CRIME

The crime rate across the nation is rising at a fast pace. Americans in rural areas and in the biggest cities are fearful, and are asking for remedies.

President Johnson has made some proposals to combat street crime. But they would have given Washington too much control over local law enforcement agencies, opening the way to more Federal "guidelines." The House has voted to channel Federal help through state governments instead, and this is a much better approach.

The other kind of crime is organized crime. Unlike street crime, organized crime crosses state lines. Narcotics traffic, numbers games, vice, and loan sharking require federal as well as local government attention.

Yet, where organized crime is concerned, LBJ has done very little, even though his own National Crime Commission has made recommendations for corrective action.

It is a fact that the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Department of Justice is far less active now in efforts against organized crime than it was in 1964. Its work should be intensified.

Growing crime and the conditions which bring it about require serious attention.

POSTAL RATES

Just as the overall federal budget deficit is growing so fast, the Post Office operating deficit is also on the rise. To help meet rising costs an increase in postage rates is likely to be approved this year.

As planned now, the first class mail rate would go from 5¢ to 6¢; the air mail rate from 8¢ to 10¢. Second class rates would go up about 21 percent, and third class rates about 32 percent.

ELECTION CAMPAIGN SUBSIDY

A committee in the Senate has approved new legislation which would subsidize election campaign expenses for Presidential and Senatorial candidates. Though intended to reduce the influence of big political contributors, the proposal seems unlikely to do that job, and raises many new problems.

Under the plan a Presidential candidate could tap the Treasury for $14 million. The subsidy to Senate candidates would vary from state to state. In Alabama it would be about $250,000 per candidate. The total cost in 1968 could be $54 million, not counting minor party candidates. The cost would be sure to rise later.

This bill would certainly create more mischief than it would eliminate. It should not be enacted into law and I intend to vigorously oppose it.

Briefing at Langley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1967

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 50th anniversary of the Langley Research Center at Hampton, Va., and I had the high privilege of representing the House Committee on Science and Astronautics yesterday at a briefing on the accomplishments at the Langley Research Center.

I stand today to express the gratitude which citizens of this Nation hold for Langley and its continuing vital role in developing U.S. preeminence, in both the air age and the space age.

In 1917, the Langley Center began its illustrious function as a key installation of the former National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the NACA. Langley was the first national laboratory established to conduct basic research in the science of aeronautics, and, for 41 years, was a facility of the NACA. In 1958, Langley became a bulwark of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration when NASA was formed.

As a former airline pilot, I have personally observed the fruits of the Langley harvest of research while piloting their aircraft.

In Langley's 50 years of service to the Nation, the speed of airplanes has increased from less than 100 miles per hour to more than 4,000 miles per hour. Langley's accomplishments in aeronautics have been vital to this progress.

The first of these Langley milestones was the development in the late twenties of the cowling for radial air-cooled engines, a streamlining effect credited with increasing airplane speeds of that period from 12 to 15 percent. The development of World War II aircraft began at Langley in the thirties. In the forties, Langley conceived of research airplanes leading to history-making aeronautical advancement at supersonic and hypersonic speeds, and in the fifties, the design, development, and practical application of the world's first transonic wind tunnels. Langley's discovery and verification of revolutionary design concepts concerning aircraft configuration after World War II became the key to practical supersonic flight.

Today, Langley's aeronautical research includes investigations of current and future concepts such as hypersonic flight vehicles and their propulsion systems; supersonic aircraft of advanced design, such as the SST and military vehicles; helicopters; VTOL/STOL aircraft, which combine vertical or short takeoff and landing capability with the performance and handling qualities of a conventional airplane in cruising flight; and the development and practical application of pioneering aircraft design concepts such as the variable sweepwing.

Langley was the birthplace of Project Mercury, the first U.S. manned space flight project. Some of Langley's other milestones in space—both past and present—include research in support of the successful Gemini program and the current Apollo; the invention of automatically erectable spacecraft which made possible the successful Explorer and Echo-type satellites; the development of the versatile Scout, the first all-solid fueled launch vehicle to place a satellite in orbit; the management of Lunar Orbiter, Project Fire, and other major space flight efforts; and analytical, laboratory, and flight investigations which are providing basic information useful in future projects concerned with the exploration of the planets.

In addition to Lunar Orbiter, the Langley Center is supporting Apollo through the use of unique simulators and specialized laboratories, which are making it possible for Langley scientists and research pilots, working with NASA astronauts, to duplicate some of the conditions of space and to develop techniques for such events as lunar landing, walking on the moon, extravehicular activity, rendezvous and docking in lunar orbit, reentry, and earthlanding.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and a professional rated pilot, it was an inspiration to see these facilities in use and to meet the dedicated Langley team who are working to assure that Langley's proud record of the past 50 years is but a prolog of greater achievements in the future.

Roosevelt-Kennedy Memorial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in an address at Medford, Oreg., last Saturday, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman helped Oregonians commemorate two great Democratic Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy.

During this time of domestic crisis and foreign trial, it is well for us to recall some of the major achievements of the past 6 years. Secretary Freeman has not only done this, but has repeated the pledge of the Democratic Party to work to resolve the problems of rural America.

I commend the Secretary's remarks to my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT A ROOSEVELT-KENNEDY MEMORIAL DINNER IN MEDFORD, OREG., 8 P.M., SEPTEMBER 30, 1967

Tonight we meet to honor the memory and the accomplishments of two great Democratic Presidents—Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy.

But it is not my purpose to eulogize the man who taught us that all we had to fear was fear itself and the man who inspired this country to get moving again.

Their deeds do not need eulogy. They are inscribed in the annals for all time to come.

I grew up in Franklin Roosevelt's time and he was my hero. I served in John Kennedy's Administration. And he was my hero, too. My memories, my respect, my deep affection for both will never die.

Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy shared many attributes, and not the least of these was their deep concern for a continuity of responsibility, a concern that progress be a steady procession, unmarked by backward steps.

So tonight I want to address myself to the matter of continued responsibility and steady progress, for this is what I think the two men we honor tonight would want me to talk about. Their attention, too, was focused

on the present and the future . . . and only rarely on the past.

Now I am told that there are some Republicans in the audience this evening. I trust they will not be too uncomfortable. My purpose will not be to embarrass them . . . but it *will* be to convert them. The Democratic party, you know, keeps a candle in the window for all repentent wanderers.

This year marks the 175th year of the founding of the Democratic party, and perhaps it is in order, tonight, to say a few words about our party—about how it began—about how and upon what it grew.

It began as the Republican party, as most of you know, but in those days the word Republican carried a different connotation than it does today. Specifically, the party called itself Republican to distinguish itself from the Monarchist party.

Later it became the Democratic-Republican party, but as if this incongruity were too much to bear, it divested itself of both hyphen and Republican in the 1830's and became the Democratic party.

From that time to now, the Democratic party has been distinguished by two characteristics, both of them described by Thomas Jefferson in this statement:

"No maxim," Jefferson said, "can be laid down as being wise and expedient for all times and circumstances. The maxim to be applied to a concrete case must depend on the circumstances which shall then govern."

Was everything, then, changeable?

"Yes," said Jefferson, "everything except the inherent, unalienable rights of man."

A pragmatism dedicated to respecting and best serving the unalienable rights of man . . . this is the philosophy and the modus operandi of the Democratic party. And this is the secret of its historical success.

In a phrase, the Democratic party has been, is, and will continue to be the party of concern, compassion, courage . . . and continuity. The party of Yesterday. The party of Today. The party of Tomorrow.

It is my purpose tonight to inspire you to go out and tell the story of how the Administration of Lyndon Baines Johnson has kept faith with the people—and enhanced the great traditions of the party of Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman and John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

We've got the oldest and the greatest political party of all time. We represent a party that in the past seven years has written a record of accomplishment and progress unmatched in the annals of government in any country of the world.

And we have a President who will go down in history as one of the most courageous, humanitarian, imaginative and resourceful leaders this nation has ever known.

And yet, with all this going for us, there are too darned many Democrats going around these days wearing a hangdog look and an apologetic air!

Well, I'm here tonight to tell them to wipe it off! To stand tall and walk proud—because they've got every right to stand tall and walk proud.

Let me tell you right now that whatever political troubles the Democratic party is experiencing *are in large part a direct—and ironic—result of the successes we've had in building the foundations of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society on John Kennedy's New Frontier.*

Why? Because so much has been done, so much progress has been made in so short a time that perhaps the people of this country have come to expect too much too soon.

A rising tide of expectations—a tide drawn by the moon and the sun of seven years of prosperity and performance—has not yet washed ashore the *full* realization of those expectations.

But worst of all, we're letting the opposition use the resulting frustrations to their own advantage. We're letting them smokescreen the very real, dramatic, record-setting progress that *has* been made since 1960 and detract attention from their own record of obstructionism and negativism. And it's gone on long enough!

Let me ask my fellow Democrats some questions:

Are you ashamed of the greatest seven years of economic and social advance this nation has ever seen?

Are you ashamed of a gross national product 50 percent greater than it was in 1960?

Are you ashamed of the 7½ million new jobs created in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations?

Are you ashamed of a three percent *drop* in the unemployment rate?

Are you ashamed that personal income has jumped $180 billion, that you and your fellow citizens have $40 billion more to spend today than you had last year at this time?

Are you ashamed that corporate profits, *after taxes,* have doubled in the last seven years?

Are you ashamed that net per farm income jumped 70 percent from the beginning of 1961 to the close of 1966?

Are you ashamed that there is 25 percent less poverty in this country today than there was in 1960?

Are you ashamed that more progress, in less time, has been made in ending discrimination and righting the wrongs of two centuries than in any other era in history?

Are you ashamed of the record advance in aid to education?

Are you ashamed of Medicare, and what it has done to lighten the worries of our elderly?

Are you ashamed of the efforts this Administration is making to restore sociological health to our cities and economic vigor to our countryside?

Are you ashamed of the landmark legislation of the past seven years: Voting Rights, Elementary and Secondary Education, Higher Education, Peace Corps, Nuclear Test Ban, Alliance for Progress, Model Cities, Rent Supplements, Minimum Wage, establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation, a host of anti-poverty measures, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, Food for Freedom?

Are you ashamed that while 90 percent of the Republicans in Congress were voting *against* increased funds for education, building programs to reduce unemployment, finding ways to combat sickness, poverty and ignorance . . . 90 percent of the Democrats in Congress were voting *for* these measures?

Are you ashamed that your party put that legislation on the books and that that legislation was directly responsible for the remarkable progress of the past seven years?

Of course you aren't.

But you hear grumbling. And you hear complaints. And you hear criticism. And it disturbs you.

Don't let it. Remember, because our party and our Administration have done so much in such an incredibly short time, people have come to expect even more.

And they should!

This nation was built on the groundswell of rising expectations . . . and so was the Democratic party.

I am proud that our party—like the Man of LaMancha—fights unbeatable foes and tries to right unrightable wrongs and dreams impossible dreams . . . for humanity's victory lies not in realizing *all* that is expected, *it lies in the trying.*

Let them call us Quixotic dreamers. The dreamers get more done than those who merely sleep!

Robert Browning said it:

". . . a man's reach should exceed his grasp.

Or what's a heaven for?"

The earthly heaven we seek will always lie beyond our grasp . . . *but the extent to which we exert ourselves to reach the unattainable will determine the possible.*

We have not made all the progress we wanted to make in the last seven years. We've made mistakes. We've goofed on occasion. *But we tried. And we continue to try.*

And while we try, the opposition contents itself by denouncing and decrying, delaying and destroying, carping and criticizing, and nullifying and nay-saying.

And in few places is this more evident than in agriculture.

Let me preface my remarks by emphasizing as strongly as I can that we have not been able to solve all of agriculture's problems. Perhaps they never will be completely solved.

And let me say for the record that I am not satisfied, nor is the President satisfied, with our progress—remarkable though it has been in the last seven years.

How could we say we're satisfied as long as farmers still earn only two-thirds what city people earn, are still caught in the painful crunch of the cost-price squeeze?

Moreover, after a record income year in 1966 farmers have seen prices soften this year in the face of temporary oversupplies. I'll have more to say about that in a minute.

But these blemishes and disappointments cannot, and should not, obscure the record of advances made since 1961, nor dull the hope that further progress can be made.

Let's examine the record of just what has happened since the Democratic party regained the White House in 1960.

In the dreary eight years that preceded this happy event, farm income dropped 17 percent; grain surpluses piled up into mountains, crushing farm prices and flattening taxpayers' wallets; and the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in farm commodities rose to more than $8 billion.

In 1960 we had 2 billion bushels of corn in storage, enough grain sorghum to last a year and a half, and enough wheat to meet domestic needs for more than two years. We had so much surplus we were running out of storage space . . . and the farm outlook was as bleak as it could be.

But then, in 1961, things started to happen. Early that year an emergency feed grain bill set up a voluntary program that provided acreage reduction and price support for corn and grain sorghum. This program authorized payments to farmers for diverting feed grain acreage to soil conserving uses.

This was the first of the recovery measures. Had it not come when it did, feed grain stocks would have grown another 300 to 400 million bushels within the year.

But it was passed, and it was passed by Democratic votes . . . and it set the stage for four more gruelling fights to put four more great farm acts on the books: the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the Voluntary Feed Grains Bill of 1963, the Wheat-Cotton Bill of 1964, and—finally—the great Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 . . . great because it gave us the wheat, cotton, wool and feed grains commodity programs, milk quotas and acreage retirement provisions so necessary to round the corner from gloom to promise.

Now . . . what's happened since?

First of all, those mountains of surplus are gone. No more do they plague farmers *and* taxpayers. The CCC investment in commodities is now below $3.4 billion, the lowest level since 1953 and less than half the more than $8 billion peak. Feed grains and wheat—which once made up over 65 percent of the investment total—are now less than 30 percent.

And—Republican charges of "grain-dumping" notwithstanding—these surpluses of the Fifties were worked off *without* depressing farm prices.

While this was happening, farm income was climbing steadily. By 1966, net farm income had climbed 40 percent *and stood at*

the second highest mark in history. And gross farm income and net per farm income set all time records last year . . . the latter climbing 70 percent in six years.

Now statistics are cold consolation for those who have not shared in this upward income thrust. I know that. But to measure economic progress we have to deal with numbers and averages. They're the only tools we have.

At the same time, I am deeply concerned—and the President is deeply concerned—about those areas, those States—including your own—where farm income progress has not kept pace with the national advance. An impersonal set of statistics is one thing. A living, breathing, suffering farm family is another. No one is more aware of this than the President.

But we have made progress, and there's no denying it. And there's no denying that the legislation put on the books by Democrats was the legislation that enabled us to get rid of surpluses, strengthen prices, increase income and set farm export records. In the last fiscal year, farm exports climbed to $6.7 billion, 44 percent higher than the 1960 level. This fiscal year we'll hit $6.8 billion, despite less tonnage in some commodities and tougher competition abroad. We now have over 90 percent of the world soybean trade, almost half the world feed grain trade, and about 37 percent of the world wheat trade. And our dollar sales overseas are going up with each passing year.

That's the record of progress in agriculture since 1960. And here's how the opposition contributed to that record. Of the possible 1,576 Republican votes for the five great farm bills that produced this progress, House Republicans voted *No* 1,494 times! And Senate Republicans voted *No* by a margin of better than 2 to 1.

And the nay-sayers are still at it.

They're footdragging on two new concepts for continued farm progress and playing footsie with a measure that promises farm disaster.

After the bumper income year in 1966, this year we've had a little setback. That old bugaboo of overproduction has resulted in temporary supply gluts that have pushed prices down.

When the effort is to bring production in on a supply target, slight weather variations can mean a difference of millions of bushels in the total crop. This year excellent growing conditions in many areas have resulted in bumper crops. We expect a feed grain crop 12 percent above last year, a wheat crop 14 percent bigger than a year ago, and a billion bushel soybean crop for the first time.

This temporary glut—not a surplus—will require restraint on the part of farmers on the quantities of a commodity they move into the market at one time.

There are a number of things to help them avoid panic selling for too-low prices. The price-support program helps in the holding process. With a reseal program for onfarm and warehouse storage, farmers can hold on to their products and make the market work *for* them, rather than *against* them. Price supports and payments strengthen their holding power, and direct and diversionary payments make it possible for them to compete in world markets and, at the same time, maintain their income.

And just two weeks ago the President authorized me to open negotiations with a number of countries for the additional sale of our wheat and feed grains. These commodities will be sold under the Public Law 480 plan, and foreign countries will use their own currency to buy our grains.

This will mean the sale of hundreds of thousands of tons of wheat and feed grains and vegetable oil, and is certain to have a healthy effect on farm prices.

But . . . we need still another tool to keep prices strong in the face of temporary oversupplies. We need a strategic reserve bill of the kind that Congressman Graham Purcell has introduced. Not only would this bill permit the storing of a strategic reserve of grain to insure against a critical drawdown in an emergency or a bad crop year—*it would also bolster farm prices.*

But despite the obvious need for such legislation, the Republicans in Congress are trying to hamstring this bill with attempts to attach impossibly restrictive provisions to it.

I am appealing to farmers everywhere to tell their Congressmen how much they want—and need—the Purcell Bill.

Such a bill, coupled with the current commodity programs, would do much to stabilize the prices of the basic commodities. But, there still remains the problem of balancing supply and demand in those non-storable commodities not covered by programs. And 60 percent of our farmers' cash receipts come from the sale of those non-program commodities. In these commodities, the farmer is at the mercy of the market. There simply isn't very much—under present law—that the government can do.

What else can be done, then? Well, for the past six months I've been engaged in a continuing dialogue with farmers and farm leaders about an idea whose time has come—farmer bargaining—as one means to strengthen the farmers' muscle in the market place.

Interest and consensus are building rapidly. The idea is catching hold everywhere, and now we're considering possible legislation to give the farmer legal sanction to bargain effectively. Without this sanction, farm bargaining power remains just a phrase.

The approach could take several forms. One could be a National Farm Bargaining Board. Under this, producers could request the board to call elections and certify bargaining agents for farmers to negotiate with buyers. Another could be the broadening of the present system of marketing orders to include new commodities and new concepts.

Under either system, producers would thus have at least some power to determine their own prices.

But despite the excitement and the enthusiasm this concept is spurring in farm circles, *I have yet to hear one Republican leader—in or out of the Congress—utter a single word of support for it.*

But this, again, shouldn't surprise us. Farm bargaining is a positive idea . . . and Republicans instinctively gravitate toward the negative . . . just as they appear to be doing now in the case of a bill introduced by Tom Curtis, a powerful city Republican Congressman from Missouri.

The Curtis Bill is called a farm bill. In truth, it ought to be called a banker's bill.

I say this because the Curtis Bill would change the crop loan program by authorizing only private lending agencies to make recourse loans. The non-recourse CCC commodity loan program has long been one of the cornerstones of the farm programs. In the last 10 years, farmers have put a total of 3,916 million bushels of corn, 1,603 million bushels of grain sorghum, and 2,698 million bushels of wheat under non-recourse CCC loans. These non-recourse loans permitted a farmer to avoid dumping his crops on the market at harvest time. He could use the loan as a price support with the knowledge that should the market price fall below the loan level, he could deliver the crop in full satisfaction of the loan and not be subject to any legal deficiency judgment.

But the Curtis Bill would require the farmer to repay the loan on or before the maturity date, plus interest. The bill does provide for purchases by lending agencies, true, but how many private lending agencies have facilities for storage or are likely to want to pay the costs for commercial storage? And how many banks charters authorize such action?

Let no farmer delude himself about the real purpose of this bill. It has the support of the Farm Bureau . . . and the tacit approval of the Republican party. And this is exactly what Farm Bureau President Charles Shuman said about it:

"We are supporting a bill (the Curtis Bill) in the Congress which would eliminate the feed grain and the wheat control and subsidy plan immediately."

Could it be any clearer than that? And how long do you suppose cotton, tobacco, peanut, and rice programs would last once the wheat and feed grain programs were eliminated?

I hope our farmers realize how this would hurt them. Our studies and our consultations with agricultural economists in a number of land-grant colleges indicate *that in the absence of these programs net farm income might well fall by a third . . . or some $5 billion below the 1966 level of $16.4 billion!*

With these programs, wheat receipts have climbed $500 million over what they were in 1960, and feed grain receipts have soared $2.1 billion.

The Curtis Bill has been introduced. I think it's time for Republicans to stand up and be counted. Are they *for* this bill? Do they *want* to get rid of farm programs? Do they *want* to plunge agriculture back into the depths of the Dismal Fifties?

If that's what they want, let them say it. We'll stand on our record . . . not just for the past seven years, but for the past 57 years!

That record will show, my friends, that every single time since 1910 that a Democrat has succeeded a Republican in the White House farm prices and farm income have gone up. And every single time that a Republican has succeeded a Democrat in the White House farm prices and farm income have gone down!

And now, in closing, let me examine another phase of progress in rural America, a record of rural areas development that has also been written under the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations.

It is fast becoming apparent to millions of Americans that unless we restore across-the-board vitality to rural America we'll never stem the tide of migration to the big cities.

With each passing year, more than half a million Americans move from the countryside to the city . . . a move which simultaneously drains human resources from rural America and jams more bodies into big cities already all but overcome by the problem of too many people for too little space.

There seems little doubt that much of the social unrest of the cities is brought on by human friction—congestion and frustration—and that this congestion and frustration is being compounded by the continuing influx of rural migrants.

The challenge, then, is to restore economic vitality to the towns and the small and medium size cities in order to create enough opportunity to keep people there . . . and out of the big cities.

Industrial, recreation and service industries will come to rural America, if we work at it, and they will provide the economic backbone for jobs, new tax income, new business, and the social benefits that people want and need.

These things just don't find their way to a community. They can't be bestowed by a benevolent government. They don't just happen. They are the product of dynamic local leadership, working with determined local citizens, and using every tool—public and private—that is adaptable to the task.

In the past few months I have visited a number of states to see, first hand, how this

partnership of people with their governments is working with respect to creating a rural renaissance. I can report to you that it's working well in many places and not very well in others. But the tide is running our way. There is positive and dynamic action in enough places—including your own state—to convince me that rural America is stirring once again.

People who fled jobless to the big cities a few years ago are actually returning to the countryside, because this is where they want to live, and this is where they can get jobs again.

I won't try to tick off all the things the Johnson Administration is trying to do to bring about this revitalization of the countryside, but I will tell you what the Department of Agriculture alone is doing to bring the facilities, preserve and enhance the resources, that rural America must have to enjoy parity of opportunity and the amenities of life.

This fiscal year we will make 1,500 water system loans, 320 sewer system loans, 600 water and sewer planning grants, add another 100,000 rural telephones and provide electricity for another 150,000 rural Americans.

We will help rural Americans obtain 4,000 moderate cost houses, build or repair 47,089 low to moderate cost houses, 12,274 farm labor housing units and 2,230 rental units.

We'll make 243 more recreation association loans and we'll add another 13 Resource Conservation and Development Districts to the 21 we already have. We'll add 11 more new constructions for flood prevention and add hundreds of additional Watershed Protection projects. There are 68 project plans completed, 702 under construction and a total of 817 approved for operation.

This past fiscal year we added 219 new recreational sites, bringing the total to 9,500, and we reforested 116,468 acres and improved 194,906 acres of timber land.

For Oregonians, with their understandable preoccupation with forest lands, other natural resources, and outdoor recreation, these latter statistics should have particular significance.

As ardent conservationists, Oregonians should know, too, that under President Johnson the Congress has passed more conservation measures than any other Congress in history . . . including Highway Beautification, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Water Pollution Control Act, the Clean Air Act Amendment, the Small Watershed Program under Public Law 566, and authorization for Resource Conservation and Development.

Laws aren't everything, of course. The laws of the 1900's and the 1930's would not have succeeded without the wise administration of two great Presidents—both named Roosevelt.

Today, another great conservationist President is in the White House and his First Lady is the nation's leading advocate of natural beauty. Like the two Roosevelts, Lyndon Johnson is focusing national attention on conservation because he believes in it . . . and because he understands it.

And . . . like Franklin Roosevelt and John Fitzgerald Kennedy . . . this great President believes in the people because he understands the people.

He gives a brave heart to their aspirations . . . he gives a sad heart to their frustrations . . . he gives a glad heart to their Great Expectations.

For he, too, dreams the Impossible Dream . . . to wine the Possible Dream for the people.

Thank you.